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#### We’ll concede 1AC arg that FDI is key – Ex-Im doesn’t do that – only the counterplan solves the AFF

Hochberg – Chairman of Ex-Im – 9 (Fred P. Hochberg, chairman and president, Export-Import Bank of the United States, “Ex-Im helps US,” 9-25-2009, http://www.hutchnews.com/Westernfront/exim)

The letter, "Logic defied" (Sept. 13, 2009), is mistaken regarding the availability of $2 billion in financing from the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im Bank) for Brazil's oil company, Petrobras. Ex-Im Bank is the official U.S. export-credit agency, and its mission is not foreign investment but export financing to create and sustain American jobs.

#### OPIC can do the plan – empirical success

US Embassy, Mexico 7 (wikileaked cable from the US Embassy, Mexico to the US Secretary of State, “MEXICO 2007 INVESTMENT CLIMATE STATEMENT -- PART II,” 1-12-2007, http://wikileaks.org/cable/2007/01/07MEXICO173.html)

OPIC and Other Investment Insurance Programs ¶ In June 2003, Mexico and the U.S. Overseas Private Investment ¶ Corporation (OPIC) signed an agreement that will enable OPIC ¶ to offer all its programs and services in Mexico. The ¶ Mexican Senate approved full OPIC operations in August of ¶2004. Since then, OPIC has aggressively pursued potential ¶ investment projects in Mexico. OPIC increased its support ¶ for U.S. investment in Mexico more than tenfold when it ¶ approved 570 million USD in financing for new projects in ¶ February of 2005. ¶ OPIC-supported funds are among the largest providers of¶ private equity capital to emerging markets. Since 1987, OPIC ¶ has committed (as of FY 2005) over 2.6 billion USD in funding ¶ to 32 private equity funds. The OPIC funds currently ¶ investing in Mexico include Darby-BBVA Latin America Private ¶ Equity Fund, LP with a primary focus on equity investments in ¶ media and communications, transportation, consumer goods, ¶ housing, energy, and non-bank financial services and Latin ¶ Power III, L.P. focusing on equity investments in independent ¶ power projects ("IPPs") in Latin America and the Caribbean ¶ with a focus on renewable energy and Mexico.

#### Including advanced biofuels

NUICC 11 (National US-India Chamber of Commerce, “Energy (India),” 2011, http://www.nuicc.info/energy/)

In late 2010, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA) — which helps U.S. companies create jobs through the export of U.S. goods and services for priority development projects in emerging economies — and the U.S. Department of Commerce, together with India’s Planning Commission, launched the U.S.-India Energy Cooperation Program (ECP). The ECP aims to leverage private-sector business resources in the United States and India to promote a commercially viable clean-energy infrastructure and energy-efficiency technologies.¶ Initially, USTDA will support an Efficiency and Clean Energy Exchange Program that consists of four reverse trade missions to the United States, to introduce Indian officials and private-sector project sponsors to U.S. clean-energy and energy-efficiency technologies.¶ Also in late 2010, U.S. President Barrack Obama said the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) would provide up to $100 million of a $300 million clean-energy investment fund designed to deepen U.S.-India cooperation and further the development of low-carbon economies throughout the South Asia region. The fund, which will invest in solar, wind, hydropower, advanced biofuels and natural-gas projects, will focus predominantly on investments in India.¶ The South Asia fund and the India sub-fund augment OPIC’s growing pipeline of nearly $300 million in other clean-energy and energy-efficiency projects in India.

#### Ex-Im fails – turns solvency – and elimination is key to prevent retaliatory subsidization

DeMaura 13 (Stephen DeMaura, “Ex-Im Bank, Last Great Bastion of Corporate Cronyism,” Town Hall, 7-17-2013, http://townhall.com/columnists/stephendemaura/2013/07/17/exim-bank-last-great-bastion-of-corporate-cronyism-n1641838/page/full)

Somewhere in the long list of failed government programs, there still exists an agency that subsidizes some of America’s wealthiest corporations to the detriment of American employers. During a time when most Americans are cutting back financially, a federal agency known as the Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank) is providing monetary assistance to those that need it least.¶ For some time now, the Ex-Im Bank has been giving financial assistance in the form of loan guarantees to Fortune 500 companies that generate billions of dollars in profit each year. Most prominent is Boeing, which has received more than 8. 2 percent of Ex-Im’s total loan guarantees or roughly $12.2 billion in 2012. Boeing hardly needs the financial assistance seeing that this very same year the company generated more than $80 billion worth of revenue.¶ While this might not be enough to constitute government malpractice, it is also a fact that these loans are hurting American jobs and companies. In essence, the Ex-Im Bank enables foreign carriers to purchase Boeing aircraft at a discounted rate and with favorable terms. Thus, foreign airlines have lower fixed budgets and are thereby given a competitive advantage over their American counterparts, which have traditionally been prohibited from accessing such assistance. Some estimates calculate that the Bank has caused the U.S. airline industry to lose as many as 7,500 jobs.¶ Such collateral damage was never meant to be part of the Ex-Im Bank’s mission. In fact, the Export-Import Bank was originally established in 1934 to, ironically, promote American competitiveness. However, like many big-government programs as of late, the Ex-Im Bank is completely out of control. It now serves to enrich well-connected special interests at the expense of the rest of the country.¶ Such cronyism is most evident in the green energy sector, an industry that has been one of the largest benefactors of Ex-Im’s corporate welfare. The most notorious example is Solyndra, a solar-panel maker that received a $10.3 million loan guarantee from the Bank in addition to a $535 million stimulus loan from the Department of Energy. Despite receiving millions of dollars in taxpayer backed capital, the company went bankrupt. It is perplexing that a company with such weak financial health received so much taxpayer money, but perhaps it was related to the hundreds of thousands of dollars Solyndra spent on lobbyists or the large Obama campaign contributions bundled by one of Solyndra’s lead investors. Unfortunately, this is not the first or last time that Ex-Im has engaged in risky financial transactions. Ex-Im has provided financial assistance to a cacophony of financially troubled companies, including Abound Solar and Enron, proving that government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers.¶ Last year, Congress took notice of Ex-Im’s malfeasance and reauthorized the Bank’s charter with the understanding that it would begin to wind down operations and analyze its economic impact going forward, so as to ensure that no American employers were negatively affected. Unfortunately, the Bank has thus far failed to adhere to the law. The Ex-Im Bank has shown no signs of slowing down and continues providing loans to foreign entities at the expense of American companies as it quickly approaches its $140 billion lending limit.¶ Clearly, Congress needs to take a more aggressive approach in reining in the Bank’s largess. And that is why Senator Mike Lee and Congressman Justin Amash have introduced legislation to phase down the Export-Import Bank. The Bank has displayed a rampant disregard for the best interests of the American people, often favoring foreign entities at the expense of their American competitors. This rogue agency has additionally ignored Congressional oversight and perverted markets by instilling political cronyism.¶ While it is critical that American policymakers remain vigilant in their support of U.S. exports, a federal agency should not be at the epicenter of financial decisions that expose taxpayers to risk, particularly when private institutions are capable of efficiently approving or rejecting such transactions. In short, our country should not be financing a race to the bottom, where corporations are competing in an international subsidy bidding war that leaves our employers at a disadvantage. Instead, we should eliminate the Export-Import Bank and work with other countries to reach multilateral agreements to reduce subsidies in all nations.

#### Triggers escalating global trade wars, particularly with China

James 12 (Sallie James, policy analyst, CATO Institute, “Expanding Ex-Im's Mandate Is A Big Mistake,” Free Trade Bulletin, No.48, 3-14-2012, http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/expanding-exims-mandate-is-big-mistake)

Stop the Madness¶ Perhaps the most worrying aspect of the administration's plans is the apparent lack of standards or limits on where this subsidy race would end. Multilateral efforts to solve the growth of official export credits — the best way of dealing with this problem — don't appear to feature prominently in the administration's plans. The administration and other bank supporters have expressed concerns in the past about China, which is not a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and thus not bound by its 1978 agreement that limits export finance subsidies. But the "solution" put forward by the administration appears to accept export credit subsidies as a fact of life, as a substitute for trying to open dialogue to limit the export credit arms race. The administration's proposal, in other words, would see the United States match "export" financing, including for sales on home turf, to a pace and scope set by Beijing.¶ Rather than set off an ever-escalating round of tit-for-tat export credit subsidies, the federal government should seek to promote free markets at home and abroad and, in any case, refrain from growing ever larger in a futile and counterproductive attempt to micromanage the economy. The Ex-Im Bank's activities, even now, do not constitute a legitimate role of the federal government. Expanding the bank would be a mistake. Legislators should be looking toward winding down the bank completely, not expanding its role.

#### Most likely scenario for conflict

Landy 7 (Ben Landy, Atlantic Media Company director of research and strategy, 4-3-2007, http://chinaredux.com/2007/04/03/protectionism-and-war/#comments)

The greatest threat for the 21st century is that these economic flare-ups between the US and China will not be contained, but might spill over into the realm of military aggression between these two world powers. Economic conflict breeds military conflict. The stakes of trade override the ideological power of the Taiwan issue. China’s ability to continue growing at a rapid rate takes precedence, since there can be no sovereignty for China without economic growth. The United States’ role as the world’s superpower is dependent on its ability to lead economically. As many of you will know from reading this blog, I do not believe that war between the US and China is imminent, or a foregone conclusion in the future. I certainly do not hope for war. But I have little doubt that protectionist policies on both sides greatly increase the likelihood of conflict–far more than increases in military budgets and anti-satellite tests.
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#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America and spill over -- the plans reifies neoliberalism --- ethics require we de-link to preserve the environment and indigenous culture.

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

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

#### Allowing market principles to dictate the transition to renewables short circuits it—creates resource wars that only the alt can solve.

**Abramsky, former Institute of Advanced Studies in Science, Technology and Society fellow, 2010**

(Kolya, Sparking a Worldwide Energy Revolution: Social Struggles in the Transition to a Post-Petrol World, pg 26-7)

The fact that coal and oil are finite resources means that there is a long-term tendency in the direction of their phase-out, regardless of what intentional short-term interventions are carried out or not. Many proponents of renewable energy simply advocate leaving this phase-out process to the market. It is hoped that rising oil and coal prices will make these fuels increasingly less attractive. Efforts are focused on developing a renewable energy sector that is able to compete, rather than directly confronting, suppressing, and ultimately dismantling the coal and oil industries. However, leaving the phase-out of oil and coal to the market has at least three crucial implications. First, such a phase-out is likely to actually prolong the use of fossil fuels. As long as these energy sources are profitable to extract and to use, they will be. Down to the last remaining drops of oil or lumps of coal. Although resources are finite, they are still relatively abundant. Even those analysts who give the most pessimistic (though realistic) perspectives on resource availability, such as those included in this book, do not predict a complete exhaustion of resources in the very near future. And, from the perspective of climate change, a prolongation of fossil fuel use is the exact opposite of what needs to happen, phase-out must be sped up, not prolonged. Linked to this, the second consequence of a market-based phase-out of oil and coal will mean that the remaining oil and coal resources are frittered away for immediate profit rather than to build the infrastructure for a transition process. Given that building a new energy system will require massive amounts of energy inputs in a very concentrated period of time, this is a recipe for disaster. The third important consequence is that leaving the transition process to the market is likely to be increasingly coercive and conflictive if competition is left to determine who controls the last of these resources and for what purposes they are used. This means competition between workers globally, competition between firms, and competition between states. This translates to massive inequalities, hierarchies, and austerity measures being imposed on labor (both in and outside the energy sector); massive bankruptcies of smaller firms and concentration and centralization of capital; and last, but not least, military conflicts between states. Accepting a market-based phase out of oil and coal is accepting in advance that the rising price of energy and a transition away from coal and oil is paid by labor and not capital, when in actual fact the question of who pays still remains to be determined. The answer will only come through a process of collective global struggle, which occurs along class lines within the world-economy. It is important to correctly identify these lines of struggle at the outset, otherwise it will be a struggle lost before the fight even begins. Collectively planning energy use and fossil fuel phase-out is proving to be an enormously difficult social process, but it is likely to be far less socially regressive if based on cooperation, solidarity, and collectively-defined social needs, rather than if it is based around competition and profit. On the other hand, as the renewable energy sector expands globally, it is becoming increasingly clear that the only possible basis for an emancipatory transition towards renewable energy is by ensuring that a significant proportion of the sector is held under common or public ownership for non-commercial use. This includes the relevant infrastructures, technologies, and knowledge. It is likely that, as the sector expands, so too will struggles over its ownership. Of particular importance here is the struggle for non-commercial technology transfer against the iron straitjacket of the international patent regimes.

#### Environment collapse causes extinction – tipping points are coming

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 14-8, ldg)

It is common today to see this ecological rift simply in terms of climate change, which given the dangers it poses and the intractable problems for capitalism it presents has grabbed all the headlines. But recently scientists—in a project led by Johan Rockstrom at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and including Crutzen and the leading U.S. climatologist, James Hansen—have developed an analysis of nine "planetary boundaries" that are crucial to maintaining an earth-system environment in which humanity can exist safely. Climate change is only one of these, and the others are ocean acidification, stratospheric ozone depletion, the nitrogen and the phosphorus cycles, global freshwater use, change in land use, biodiversity loss, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. For the last two, atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution, there are not yet adequate physical measures, but for the other seven processes clear boundaries have been designated. Three of the boundaries—those for climate change, ocean acidification, and stratospheric ozone depletion—can be regarded as tipping points, which at a certain level lead to vast qualitative changes in the earth system that would threaten to destabilize the planet, causing it to depart from the "boundaries for a healthy planet." The boundaries for the other four processes—the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, change in land use, and biodiversity loss—are better viewed as signifying the onset of irreversible environmental degradation. Three processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries: climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss. Each of these can therefore be seen, in our terminology, as constituting an extreme "rift" in the planetary system. Stratospheric ozone depletion was an emerging rift in the 1990s, but is now stabilizing, even subsiding. Ocean acidification, the phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, and land system change are all rapidly emerging global rifts, though not yet extreme. Our knowledge of these rifts can be refined, and more plan-etary rifts may perhaps be discovered in the future. Nevertheless, the analysis of planetary boundaries and rifts, as they present themselves today, helps us understand the full scale of the ecological crisis now confronting humanity. The simple point is that the planet is being assaulted on many fronts as the result of human-generated changes in the global environment.4 In the planetary boundaries model developed by Rockstrom and his associates, each ecological process has a preindustrial value (that is, the level reached before the advent of industrial capitalism), a pro-posed boundary, and a current status. In the case of climate change the preindustrial value was 280 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere; its proposed boundary is 350 ppm (necessary if tipping points such as a catastrophic rise in sea level are to be avoided); and its current status is 390 ppm. Biodiversity loss is measured by the rate of extinction (number of species lost per million species per year). The preindustrial annual rate, referred to as the "natural" or "background" rate of species loss, was 0.1-1 per million; the proposed boundary is 10 per million; whereas the current rate is greater than 100 per million (100-1,000 times the preindustrial back-ground rate). With respect to the nitrogen cycle, the boundary is con-cerned with the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere for human use in millions of tons per year. Before the rise of industrial capitalism (more specifically before the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process early in the twentieth century), the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere was 0 tons. The proposed boundary, to avoid irreversible degradation of the earth system, is 35 million tons per year. The current status is 121 million tons per year. In each of these extreme rifts, the stability of the earth system as we know it is being endangered. We are at red alert status. If business as usual continues, the world is headed within the next few decades for major tipping points along with irreversible environmental degradation, threatening much of humanity. Biodiversity loss at current and projected rates could result in the loss of upward of a third of all living species this century. The pumping of more and more nitrogen into the biosphere is resulting in the creation of dead zones in lakes and ocean regions (a phenomenon also affected by phosphorus). Each one of these rifts by itself constitutes a global ecological crisis. These ruptures reveal that the limits of the earth system are not determined by the sheer physical scale of the economy but by the particular rifts in natural processes that are generated.5 The emerging rifts in the other ecological processes, which have not yet overshot their boundaries, are scarcely less threatening. For the phosphorus cycle (categorized as part of a single planetary boundary together with the nitrogen cycle), the preindustrial quantity flowing into the oceans per year was approximately 1 million tons; the proposed boundary is 11 million tons (based on the assumption that ocean anoxic events begin at ten times the background rate); and its current status is already 8.5 to 9.5 million tons. In regard to ocean acidification, the value refers to a global mean saturation state of arag-onite (a form of calcium carbonate) in surface seawater. A decline in the number indicates an increase in the acidity of the ocean. The preindustrial value was 3.44 (surface ocean aragonite saturation state); the proposed boundary—after which there would be a massive die-down of shell-forming organisms—is 2.75; and the current status is 2.90. In the case of freshwater use, the preindustrial annual consumption of freshwater in km3 (cubic kilometers) was 415; the estimated boundary is 4,000 km3 (marking a threshold beyond which the irreversible degradation and collapse of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is likely); and the current rate of consumption is 2,600 km3. For change in land use, the parameters are set by the percentage of global ice-free land surface converted to cropland. In preindustrial times, this percentage was very low. The proposed boundary is 15 percent (after which there is the danger of triggering catastrophic effects on ecosystems), and the current status is 11.7 percent. In each of these emerging rifts, we are faced with an orange alert status, in which we are rapidly moving toward extreme conditions, whereby we will pass the planetary boundaries, undermining the earth system that supports the conditions of life. No measure for chemical pollution has yet been determined, but proposals include measuring the effects of persistent organic pollu-tants (otherwise known as POPs), plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals, and nuclear waste on ecosystems and the earth system in general. Likewise, no measure has yet been determined for atmospheric aerosol loading (the overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere on a regional basis), which can disrupt monsoon systems, lead to health problems, and interact with climate change and freshwater boundaries. Stratospheric ozone depletion is the one previously emerging rift that was brought under control (as far as anthropogenic drivers were concerned) in the 1990s, reducing what was a rapidly growing threat to life on the planet due to an increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The preindustrial value of ozone concentration was 290 (Dobson Units—the measurement of atmospheric ozone columnar density, where 1 Dobson Unit is defined as 0.01 millimeters thick under standard pressure and temperature); the proposed planetary boundary is a concentration of 276 (after which life on the planet would experience devastating losses); and the current status is 283. Between 60°S and 60°N latitude, the decline in stratospheric ozone concentrations has been halted. Nevertheless, it will take decades for the Antarctic ozone hole to disappear, and Arctic ozone loss will likely persist for decades. Life on the planet had a close call.6 The mapping out of planetary boundaries in this way gives us a better sense of the real threat to the earth system. Although in recent years the environmental threat has come to be seen by many as simply a question of climate change, protecting the planet requires that we attend to all of these planetary boundaries, and others not yet determined. The essential problem is the unavoidable fact that an expanding economic system is placing additional burdens on a fixed earth system to the point of planetary overload. It has been estimated that in the early 1960s humanity used half of the planet's biocapacity in a year. Today this has risen to an overshoot of 30 percent beyond the earth's regenerative capacity. Business-as-usual projections point to a state in which the ecological footprint of humanity will be equivalent to the regenerative capacity of two planets by the mid-2030s.7 Rockstrom and his associates concluded their article in Nature by stating: "The evidence so far suggests that, as along as the [planetary boundary] thresholds are not crossed, humanity has the freedom to pursue long-term social and economic development." Although this is undoubtedly true, what is obviously not addressed in this conclu-sion—but is clearly the point of their whole analysis—is that these thresholds have in some cases already been crossed and in other cases will soon be crossed with the continuation of business as usual. Moreover, this can be attributed in each and every case to a primary cause: the current pattern of global socioeconomic development, that is, the capitalist mode of production and its expansionary tendencies. The whole problem can be called "the global ecological rift," referring to the overall break in the human relation to nature arising from an alienated system of capital accumulation without end.'

#### And, Neolib is a genocidal impulse that leads to extinction

**Santos, sociology prof, 3** (Boaventura de Sousa, Professor of Sociology at the School of Economics, University of Coimbra (Portugal) and Distinguished Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School. "Collective Suicide?" March 28, 2003 online http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php)

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge, and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra‑conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to he incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage", to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

#### Vote Neg to reject the Aff’s neoliberal economic engagement in favor of a commons-based approach. That solves and creates space to challenge neoliberalism

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2003**

(Massimo, “Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities”, Winter, <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06.pdf>, DOA: 7-2-12, ldg)

This movement has posed the question of a plurality of “alternatives” to the social processes and arrangements that produce the horrors of modern global capital. In order to take the many calls for and practices of alternatives seriously, we have to make them relevant to the real people at the fringe or outside the movement. In other words, we want to move from movement to society not so much by persuading people to “join” our movement, but through a language and a political practice that by tracing the connections between diverse practices attempts to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement, i.e., actually moves ‘from movement to society’. To make the possibility of a new world that contains many worlds an actuality, we have to be able to shape our own discourse in such a way as to echo the needs and aspirations coming from below. We have to give coherence to their plurality, without imposing a model or reiterating dead ideologies. We need a discourse that helps to articulate the many alternatives that spring out of the points of crises of neoliberal capital, which seriously threaten to dispossess people of their livelihood and impose on them new or more intensified commodified patterns of life. We need a discourse that builds on the plurality of the many concrete struggles and their methods and help us to articulate a vision – not a plan – of the whole. Then we can better evaluate what are the global implications of our local struggles, as well as the local implications of global struggles for the building of a world that contains many worlds. But most of all, we need a discourse that recognizes the power we have to shape alternatives, at every level in society, that sets out from the simple fact that, contrarily to common belief, alternatives do exist, are everywhere and plural. To clarify, I think that every social node, that is every individual or network of individuals is a bearer of alternatives. This is evident not only when struggles erupt in any of the waged or unwaged local and trans-local nodes of social production. We just need to look around in the relative normality of daily routines to see that every social node “knows” of different ways to do things within its life-world and sphere of action longs for a different space in which things can be done in different ways. Each social node expresses needs and aspirations that are the basis of alternatives. For example: the alternative to working 10 hours a day is working 6; the alternative to poverty is access to the means of existence; the alternative to indignity is dignity; the alternative to building that dam and uprooting communities is not building that dam and leaving communities where they are; the alternative to tomatoes going rotten while transported on the back of an old woman for 20 miles is not GM tomatoes that do not rot, but access to land near home, or a home, or a road and a truck. Since every social node is aware of a spectrum of alternatives, the problem is simply how to make these alternatives actual? What resources are needed? How to coordinate alternatives in such a way that they are not pitted against each other as is the case of the competitive markets’ understanding of alternatives? How to solve the many existing problems without relying on the alienating coordinating mechanism of the market and creating instead social relations of mutual enrichment, dignity, and respect? These are I believe the bottom line questions on which a new political discourse must be based. Once we acknowledge the existence of the galaxy of alternatives as they emerge from concrete needs and aspirations, we can ground today’s new political discourse in the thinking and practice of the actualization and the coordination of alternatives, so as each social node and each individual within it has the power to decide and take control over their lives. It is this actualization and this coordination that rescues existing alternatives from the cloud of their invisibility, because alternatives, as with any human product, are social products, and they need to be recognized and validated socially. Our political projects must push their way through beyond the existing forms of coordination, beyond the visible fist of the state, beyond the invisible hand of competitive markets, and beyond the hard realities of their interconnections that express themselves in today forms of neoliberal governance, promoting cooperation through competition and community through disempowerment. As I will argue, this new political discourse is based on the project of defending and extending the space of commons

### IRAN

#### Obama’s PC is on the brink – he can hold off sanctions on Iran but must maintain focus

Finkel 14 (David Finkel, editor of Against the Current, sponsor of New Politics, “Will the Iran Deal Hold?” ATC, #168, Jan/Feb 2014, http://www.solidarity-us.org/site/node/4058)

A politically weakened U.S. president is pulled by a powerful domestic lobby and influential foreign governments toward launching a war that U.S. imperialism right now doesn’t want, that the world doesn’t want, and that the large majority of the American public doesn’t want — what will be the outcome?¶ It’s an interesting, if dangerous and scary, test of how U.S. politics actually work. The initial results, at least, are in: The unleashed fury of the Israeli government and the “pro-Israel” lobby, the monarchy of Saudi Arabia, the neoconservative warmongers and the much-feared religious right weren’t able to block the Obama administration and European partners from reaching a six-month interim agreement with Iran over that country’s nuclear enrichment program.¶ Any socialist, progressive or sane person must welcome this agreement. That’s not because it resolves the proliferation of nuclear weapons, or changes the hideous character of the Iranian regime in relation to its own population, or addresses the multiple underlying issues of the Middle East crisis — it does none of these things — but because it pushes back the imminent danger of a really catastrophic war. That’s one strike against the widely held theory that the toxic influence of the Israel Lobby can drag the United States into wars that this country‘s ruling class disapproves.¶ The political fight, of course, is hardly over. We’ll explore the underlying reasons for the Israeli and Saudi sound and fury over the deal with Iran, which in fact have little to do with the rather distant specter of an Iranian atomic bomb. But we need to note the U.S. political context in which the fight will play out. If anything, this might have been expected to strengthen the hand of the “war party.”¶ A Wounded Presidency¶ The spectacular disaster of the Afford­able Care Act website is a self-inflicted wound from which the Obama administration will not easily, or perhaps ever, fully recover. Certainly all of us who support single-payer health insurance realized that the fantastically tangled system of “Obamacare” would ultimately fail, due to its scheme for subsidizing the parasitical private insurance industry, but no one could have expected such an immediate display of arrogant incompetence in the “rollout.”¶ The Republican Party has regained big chunks of the ground lost during its own government shutdown fiasco. It’s true that Congress’s approval ratings remain even deeper in the toilet than the President’s, but that fact affects both capitalist parties — and now, Congressional Democrats who stood united against repealing “Obamacare,” because that would have represented the effective end of the Obama presidency and virtual suicide for the party, are angry, alienated and afraid to be near him.¶ Whatever political capital the President had for immigration reform, seriously raising the minimum wage, protecting food stamps from savage cuts, or much of anything else including the climate change crisis, has been dissipated. The Democrats’ chances of regaining the House of Representatives in the November 2014 midterm election, marginal to begin with, are now much less than those of losing the Senate as well.¶ In these circumstances, this might be considered a favorable moment for the power of the Israel Lobby, Saudi Arabia and rightwing militarists to derail the Obama administration’s deal with Iran.¶ In fact, France made a last-minute move to block the first version of the interim agreement — right after Saudi Arabia signed off on a huge purchase of French weapons (a point worth noting in case anyone thought it’s only the USA that has a military-industrial complex).¶ The President’s loss of control over his own party is such that many prominent Democratic Senators have taken to the airwaves loudly denouncing his “appeasement” of the Iranians and abandonment of Israel in its hour of existential peril.¶ Yet the interim agreement — prepared, as we now know, by secret direct discussions between U.S. and Iranian representatives — went through, suspending parts of Iran’s enrichment program and releasing a few billion Iranian dollars held in frozen accounts abroad. That’s actually a small deal in relation to the overall brutal sanctions imposed on Iran’s economy. But as a political breakthrough it’s wildly popular inside Iran, and approved by a strong majority of the U.S. population that’s sick and tired of post-9/11 wars that begin with glowing promises and end in disaster.¶ What Are the Issues?¶ In fact, the Iranian nuclear program is no “existential threat” to Israel — not even close. Iran has no nuclear weapon, is not close to one, claims it doesn’t want one, in any case cannot make or test one without detection, and — most important — has no means of delivering such a weapon. All this is commonplace understanding among intelligence services (including Israel’s) and everyone who’s not mesmerized by Netanyahu’s grandstanding. Meanwhile, of course, Israel has its own undeclared arsenal of hundreds of ready-to-launch nuclear bombs.¶ The real “threat” here is not to the Israeli state’s existence, but to its longstanding status as the overwhelming regional military power and its guaranteed status as the only privileged U.S. ally in the area.¶ That status allows Israel to terrorize its neighbors at will, especially Lebanon, to run amok in its colonization of the Occupied Palestinian Territories, to bomb and invade Gaza on any pretext or none, and to carry out assassinations outside its territory, including notoriously the murder of several Iranian scientists.¶ When it comes to the destruction of Palestine, nothing of substance will change. The broader strategic scene, however, is shifting. After its debacles in Iraq and Afghanistan, the unplanned consequences of the bombing of Libya and its inability to control the outcome in the Syrian tragedy, U.S. imperialism needs to cut its reliance on direct boots-on-the-ground and massive bombing campaigns to keep “order.” Drone warfare and Special Forces operations, the symbols of America’s capacity to strike viciously and murderously with legal impunity, can only accomplish so much.¶ To keep the region safe for investment and oil and to contain if not defeat the Sunni/al-Qaeda jihadist resurgence, U.S. interests require making deals with a number of regional forces — including Turkey, Iran and now, it seems, even the loathsome Syrian regime.¶ It’s not that there is anything progressive or democratic about this shift, or anything to do with human rights. Those are not Great-Power concerns. It’s just realism: The United States can’t unilaterally hegemonize the Middle East, as the lunatic elements of the neoconservative movement believed, especially when also having to navigate complicated new problems with China in the Pacific, Russia in Eastern Europe, and its own troubled economy and fractured domestic politics.¶ The U.S. partnership with Israel is definitely a component of the emerging strategy of regional understandings, but not the only one. In fact, above all, if the U.S. extraction from Afghanistan is to be accomplished without a total collapse of the Afghan state, and if Syria isn’t to become a permanent wasteland with jihadist enclaves embedded inside, some kind of U.S.-Iranian détente is going to be essential — with Russia, Turkey and the European Union also on board.¶ That’s the real backdrop of the next six months of negotiations with Iran, much of which will be occurring in secret back channels. It’s about much more than Iran’s nuclear program — and that’s exactly what’s anathema to Israel’s rightwing government, to the “pro-Israel” Zionist and Christian religious right U.S. lobby, and to the Saudi and other Gulf oil monarchies.¶ What they fear is Iran’s conventional military power, its political outreach to the region’s Shia populations, and the capacity of its intelligence services to compete with the rest in the tradecraft of murder, mayhem and malicious mischief.¶ For these forces, then, it’s essential that any U.S. deal with Iran must fail. As the Roman Senator Cato the Elder famously proclaimed in every speech that “Carthage must be destroyed,” the Netanyahu mantra holds that Iran must be destroyed. Netanyahu, of course, is not the imperial ruler but only a junior partner who cannot attack Iran alone — and even if he may believe that Israel has the capacity to do so, his generals know better.¶ The Fight to Come¶ Netanyahu does have, of course, the U.S. Israel Lobby with its considerable power of intimidation and blackmail. Readers will recall the spectacle of the Israeli leader speaking to a joint session of Congress in May 2011, openly ridiculing president Obama’s and official United States policy on Israeli settlements in occupied Palestine, with 500-plus Congresspeople and Senators from both parties jumping up and down like so many trained chimpanzees.¶ The Lobby is gearing up for the fight to come. At this writing, Eric Cantor, Netanyahu’s front man in Congress, has introduced legislation demanding the complete dismantling of Iran’s uranium enrichment capacity. Senators from the left and right, a united front including some of president Obama’s usual strong Democratic supporters and reactionaries who want to destroy him, are also proposing harsh new sanctions aimed at cutting off all of Iran’s remaining oil exports.¶ It’s important to understand what this battle entails. The stated demand of the Israeli government is that Iran must not only cease enrichment but ship all its centrifuges outside the country and dismantle its hardened underground Fordo facility, the one place that Israel can’t bomb.¶ No Iranian government could conceivably accede to these conditions — but that’s the point of the plan. The war party’s strategy depends on the negotiations’ failure, and beyond that on Iranian president Rouhani’s government falling apart.¶ Their tactic is to impose such extreme measures that the hardliners in Iran take over, and the regime is squeezed to the point where it might make a desperate ”dash” for a nuclear weapon. At that point, the seekers of war calculate that Israel could force the United States into a full-scale military operation and that Europe, Russia and China would stand by.¶ To think about the consequences of this logic is to recognize its potentially suicidal implications, and to realize that it’s a rather desperate rearguard action against the logic of the new U.S. imperial project in the Middle East. It would also risk the unity of the various countries supporting the current sanctions program.¶ While the House of Representatives might adopt Cantor’s toxic legislation, it’s likely that leading Senators, even many of those now lining up to fill their campaign coffers at the AIPAC trough, will at least delay the course leading to the ultimate confrontation. The alienation of many American Jews from Israel will deepen if they see its government pushing a war that they, like the majority of the U.S. population, absolutely don’t want. Israel and its Lobby are a powerful tail, but not strong enough to wag the imperial dog when real global stakes are involved — not a secondary question like the fate of Palestine, but the danger of a major unraveling of U.S. policy.¶ The dangers, however, remain. It’s quite possible that Israel would undertake some major provocations in the coming months. The Obama White House might feel it necessary to do something to look tough. Iran’s rulers might miscalculate if new sanctions legislation looks like passing Congress.¶ The risk of any particular crisis leading to escalation and unintended catastrophe are small, but over time the cumulative risk of apocalypse most certainly isn’t.¶ Short of a nuclear-free Middle East that can only arise from a profound democratic transformation of the entire region, the danger is ambient. And as satisfying as it is to see the defeat of the Israel Lobby’s current war drive, and as much as the Iranian people deserve relief from the cruelty of sanctions and of their own rulers, the issues that produce one crisis after another remain.

#### New agenda items overstretch PC and trigger cascading prolif and war with Iran

Sabet 9-13 (Farzan Sabet, co-founder and editing manager of IranPolitik.com, doctoral student in International History and M.A. International History & Politics, Graduate Institute, Geneva, focused on international relations, international trade law, and Iranian domestic politics and foreign policy, “4: Iran: Resolving the Nuclear Crisis,” Journal of Public and International Affairs, September 2013, p.74-77, http://www.princeton.edu/jpia/past-issues-1/2013/JPIA-2013-Final.pdf)

American President Barack Obama currently has an unprecedented opportunity to resolve the Iranian nuclear crisis. In¶ the first year of his second term, he has substantial political capital at home and a strong coalition of countries supporting his sanctions strategy and nuclear negotiations abroad. Just as¶ importantly, devastating economic sanctions since 2012 may¶ have increased the willingness of the Islamic Republic of Iran to¶ compromise¶ on its nuclear program. This policy paper argues¶ that President Obama should capitalize on this historic window¶ of opportunity by acknowledging Iran’s right to a peaceful¶ nuclear program and offering a roadmap for lifting sanctions in¶ exchange for deep concessions by Iran on its nuclear program.¶ The United States has not yet placed substantive sanctions relief on the table, and this may be the key to breaking the¶ deadlock in P5+1-Iran nuclear negotiations. However, the¶ current strong U.S. negotiating position will erode over time¶ and thus President Obama must take decisive action to resolve¶ the Iranian nuclear crisis.¶ INTRODUCTION¶ As President Barack Obama resettles into the White House and as pres¶ -¶ ident-elect Hassan Rouhani prepares to take on his new office, a historic¶ window of opportunity may exist for the United States of America and¶ the Islamic Republic of Iran to not only resolve the crisis over the contro¶ -¶ versial Iranian nuclear program but to also seek broader rapprochement.¶ There are, however, many obstacles in the path of successful negotiations.¶ Both sides will be under pressure from hardline domestic actors seeking¶ a continuation of the status quo. The United States will also be under¶ strong pressure from important allies abroad, including Israel and the Gulf¶ Cooperation Council (GCC), to extract maximum concessions from Iran.¶ The Islamic Republic, for its part, wants to project an image of strength¶ to foreign audiences and can only accept a deal which, at the very least,¶ allows it to save face (Mousavian 2013). This creates constraints on the¶ both sides, limiting the range of possible agreements.¶ Failure to reach a negotiated settlement, however, could have potentially¶ catastrophic consequences for American interests. At one extreme, this¶ failure may allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapons capability, shifting the¶ balance of power in the Middle East and beginning a nuclear proliferation cascade. The Obama administration, however, has ruled out a situation in¶ which the United States is forced to contain a nuclear weapon-latent Iran.¶ At the other extreme, the United States may have to carry out military operations on Iranian nuclear facilities, an option which could temporar¶ -¶ ily set back the Iranian nuclear program but would likely have disastrous¶ humanitarian consequences and lead to a regional conflagration. An attack¶ could also give Iran a justification to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation¶ Treaty (NPT) and make a dash for nuclear weapons, undermining the¶ cause of nuclear non-proliferation. The Iranian nuclear crisis is thus one¶ of the most important international security issues today.¶ Since the failure of the first round of negotiations between the Obama¶ administration and the Islamic Republic in October 2009, the United¶ States has pursued a “comprehensivizing” and “multilateralizing” economic¶ sanctions strategy. This means that the United States has expanded the¶ scope of sanctions to broader swaths of the Iranian economy, particularly¶ its financial and petroleum sector, and multiplied the number of actors¶ complying with sanctions. Since the five permanent members of the¶ United Nations Security Council plus Germany (P5+1) and the Islamic¶ Republic resumed high level political negotiations in February 2013, a¶ question has hung in the air: Has the Obama administration’s sanctions¶ strategy sufficiently changed Iran’s cost-benefit analysis to make a nuclear¶ deal more likely?¶ This policy paper argues that this is the case. More specifically, it argues ¶ that by applying sanctions to Iran the United States has increased the costs of¶ failing to reach an agreement for Tehran. Sanctions appear to have strongly¶ contributed to the rapid deterioration of the Iranian economy since at least¶ 2012. What this means for Iran is that the price of continuing its nuclear¶ program on the current trajectory is no longer diplomatic condemnation¶ or vague threats of military action but deteriorating social conditions and¶ severe economic pain that it can measure in the billions of dollars. While¶ sanctions have largely succeeded as a mechanism of economic pain, this¶ paper argues that expectations of what sanctions can achieve should be¶ tempered and that pain must be applied in a broader framework that¶ also includes incentives. As such, while sanctions have made a negotiated¶ settlement of the nuclear crisis more likely, they cannot be relied upon to¶ achieve a breakthrough by themselves. Negotiations must ultimately offer¶ acknowledgement of Iran’s right to a peaceful nuclear program under the¶ NPT and a viable road map for lifting sanctions if they are to succeed.¶ While President Obama’s re-election, Rouhani’s election, and the¶ relative success of sanctions thus far provide a window of opportunity for¶ a mutually beneficial negotiated settlement of the nuclear crisis, several¶ factors may erode the current strong U.S. position over time. First, as¶ time passes, other policy priorities will divide the Obama administration’s attention and political capital, weakening its ability to sell a negotiated settlement at home. Second, the Islamic Republic is already mitigating¶ some of the effects of sanctions through a variety of methods, decreasing¶ sanctions’ value as a bargaining chip for the United States. Finally, the¶ P5+1 and sanctions coalitions may begin to unravel over a wide range of¶ issues, such as the attractiveness of Iranian petroleum resources at steep¶ discounts or the humanitarian impact of sanctions, reducing the impact¶ of sanctions and the international momentum for a negotiated settlement.¶ Time is thus of the essence.¶ Based on these observations this paper proposes four specific policy¶ recommendations for the U.S. strategy toward P5+1-Iran nuclear negotia¶ -¶ tions, taking into account both domestic, foreign, and temporal factors.¶ First, President Obama should end the dual-track strategy as it is currently¶ conceived. This means halting the expansion of the Iran sanctions regime¶ by the U.S. Congress while negotiations are ongoing, as this may encourage Iran to escalate its nuclear program to maintain the balance of power¶ in negotiations. Second, President Obama can offer to help suspend E.U.¶ and some U.S. sanctions in exchange for suspensions of elements of the¶ Iranian nuclear program. This suspension-for-suspension proposal creates¶ further trust and builds momentum. Third, President Obama should use ¶ this momentum to reach a final agreement. A final resolution of the nuclear¶ crisis will require the Obama administration to offer both acknowledge¶ -¶ ment of Iran’s right to a peaceful nuclear program and a viable road map¶ for sanctions relief. Fourth, the Obama administration must put in place¶ guarantees that make any final agreement lasting. This paper makes its¶ case in three parts. Part one briefly reviews the historical background of¶ the Iranian nuclear crisis. Part two argues that current conditions could¶ allow for a mutually acceptable deal, but that this window of opportunity¶ will not last forever. Part three lays out the four policy proposals in detail.

#### Plan specifically derails immigration reform - Economic engagement initiatives PERCEIVED as deprioritizing necessary focus on security issues and drug war while kowtowing to Mexico – perception is key and hardliner target spin control to play on fence sitters largest fears

Shear, 13

(Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>)

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted.” “Drugs today are not very important to the U.S. public over all,” she added, “but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.” Representative Michael T. McCaul, a Texas Republican who is chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against the danger of drug cartels forming alliances with terrorist groups. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that when it comes to the United States and Central America, “so much of the focus ends up being on security.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico is politically divisive

Wilson 13 – Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International. Center for Scholars (Christopher E., January, “A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region,” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new\_ideas\_us\_mexico\_relations.pdf)

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing renaissance is underway in North America and bilateral trade is booming, the United States and Mexico have an important choice to make: sit back and reap the moderate and perhaps temporal benefits coming naturally from the evolving global context , or implement a robust agenda to improve the competitiveness of North America for the long term . Given that job creation and economic growth in both the United States and Mexico are at stake, t he choice should be simple, but a limited understanding about the magnitude, nature and depth of the U.S.-Mexico economic relationship among the public and many policymakers has made serious action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.

#### War escalates, collapses the global economy and causes extinction

Avery 11-6 (John Scales Avery, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, “An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War,” 11-6-2013, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm)

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences.¶ As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems.¶ The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy.¶ In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result.¶ Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

# T – G2G

#### It’s is exclusive

Updegrave 91 (W.C., “Explanation of ZIP Code Address Purpose”, 8-19, <http://www.supremelaw.org/ref/zipcode/updegrav.htm>)

More specifically, looking at the map on page 11 of the National ZIP Code Directory, e.g. at a local post office, one will see that the first digit of a ZIP Code defines an area that includes more than one State. The first sentence of the explanatory paragraph begins: "A ZIP Code is a numerical code that identifies areas within the United States and its territories for purposes of ..." [cf. 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)]. Note the singular possessive pronoun "its", not "their", therefore carrying the implication that it relates to the "United States" as a corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia (in the singular sense), not in the sense of being the 50 States of the Union (in the plural sense). The map shows all the States of the Union, but it also shows D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, making the explanatory statement literally correct.

#### This means only direct aid and trade agreements – they’re third-party engagement

Daga 13 (Sergio Daga, director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, Bolivia, visiting senior policy analyst, Heritage Foundation, M.A. Economics, University of Chile, B.A. Economics, Catholic University of Bolivia, also trained at Libertad y Desarrollo, Chile, and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, United States, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic: U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela,” National Center for Policy Analysis, Debate Backgrounder No. 7, 5-15-2013, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economics is the branch of human knowledge concerned with the ¶ satisfaction of human wants through the production of goods and ¶ services, and the exchange of those goods and services between two ¶ or more individuals. Thus, economics encompasses human activities ¶ from simple barter between two individuals to international trade ¶ between firms or governments. Many of these economic activities ¶ are regulated by government, and some are outlawed. Trade and ¶ other economic activities that cross national borders — such as ¶ sales of goods and services, travel, migration or transfers of money ¶ — are regulated by both the government of the originating country ¶ and the government of the destination country. The government ¶ itself could be an economic actor, buying and selling from other ¶ governments or firms in other countries; or the government could ¶ regulate the private economic activities of individuals and firms.¶ Economic engagement between or among countries can take ¶ many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements ¶ designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign ¶ aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic ¶ engagement with private economic engagement through 3) ¶ international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) ¶ remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are ¶ important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate ¶ resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by ¶ the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with ¶ respect to some countries than to others.

### ADV1

#### It’s 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 timescales1\_5. 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.

#### Modeling is structurally impossible in China

Downs 8

Eric, Fellow @ Brookings, China Energy Fellow, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, China’s Energy Policies and Their Environmental Impacts, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2008/0813\_china\_downs.aspx

China suffers from a disconnect between the increasingly prominent position of energy issues on its domestic and foreign policy agendas and the capacity of the country’s institutions to manage the energy sector. Some Chinese commentators have even argued that the biggest threat to China’s energy security is posed by the very institutions responsible for enhancing it. Consequently, restructuring China’s energy policymaking apparatus has been a subject of intense debate in recent years as the country has grappled with an unexpected surge in energy demand, growing dependence on energy imports, rising global energy prices and periodic domestic energy supply shortages. Authority over China’s energy sector at the national level is fractured among more than a dozen government agencies, the most important of which is the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). Within the NDRC itself, responsibility for energy is similarly scattered among multiple departments. Prior to the restructuring in March 2008, the key component was the Energy Bureau, which had a broad mandate but lacked the authority, tools and manpower to fulfill it. In 2005, the government added another cook to the kitchen with the establishment of the National Energy Leading Group, an advisory body headed by Premier Wen Jiabao. While the leading group’s creation reflected recognition of the need to strengthen energy sector management, it did not eradicate China’s energy governance woes. China’s fragmented energy policymaking structure has impeded energy governance because there is no single institution, such as a Ministry of Energy, with the authority to coordinate the interests of the various stakeholders. For example, the implementation of energy laws is hampered by the fact that those laws often do not specify the government agencies responsible for implementation because of disputes over who should be in charge. Similarly, the fuel tax that the NPC approved in 1999 has not been implemented because of the failure of the relevant stakeholders to reach an agreement. The policy paralysis within the energy bureaucracy stands in sharp contrast to the activism of China’s state-owned energy companies. These firms are powerful and relatively autonomous actors. Their influence is derived from their full and vice ministerial ranks, the membership of some top executives in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, industry expertise, internationally listed subsidiaries and profitability (at least until recently). More often than not, it is China’s energy firms who initiate major energy projects and policies that are later embraced by the government, such as the West-East Pipeline and the acquisition of foreign energy assets. The companies also have some capacity to advance corporate interests at the expense of national ones. For example, oil and power generating companies have periodically reduced their output to pressure the government to raise the state-set prices of refined products and electricity, which have not kept pace with increases in the market-determined prices of crude oil and coal. Similarly, China’s national oil companies have ignored guidance from the central government about where they should invest overseas. II. China’s “new” energy policymaking structure The recent changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus are the latest in a series of institutional reforms aimed at improving energy governance. In March 2008, the NPC approved two additions to China’s energy bureaucracy – the State Energy Commission (SEC) and the National Energy Administration (NEA). The SEC, a high-level discussion and coordination body whose specific functions, organization and staffing have not yet been determined, will replace the National Energy Leading Group. The daily affairs of the SEC will be handled by the NEA, a vice-ministerial component of the NDRC, which is the successor to the NDRC’s Energy Bureau. In addition to the Energy Bureau, the NEA is also comprised of other energy offices from the NDRC, the Office of the National Leading Group, and the nuclear power administration of the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense. The NEA has a broad mandate, which includes managing the country’s energy industries, drafting energy plans and policies, negotiating with international energy agencies and approving foreign energy investments. The NEA, like its predecessor, will struggle to fulfill its mandate because it lacks the authority, autonomy, manpower and tools to deal with the country’s energy challenges. Although the NEA’s capabilities in each of these areas are greater than those possessed by the NDRC Energy Bureau, they still fall short of what the NEA needs to do its job. Authority: The NEA has more political clout than its predecessor, but not enough to mitigate the bureaucratic infighting that undermines energy decision-making. The NEA is a vice-ministerial body, which is a step above that of the Energy Bureau, which was a bureau-level organization. However, the NEA still does not have the authority it needs to coordinate the interests of ministries, commissions and state-owned energy companies. One of the frustrations of officials in the NDRC Energy Bureau was that the energy companies often undercut their authority by circumventing the Bureau to hold face-to-face discussions with China’s senior leadership. The authority of the NEA is somewhat enhanced by the appointment of Zhang Guobao, a Vice-Chairman of the NDRC with full ministerial rank, as head of the NEA. While it was widely expected that Zhang would retire, his new position is a reflection of his substantial energy expertise. Zhang, who has worked at the NDRC since 1983, is a smart and skillful bureaucrat with encyclopedic knowledge of China’s energy sector. He has overseen the development of some of the country’s major infrastructure projects, including the West-East Pipeline, the transmission of electricity from west to east, the Qinghai-Tibet Railway and the expansion of Beijing Capital International Airport. Autonomy: The NEA is a creature of the NDRC. Some Chinese media reports speculated that the fact that the NEA’s offices will be separate from those of the NDRC and that the NEA will have its own Party Group – which will give the NEA greater autonomy in managing its affairs, including personnel decisions – are signs of the NEA’s independence. However, the fact that Zhang Guobao – an NDRC “lifer” – is head of the NEA and its Party Group indicates that the NEA’s room to maneuver will be constrained by the NDRC. Moreover, the NEA’s independence is limited by the fact that key tools it needs to effectively manage the energy sector are in the hands of the NDRC. Tools: Arguably the greatest constraint on the NEA’s ability to fulfill its mandate is the fact that is does not possess the authority to set energy prices, which remain the purview of the NDRC’s Pricing Department. The issue of who would end up with the power to determine energy prices was, in the words of Zhang Guobao, a subject of “constant dispute” during the bureaucratic reorganization. Although the NEA can make suggestions about energy price adjustments and should be consulted by the NDRC on any proposed changes, the shots are still being called by the NDRC (and ultimately the State Council, whose approval is needed for any major energy price changes). The fact that the NDRC retained control over energy prices is hardly surprising. The power to set prices is one of the NDRC’s main instruments of macroeconomic control, which it understandably is reluctant to relinquish, especially to a subordinate component which might be tempted to adjust energy prices in ways that run counter to broader NDRC objectives, such as combating inflation. The NEA’s lack of authority over energy prices makes its task of mitigating the current electricity shortages, which are partly rooted in price controls, especially challenging. Electricity prices are set by the state, while coal prices are determined by the market. The failure of electricity price increases to keep pace with soaring coal prices has contributed to the national power shortage because some electricity producers can't afford coal while others are unwilling to operate at a loss. With no pricing power, the NEA has little choice but to resort to administrative measures to achieve an objective that would be more effectively realized by raising and ultimately liberalizing electricity prices. Personnel: The central government is still managing the energy sector with a skeleton crew. Contrary to rumors that the NEA’s staff would be as large as 200, it ended up with just 112 people. This staff quota is certainly larger than that of the NDRC Energy Bureau, which had only 50 people, but it does not represent a major increase in the number of people directly involved in managing the energy sector at the national level. Moreover, some Chinese media reports have speculated that the NEA may face the problem of “too many generals and not enough soldiers” because at least half of the 112 slots at the NEA are for positions at the deputy department head level and above. The Party organ that determines the functions, internal structure and staff quotas for government institutions probably resisted calls for more personnel out of concern that if it approved a large staff for the NEA, then other government bodies would also press for more manpower at a time when the State Council is trying to streamline the bureaucracy. In sum, China’s new energy administration is unlikely to substantially improve energy governance. The organizational changes are tantamount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Although the energy bureaucracy looks a bit different, its limited capacities remain largely unchanged. Consequently, we can expect to see a continuation of business as usual: conflicts of interest will impede decision-making; the energy companies will remain important drivers of projects and policies; state-set energy prices will continue to contribute to periodic domestic energy supply shortfalls; and the NEA, with no authority to adjust energy prices, probably will resort to “second best” administrative measures to try to eradicate those shortages. The modest tinkering to China’s energy policymaking apparatus unveiled during the March 2008 NPC meeting reflects the conflicts of interest that stymie energy decision-making. Despite widespread recognition among Chinese officials and energy experts of the need to get the country’s energy institutions “right” and the growing chorus of voices calling for the establishment of a Ministry of Energy (MOE), there are powerful ministerial and corporate interests that favor the status quo. The opposition to the creation of a MOE, a hot topic of debate in Chinese energy circles in recent years, was led by the NDRC and the state-owned energy companies. The mere specter of a MOE strikes fear in the heart of the NDRC because it would deprive the NDRC of a substantial portion of its portfolio and important tools of macroeconomic control. The NDRC’s aversion is shared by the energy firms who are reluctant to have another political master and afraid that a MOE would limit their direct access to China’s leadership. Such opposition helps explain why the government was unable to forge a consensus in favor of more robust changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus. Implications for the United States First, US policymakers should recognize that China’s fractured energy policymaking apparatus may constrain the Chinese government from doing all that US policymakers would like it to do – and indeed what Chinese leaders themselves might want to do – to enhance international energy security and combat climate change. If China falls short of our expectations it may not reflect a conscious decision by Beijing to shirk its global responsibilities but rather the limited capacity of its national energy institutions to bend other actors, notably firms and local governments, to its will.

#### Warming predictions exaggerated

McGrath 5/19- graduated MIT major in Environment (Matt, “Climate slowdown means extreme rates of warming ‘not as likely’”, BBC, May 19th, 2013, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-22567023)//SQR

Scientists say the recent downturn in the rate of global warming will lead to lower temperature rises in the short-term. Since 1998, there has been an unexplained "standstill" in the heating of the Earth's atmosphere. Writing in Nature Geoscience, the researchers say this will reduce predicted warming in the coming decades. But long-term, the expected temperature rises will not alter significantly. Continue reading the main story “ Start Quote The most extreme projections are looking less likely than before” Dr Alexander Otto University of Oxford The slowdown in the expected rate of global warming has been studied for several years now. Earlier this year, the UK Met Office lowered their five-year temperature forecast. But this new paper gives the clearest picture yet of how any slowdown is likely to affect temperatures in both the short-term and long-term. An international team of researchers looked at how the last decade would impact long-term, equilibrium climate sensitivity and the shorter term climate response. Transient nature Climate sensitivity looks to see what would happen if we doubled concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere and let the Earth's oceans and ice sheets respond to it over several thousand years. Transient climate response is much shorter term calculation again based on a doubling of CO2. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported in 2007 that the short-term temperature rise would most likely be 1-3C (1.8-5.4F). But in this new analysis, by only including the temperatures from the last decade, the projected range would be 0.9-2.0C. Ice The report suggests that warming in the near term will be less than forecast "The hottest of the models in the medium-term, they are actually looking less likely or inconsistent with the data from the last decade alone," said Dr Alexander Otto from the University of Oxford. "The most extreme projections are looking less likely than before."

#### No risk of China-Russia war – meetings and energy cooperation prove

**Keek, 3/23** – Writer for the Diplomat (Zachary, “Ties that Bind: Can China-Russia Relations Endure?”, The Diplomat, 2013, http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2013/07/12/why-china-and-the-us-probably-wont-go-to-war/)//VP

The long-running consensus in the West and elsewhere has been that China and Russia are destined to clash. According to this narrative, while America’s post-Cold War primacy pushed the two sides together, geography and China’s growing power ensure Beijing and Moscow will be strategic competitors over the long-term. There’s certainly something to this argument; at the very least these factors ensure mistrust will be a permanent feature of the bilateral relationship. That being said, this ignores the potential areas of cooperation between Russia and China, and fails to tell us how temporary the Sino-Russian relationship truly is. If President Xi Jinping’s trip to Russia is any indication, the relationship has greater staying power than analysts previously expected. Not only is it symbolically important that Xi has made Russia the destination of his maiden voyage as China’s top leader, but he clearly is placing a lot of importance on the visit. China’s state media have spent the past week covering the trip and Sino-Russian ties in excruciating detail, and Xi has reportedly been brushing up on his rudimentary Russian language skills and even memorizing Russian poetry in order to make a strong impression on his hosts. Given Moscow’s strong desire to be perceived as a great power, Xi likely had Putin and company at “my first overseas trip.” While Xi’s trip may be a one time event, the growing Sino-Russian energy relationship is premised on long-term cooperation. Just hours after Xi's arrival in Russia on Friday, the head of Russian energy giant Rosneft announced it had reached an "agreement in principle" to more than triple its annual oil exports to China, from 15 million tonnes last year to 45-50 million tonnes at an unspecified future date (likely around 2018). This will make China the largest consumer of Russian oil. As part of the deal, Rosneft and China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) will also jointly develop 3 offshore blocks of oil near the Barents Sea and 8 onshore deposits in East Siberia. Furthermore, Gazprom expects to finally sign a deal with Beijing as early as the end of this month, in which it would export 38 billion cubic meters of gas to China annually. Gazprom is also reportedly pushing for a loan as part of this deal to construct a pipeline to deliver gas to China via Siberia, much like the U.S. $25 billion loan China provided Rosneft with in 2009 to construct the East Siberia-Pacific Ocean oil pipeline. There is a significant convergence of interest between the two sides on energy cooperation. British Petroleum forecasts that over half of the global liquids demand growth through 2030 will come from China, at which point Beijing’s 46 Billion Cubic Feet (bcf/d) of daily gas consumption will equal the entire EU’s gas consumption in 2010. China is already rivaling the U.S. in terms of oil imports, and BP expects China and India to account for 94 percent of net oil demand growth through 2030. According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), by 2035 will be China importing 75 percent of the oil it consumes.

### ADV2

#### No risk of nuclear terror – assumes every warrant

**Mueller 10** (John, professor of political science at Ohio State, Calming Our Nuclear Jitters, Issues in Science and Technology, Winter, http://www.issues.org/26.2/mueller.html)

Politicians of all stripes preach to an anxious, appreciative, and very numerous choir when they, like President Obama, proclaim atomic terrorism to be “the most immediate and extreme threat to global security.” It is the problem that, according to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, currently keeps every senior leader awake at night. This is hardly a new anxiety. In 1946, atomic bomb maker J. Robert Oppenheimer ominously warned that if three or four men could smuggle in units for an atomic bomb, they could blow up New York. This was an early expression of a pattern of dramatic risk inflation that has persisted throughout the nuclear age. In fact, although expanding fires and fallout might increase the effective destructive radius, the blast of a Hiroshima-size device would “blow up” about 1% of the city’s area—a tragedy, of course, but not the same as one 100 times greater. In the early 1970s, nuclear physicist Theodore Taylor proclaimed the atomic terrorist problem to be “immediate,” explaining at length “how comparatively easy it would be to steal nuclear material and step by step make it into a bomb.” At the time he thought it was already too late to “prevent the making of a few bombs, here and there, now and then,” or “in another ten or fifteen years, it will be too late.” Three decades after Taylor, we continue to wait for terrorists to carry out their “easy” task. In contrast to these predictions, terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. The most plausible route for terrorists, according to most experts, would be to manufacture an atomic device themselves from purloined fissile material (plutonium or, more likely, highly enriched uranium). This task, however, remains a daunting one, requiring that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered and in sequence. Outright armed theft of fissile material is exceedingly unlikely not only because of the resistance of guards, but because chase would be immediate. A more promising approach would be to corrupt insiders to smuggle out the required substances. However, this requires the terrorists to pay off a host of greedy confederates, including brokers and money-transmitters, any one of whom could turn on them or, either out of guile or incompetence, furnish them with stuff that is useless. Insiders might also consider the possibility that once the heist was accomplished, the terrorists would, as analyst Brian Jenkins none too delicately puts it, “have every incentive to cover their trail, beginning with eliminating their confederates.” If terrorists were somehow successful at obtaining a sufficient mass of relevant material, they would then probably have to transport it a long distance over unfamiliar terrain and probably while being pursued by security forces. Crossing international borders would be facilitated by following established smuggling routes, but these are not as chaotic as they appear and are often under the watch of suspicious and careful criminal regulators. If border personnel became suspicious of the commodity being smuggled, some of them might find it in their interest to disrupt passage, perhaps to collect the bounteous reward money that would probably be offered by alarmed governments once the uranium theft had been discovered. Once outside the country with their precious booty, terrorists would need to set up a large and well-equipped machine shop to manufacture a bomb and then to populate it with a very select team of highly skilled scientists, technicians, machinists, and administrators. The group would have to be assembled and retained for the monumental task while no consequential suspicions were generated among friends, family, and police about their curious and sudden absence from normal pursuits back home. Members of the bomb-building team would also have to be utterly devoted to the cause, of course, and they would have to be willing to put their lives and certainly their careers at high risk, because after their bomb was discovered or exploded they would probably become the targets of an intense worldwide dragnet operation. Some observers have insisted that it would be easy for terrorists to assemble a crude bomb if they could get enough fissile material. But Christoph Wirz and Emmanuel Egger, two senior physicists in charge of nuclear issues at Switzerland‘s Spiez Laboratory, bluntly conclude that the task “could hardly be accomplished by a subnational group.” They point out that precise blueprints are required, not just sketches and general ideas, and that even with a good blueprint the terrorist group would most certainly be forced to redesign. They also stress that the work is difficult, dangerous, and extremely exacting, and that the technical requirements in several fields verge on the unfeasible. Stephen Younger, former director of nuclear weapons research at Los Alamos Laboratories, has made a similar argument, pointing out that uranium is “exceptionally difficult to machine” whereas “plutonium is one of the most complex metals ever discovered, a material whose basic properties are sensitive to exactly how it is processed.“ Stressing the “daunting problems associated with material purity, machining, and a host of other issues,” Younger concludes, “to think that a terrorist group, working in isolation with an unreliable supply of electricity and little access to tools and supplies” could fabricate a bomb “is farfetched at best.” Under the best circumstances, the process of making a bomb could take months or even a year or more, which would, of course, have to be carried out in utter secrecy. In addition, people in the area, including criminals, may observe with increasing curiosity and puzzlement the constant coming and going of technicians unlikely to be locals. If the effort to build a bomb was successful, the finished product, weighing a ton or more, would then have to be transported to and smuggled into the relevant target country where it would have to be received by collaborators who are at once totally dedicated and technically proficient at handling, maintaining, detonating, and perhaps assembling the weapon after it arrives. The financial costs of this extensive and extended operation could easily become monumental. There would be expensive equipment to buy, smuggle, and set up and people to pay or pay off. Some operatives might work for free out of utter dedication to the cause, but the vast conspiracy also requires the subversion of a considerable array of criminals and opportunists, each of whom has every incentive to push the price for cooperation as high as possible. Any criminals competent and capable enough to be effective allies are also likely to be both smart enough to see boundless opportunities for extortion and psychologically equipped by their profession to be willing to exploit them. Those who warn about the likelihood of a terrorist bomb contend that a terrorist group could, if with great difficulty, overcome each obstacle and that doing so in each case is “not impossible.” But although it may not be impossible to surmount each individual step, the likelihood that a group could surmount a series of them quickly becomes vanishingly small. Table 1 attempts to catalogue the barriers that must be overcome under the scenario considered most likely to be successful. In contemplating the task before them, would-be atomic terrorists would effectively be required to go though an exercise that looks much like this. If and when they do, they will undoubtedly conclude that their prospects are daunting and accordingly uninspiring or even terminally dispiriting. It is possible to calculate the chances for success. Adopting probability estimates that purposely and heavily bias the case in the terrorists’ favor—for example, assuming the terrorists have a 50% chance of overcoming each of the 20 obstacles—the chances that a concerted effort would be successful comes out to be less than one in a million. If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds that they will be able to pull off the deed drop to one in well over three billion. Other routes would-be terrorists might take to acquire a bomb are even more problematic. They are unlikely to be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state for delivery abroad because the risk would be high, even for a country led by extremists, that the bomb (and its source) would be discovered even before delivery or that it would be exploded in a manner and on a target the donor would not approve, including on the donor itself. Another concern would be that the terrorist group might be infiltrated by foreign intelligence. The terrorist group might also seek to steal or illicitly purchase a “loose nuke“ somewhere. However, it seems probable that none exist. All governments have an intense interest in controlling any weapons on their territory because of fears that they might become the primary target. Moreover, as technology has developed, finished bombs have been out-fitted with devices that trigger a non-nuclear explosion that destroys the bomb if it is tampered with. And there are other security techniques: Bombs can be kept disassembled with the component parts stored in separate high-security vaults, and a process can be set up in which two people and multiple codes are required not only to use the bomb but to store, maintain, and deploy it. As Younger points out, “only a few people in the world have the knowledge to cause an unauthorized detonation of a nuclear weapon.” There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were to utterly collapse; Pakistan is frequently cited in this context and sometimes North Korea as well. However, even under such conditions, nuclear weapons would probably remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb might be used in their own territory. They would still have locks and, in the case of Pakistan, the weapons would be disassembled. The al Qaeda factor The degree to which al Qaeda, the only terrorist group that seems to want to target the United States, has pursued or even has much interest in a nuclear weapon may have been exaggerated. The 9/11 Commission stated that “al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years,” but the only substantial evidence it supplies comes from an episode that is supposed to have taken place about 1993 in Sudan, when al Qaeda members may have sought to purchase some uranium that turned out to be bogus. Information about this supposed venture apparently comes entirely from Jamal al Fadl, who defected from al Qaeda in 1996 after being caught stealing $110,000 from the organization. Others, including the man who allegedly purchased the uranium, assert that although there were various other scams taking place at the time that may have served as grist for Fadl, the uranium episode never happened. As a key indication of al Qaeda’s desire to obtain atomic weapons, many have focused on a set of conversations in Afghanistan in August 2001 that two Pakistani nuclear scientists reportedly had with Osama bin Laden and three other al Qaeda officials. Pakistani intelligence officers characterize the discussions as “academic” in nature. It seems that the discussion was wide-ranging and rudimentary and that the scientists provided no material or specific plans. Moreover, the scientists probably were incapable of providing truly helpful information because their expertise was not in bomb design but in the processing of fissile material, which is almost certainly beyond the capacities of a nonstate group. Kalid Sheikh Mohammed, the apparent planner of the 9/11 attacks, reportedly says that al Qaeda’s bomb efforts never went beyond searching the Internet. After the fall of the Taliban in 2001, technical experts from the CIA and the Department of Energy examined documents and other information that were uncovered by intelligence agencies and the media in Afghanistan. They uncovered no credible information that al Qaeda had obtained fissile material or acquired a nuclear weapon. Moreover, they found no evidence of any radioactive material suitable for weapons. They did uncover, however, a “nuclear-related” document discussing “openly available concepts about the nuclear fuel cycle and some weapons-related issues.” Just a day or two before al Qaeda was to flee from Afghanistan in 2001, bin Laden supposedly told a Pakistani journalist, “If the United States uses chemical or nuclear weapons against us, we might respond with chemical and nuclear weapons. We possess these weapons as a deterrent.” Given the military pressure that they were then under and taking into account the evidence of the primitive or more probably nonexistent nature of al Qaeda’s nuclear program, the reported assertions, although unsettling, appear at best to be a desperate bluff. Bin Laden has made statements about nuclear weapons a few other times. Some of these pronouncements can be seen to be threatening, but they are rather coy and indirect, indicating perhaps something of an interest, but not acknowledging a capability. And as terrorism specialist Louise Richardson observes, “Statements claiming a right to possess nuclear weapons have been misinterpreted as expressing a determination to use them. This in turn has fed the exaggeration of the threat we face.” Norwegian researcher Anne Stenersen concluded after an exhaustive study of available materials that, although “it is likely that al Qaeda central has considered the option of using non-conventional weapons,” there is “little evidence that such ideas ever developed into actual plans, or that they were given any kind of priority at the expense of more traditional types of terrorist attacks.” She also notes that information on an al Qaeda computer left behind in Afghanistan in 2001 indicates that only $2,000 to $4,000 was earmarked for weapons of mass destruction research and that the money was mainly for very crude work on chemical weapons. Today, the key portions of al Qaeda central may well total only a few hundred people, apparently assisting the Taliban’s distinctly separate, far larger, and very troublesome insurgency in Afghanistan. Beyond this tiny band, there are thousands of sympathizers and would-be jihadists spread around the globe. They mainly connect in Internet chat rooms, engage in radicalizing conversations, and variously dare each other to actually do something. Any “threat,” particularly to the West, appears, then, principally to derive from self-selected people, often isolated from each other, who fantasize about performing dire deeds. From time to time some of these people, or ones closer to al Qaeda central, actually manage to do some harm. And occasionally, they may even be able to pull off something large, such as 9/11. But in most cases, their capacities and schemes, or alleged schemes, seem to be far less dangerous than initial press reports vividly, even hysterically, suggest. Most important for present purposes, however, is that any notion that al Qaeda has the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons, even if it wanted to, looks farfetched in the extreme. It is also noteworthy that, although there have been plenty of terrorist attacks in the world since 2001, all have relied on conventional destructive methods. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in a memo on an al Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan in 2004: “Make use of that which is available … rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In fact, history consistently demonstrates that terrorists prefer weapons that they know and understand, not new, exotic ones. Glenn Carle, a 23-year CIA veteran and once its deputy intelligence officer for transnational threats, warns, “We must not take fright at the specter our leaders have exaggerated. In fact, we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed, and miserable opponents that they are.” al Qaeda, he says, has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing, and leading a terrorist organization, and although the group has threatened attacks with nuclear weapons, “its capabilities are far inferior to its desires.” Policy alternatives The purpose here has not been to argue that policies designed to inconvenience the atomic terrorist are necessarily unneeded or unwise. Rather, in contrast with the many who insist that atomic terrorism under current conditions is rather likely— indeed, exceedingly likely—to come about, I have contended that it is hugely unlikely. However, it is important to consider not only the likelihood that an event will take place, but also its consequences. Therefore, one must be concerned about catastrophic events even if their probability is small, and efforts to reduce that likelihood even further may well be justified. At some point, however, probabilities become so low that, even for catastrophic events, it may make sense to ignore them or at least put them on the back burner; in short, the risk becomes acceptable. For example, the British could at any time attack the United States with their submarine-launched missiles and kill millions of Americans, far more than even the most monumentally gifted and lucky terrorist group. Yet the risk that this potential calamity might take place evokes little concern; essentially it is an acceptable risk. Meanwhile, Russia, with whom the United States has a rather strained relationship, could at any time do vastly more damage with its nuclear weapons, a fully imaginable calamity that is substantially ignored. In constructing what he calls “a case for fear,” Cass Sunstein, a scholar and current Obama administration official, has pointed out that if there is a yearly probability of 1 in 100,000 that terrorists could launch a nuclear or massive biological attack, the risk would cumulate to 1 in 10,000 over 10 years and to 1 in 5,000 over 20. These odds, he suggests, are “not the most comforting.” Comfort, of course, lies in the viscera of those to be comforted, and, as he suggests, many would probably have difficulty settling down with odds like that. But there must be some point at which the concerns even of these people would ease. Just perhaps it is at one of the levels suggested above: one in a million or one in three billion per attempt.

## ADV 3

#### Won’t go to war over food

Chang 2/21/11 Gordon G Chang, Graduated Cornell Law School “Global Food Wars” http://blogs.forbes.com/gordonchang/2011/02/21/global-food-wars/

In any event, food-price increases have apparently been factors in the unrest now sweeping North Africa and the Middle East. The poor spend up to half their disposable income on edibles, making rapid food inflation a cause of concern for dictators, strongmen, and assorted autocrats everywhere. So even if humankind does not go to war over bad harvests, Paskal may be right when she contends that climate change may end up altering the global map. This is not the first time in human history that food shortages looked like they would be the motor of violent geopolitical change. Yet amazing agronomic advances, especially Norman Borlaug’s Green Revolution in the middle of the 20th century, have consistently proved the pessimists wrong. In these days when capitalism is being blamed for most everything, it’s important to remember the power of human innovation in free societies—and the efficiency of free markets.

#### Tech development solves shortages

Thompson **5/13/**11 **–** Dr. Robert L. Thompson is a senior fellow for The Chicago Council on Global Affairs and professor emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. “Proving Malthus Wrong, Sustainable agriculture in 2050” http://scienceblogs.com/tomorrowstable/2011/05/proving\_malthus\_wrong\_sustaina.php

Tools available today, including plant breeding and biotechnology, can make presently unusable soils productive and increase the genetic potential of individual crops - enhancing drought and stress tolerance, for example - while also producing gains in yields. Existing tools can also internalize plants' resistance to disease, and even improve a plant's nutritional content - meaning consumers can get more nutritional value without increasing their consumption. Furthermore, modern high-productivity agriculture minimizes farmers' impact on the environment. Failure to embrace these technologies will result in further destruction of remaining forests. Adoption of technologies that produce more output from fewer resources has been hugely successful from an economic standpoint: prior to the price spike in 2008, there was a 150-year downward trend in the real price of food. The jury is still out on whether the long-term downward trend will resume, prices will flatten out on a new higher plateau, or they will trend upward in the future. The key is investing in research in the public and private sectors to increase agricultural productivity faster than global demand grows. Long ago, British scholar Thomas Malthus predicted that the human population would eventually outgrow its ability to feed itself. However, Malthus has been proven wrong for more than two centuries precisely because he underestimated the power of agricultural research and technology to increase productivity faster than demand. There is no more reason for Malthus to be right in the 21st century than he was in the 19th or 20th - but only if we work to support, not impede, continued agricultural research and adoption of new technologies around the world.

# 2NC

#### AND escalates *within months* – should control impact calculus – you can only die once and intervening actors check longer-term internals

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

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

#### AND, we control the only risk of *escalation* – *deterrence solves all other impacts*

Gable 11 (William Gable, US Army War College, “An Era of Persistent Conflict?” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA560155)

Exceptional individuals are key contributors to the turmoil the U.S. experienced in the last decade through the present, and their objectives could portend continued conflict. While the existence of these exceptional individuals alone does not necessarily assure conflict, the ideologies they espouse are underpinned by religion adding a nondeterrable dimension to their struggle. The actual or perceived preponderance of U.S. power will not diminish the likelihood of future attacks. In fact, such attacks will only serve to enhance these organizations‘ status and power, fueling every aspect of their operations from recruiting to financing operations. Consequently, threats from non-state actors will continue. Depending on the potential destruction inflicted by any terrorist attack, the attacker‘s sanctuary, and the threat posed to the aforementioned governments, the U.S. may be compelled to fight wars similar to the war in Afghanistan. Conflict with another state is possible, though less likely. Although the relative decline of U.S. economic power in relation to China appears to constitute a potential ―window‖ or threat to peace, **both** governments are aware of the risks and are working to mitigate them. Moreover, the U.S., China, and Russia represent deterrable nuclear powers**,** states dissuaded from conflict with each other due to the potential costs of a nuclear exchange. Conflict between these states appears unlikely. However, existing theory suggests problems with nondeterrable states that are not responsive to punishment or are willing to take risks that prompt conflict**.** North Korea and Iran seem to fit this description**.** Their efforts to develop, acquire, and possibly proliferate nuclear weapons, combined with the potential threat posed by a non-state actor acquiring such weapons, form conditions that indicate a strong possibility of war. In particular, Iran‘s nuclear program presents a potentially ominous window. Should diplomacy, sanctions, and cyber attacks fail to sidetrack Iran‘s nuclear program, the U.S. will be presented with an ever-narrowing window to act with force to deny Iran this capability. This could result in conflict with Iran. While false optimism is a potent and pervasive cause of war, recent experience with war and the nature of these and likely future conflicts will diminish leaders support for initiating war. Similarly, the current economic conditions and concern over the national debt will dampen leaders‘ enthusiasm for wars. But existing theories that discuss these factors fail to consider the impact of non-state actors. Thus, conflict is still possible despite them. Overall, the combination of factors seems to indicate continuing conflict with nonstate actors and potential conflict with states over development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. These factors identify specific circumstances where U.S. involvement in war is likely, and represent the primary drivers for concluding that the current era will be one of persistent conflict. The U.S. government should use all of the elements of power to focus on these factors to prevent what history and theory suggest the inevitability of war.

#### *Turns* china conflict – additional sanctions spark trade retaliation

Leverett 12 (professor at Pennsylvania State University's School of International Affairs, “America’s Iran Policy and the Undermining of International Order,” 7-5-2012, <http://www.worldfinancialreview.com/?p=3490>)

Second, secondary sanctions are a political house of cards. American officials are well aware of their presumptive illegality. Successive U.S. administrations have been reluctant to impose them on non-U.S. entities transacting with Iran, precisely to avoid formal challenges at the WTO. U.S. secondary sanctions are, in effect, an enormous bluff, leveraging the specter of legal and reputational risk in America to bully companies and banks in third countries to stop transacting with Iran, but without pulling the trigger on the threat to punish those that continue doing business in Iran. The UK and European sanctions now facing legal challenges are a product of this bullying campaign. For over a decade, the EU has condemned America’s threatened ‘extraterritorial’ application of national trade law, warning it would go to the WTO if Washington ever sanctioned European companies over Iran-related business. Over the last several years, though, enough British and European businesses stopped transacting with Iran that the EU was no longer under pressure to defend European commercial interests and could begin subordinating its Iran policy to American preferences. By last year, it has imposed a nearly comprehensive economic embargo against the Islamic Republic. While Europe has surrendered on having an independent Iran policy, the U.S. bluff on secondary sanctions will soon be called, most likely by China. To be sure, Beijing does not seek confrontation with America over Iran, and has sought to accommodate Washington in many ways—e.g., by not developing trade and investment positions in the Islamic Republic as rapidly as it might have, and by shifting some Iran-related transactional flows into renminbi to help the Obama administration avoid sanctioning Chinese banks. While China’s imports of Iranian oil appear, in the aggregate, to be growing, Beijing reduces them when the administration is deciding about six-month sanctions waivers for countries buying Iranian crude. The Obama administration, for its part, continues giving China sanctions waivers; the one Chinese bank barred from America for Iran-related transactions is a Chinese energy company subsidiary with no U.S. business. But as Congress legislates more secondary sanctions, Obama’s room to maneuver is shrinking. Obama will soon be in the position of demanding that China cut Iranian oil imports in ways that would harm its economy, and that Chinese banks stop virtually all Iran-related transactions. Beijing will not be able to accommodate such radical demands; it will have to say ‘no’, putting Obama in a classic lose-lose situation. “If America wants a nuclear deal grounded in the NPT, Hassan Rohani is an ideal interlocutor. But this would require Washington to bring its own policy in line with the NPT.” Obama could retreat. But then the world will know that secondary sanctions are a bluff, undercutting their deterrent effect. Alternatively, he could sanction major Chinese firms and banks. But that will force Beijing to respond—at least by taking America to the WTO (where China will win), perhaps by retaliating against U.S. companies. At this point, Beijing has more ways to impose costs on America for violations of international economic law impinging on Chinese interests than Washington has levers to coerce Chinese compliance with U.S. policy preferences. America and its partners will not come out ahead in this scenario. Third, U.S. secondary sanctions accelerate the shift of economic power from West to East. As non-Western economies surpass more Western countries in their relative importance to the global economy, America has a strong interest in keeping non-Western states tied to established, U.S.-dominated mechanisms for conducting, financing, and settling international transactions. Secondary sanctions, though, push in the opposite direction, incentivizing emerging powers to speed up development of non-Western alternatives to existing transactional platforms. “Strategic recovery will also entail reversing Washington’s reliance on secondary sanctions—not because of Iranian surrender (which won’t be forthcoming), but because they delegitimize America’s claim to continuing leadership in international economic affairs.” This trend will diminish Western influence in myriad ways—e.g., reducing the dollar’s role as a transactional currency, lowering the share of cross-border commodity trades on New York and London exchanges, and shrinking the global near-monopoly of Western-based reinsurance companies and P&I clubs. Add the cost of a U.S.-instigated trade dust-up with China, and the self-damaging quality of America’s dysfunctional Iran policy becomes even clearer. Finding a New Approach Putting America on a better strategic trajectory will take thoroughgoing revision of its Iran policy. In this regard, the election of Hassan Rohani—who ran the Islamic Republic’s Supreme National Security Council for sixteen years, was its chief nuclear negotiator during 2003-2005, and holds advanced degrees in Islamic law and civil law—as Iran’s next president is an opportunity. If America wants a nuclear deal grounded in the NPT, Rohani is an ideal interlocutor. But this would require Washington to bring its own policy in line with the NPT—first of all, by acknowledging Iran’s right to safeguarded enrichment. Strategic recovery will also entail reversing Washington’s reliance on secondary sanctions—not because of Iranian surrender (which won’t be forthcoming), but because they delegitimize America’s claim to continuing leadership in international economic affairs. This, however, is even more difficult than revising the U.S. position on Iranian enrichment—for Congress has legislated conditions for lifting sanctions that stipulate Iran’s abandonment of all alleged WMD activities, cutting all ties to those Washington deems terrorists, and political transformation. Overcoming this will require Obama to do what President Nixon did to enable America’s historic breakthrough with China—going to Tehran, strategically if not physically, to accept a previously demonised political order as a legitimate entity representing legitimate national interests. None of this is particularly likely. But if America doesn’t do these things, it condemns itself to a future as an increasingly failing, and flailing, superpower—and as an obstacle, rather than a facilitator, of rules-based international order.

#### Turns terrorism and shields groups from their internal link

Avraham 9/9

Rachel, “Analysis: The Main Terror Threat is Iran, Not Syria”, <http://www.jerusalemonline.com/rachel/analysis-the-main-terror-threat-is-iran-not-syria-1579>, CMR

Speaking at the World Summit on Counter-Terrorism, Maj. General Amos Gilad reiterated that the “main effort should be to prevent Iran from going nuclear. Israel has to focus on this threat. **A nuclear Iran can change the entire order in the Middle East.**” He claimed that **Iranian officials have even admitted** that **their nuclear program will help terrorist organizations** like Hezbollah, **by providing them with a** nuclear umbrella **that will** protect them against retaliation whenever they engage in acts of terrorism, thus thwarting Israeli and western counter-terror measures. ¶ Prof. Uzi Arad, head of the National Security Council, added that from an international legal perspective, Iran is also a greater violator than Syria. While emphasizing that there are many atrocities being committed in Syria as we speak and that Assad has done “terrible things,” he claims that the Geneva Convention only prohibits using chemical weapons on foreign fighters, not ones own citizens. Furthermore, Syria never ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention, implying that Syria cannot be held legally responsible for using chemical weapons against her own people.¶ To the contrary, Arad emphasized that Iran has violated the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to which Iran ratified, by internationally seeking to develop nuclear weapons. “Their level of breach is higher than the Syrians,” Arad stated. Additionally, he believes that “from a strategic point of view, our eyes should be on Iran, even if you look at Syria.” **Iran is the** main sponsor **of terrorism in the Middle East**, while Syria is merely a proxy state of Iran. ¶ Israeli Defense Minister Boogie Ya’alon emphasized, “**When we talk about states that support terrorism, Iran** tops the list.” He stated that Iran supports terrorism around the world as a means to export their revolution to other nations, with a special emphasis on Shiite communities in countries like Lebanon and Bahrain. He accused Iran of taking advantage of the instability caused by the Arab Spring to promote radical Islam. ¶ Ya’alon stated that Iran exploits the fact that the majority of states in the Middle East were artificially formed by the Sykes-Picot Agreement and were only held together by a dictator, causing these countries to descend into chaos once the dictator was overthrown. He also noted that Iran was behind the attempted assassination of the Saudi Ambassador, as well as the Burgas terror assault and numerous attacks on Israeli embassies, demonstrating the extent to which Iran is a threat to world peace. ¶ These **Israeli security experts view Iran’s nuclear program to be a threat to global security**, while Assad’s regime is mainly a threat to his own people, even though there are spillovers into the Golan Heights and other areas. To confirm this point, Arad claims that more Americans support the United States attacking Iran to prevent the country from becoming a nuclear power than starting a war to protect the Syrian people from Assad’s atrocities, since the American people understand that Iran is a greater global threat than Syria.

## U:

#### PC key to stop a Senate override

Presstv 12-21, ,PressTV, Senate hawks vow veto-proof vote on Iran, bill to skip committee, 12-21-13, <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/12/21/341142/senate-hawks-we-override-iran-bill-veto///BDS>)

Despite a veto threat from US President Barack Obama, hawkish senators in Congress say they will press forward with additional sanctions against Iran by overriding the president’s veto.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has indicated he would bring a new Iran sanctions bill for a vote.¶ On Thursday, Sen. Bob Menendez (D-New Jersey), the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, and Sen. Mark Kirk (R-Illinois) introduced a new sanctions bill against Iran which was co-sponsored by 24 other senators across the aisle.¶ The White House was quick to condemn the new anti-Iran effort by the hawkish senators on Capitol Hill with Obama’s Press Secretary Jay Carney saying that the president would veto the bill “if it were to pass” Congress.¶ However, Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-South Carolina) told Fox News that he was seeking to secure a veto-proof majority of 67 senators for the bill.¶ “If the president wants to veto [the bill], we'll override his veto," Graham said.¶ During his year-end press conference at the White House on Friday, Obama warned once more against the consequences of any new sanctions passed by Congress against Iran.¶ “If we're serious about negotiations we've got to create an atmosphere in which Iran is willing to move in ways that are uncomfortable for them and contrary to their ideology and rhetoric and their suspicions of us,” Obama said.¶ Ten US Senate committee chairs also wrote a joint letter to Reid (D-Nevada) on Thursday, saying they were “strongly opposed” to the new initiative.¶ Among signatories to the letter were Banking Committee Chair Tim Johnson (D-South Dakota) and Intelligence Committee Chair Dianne Feinstein (D-California).¶ Nevertheless, Senate aides told Reuters on Friday that Reid had filed Rule 14 for the sanctions bill, which would allow him to bypass the normal process of bringing a bill for a Senate vote through a committee. ¶ The Republican-controlled House of Representatives has already passed a sanctions bill against Iran by a 400-20 vote. The Senate bill had to originate in the Banking Committee before being considered on the full Senate floor.¶ Supporting the Obama administration, the committee did not hold a vote on the sanctions bill.¶ And now, Reid’s decision has set the stage for a battle between the 26 hawkish senators and the Obama administration and its supporters in the Senate.¶ Sen. Feinstein criticized Reid, saying he had not consulted the committee leaders before making the decision.¶ "This is not a positive thing to do at this particular point in time," she said.¶ Iranian Foreign Minister and top nuclear negotiator Mohammad Javad Zarif have already warned that any new sanctions against Iran passed by US Congress would kill “the entire deal” reached between Iran and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council -- the US, Britain, Russia, France and China -- plus Germany on November 24.

#### There’s not enough support to override now but PC key to prevent support

**Gardner and Zengerle 1/8/14**– (Timothy and Patricia, “Senate majority support Iran sanctions bill opposed by Obama”, Reuters, January 8th, 2014, <http://news.yahoo.com/senate-majority-support-iran-sanctions-bill-opposed-obama-174626292.html>)

More than half of U.S. senators support a bill to impose new sanctions on Iran should the Islamic Republic break an agreement to curb its nuclear program, aides said on Thursday, but there was no plan yet to debate the measure.¶ The White House has threatened to veto the legislation, and Iran says last November's nuclear deal struck in Geneva would be dead if the U.S. Congress imposes new sanctions.¶ The "Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act" is now supported by at least 54 senators in the 100-member chamber, according to a congressional record, with six senators joining on Wednesday. A Senate aide said two more joined on Thursday, bringing the total to 56.¶ It is uncertain whether the bill will be introduced in the Senate and whether backers can win the two-thirds majority to overcome a veto by President Barack Obama. A senior Senate Democratic aide said there were no plans yet for advancing the bill to the Senate floor, despite the growing list of co-sponsors.¶ The bill would also place sanctions on Iran if it does not agree to a comprehensive deal later this year or next. The United States and five other world powers agreed to a six-month interim deal with Iran in Geneva in November, that can be extended to a year.¶ Under last year's interim agreement, Iran will get access to billions of dollars worth of funds that had been cut off by sanctions in return for limiting enrichment of uranium.¶ Nuclear experts from Iran and the six powers have held several rounds of talks since the interim deal was signed to resolve issues before it can be put into place.¶ Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said hours before the resumption of the talks on Thursday that negotiations had revealed U.S. enmity toward the Islamic state. Khamenei had previously backed the deal, despite criticism from religious and political hardliners.¶ DEMOCRATIC BLOC OPPOSED¶ At least 16 Democrats support the bill introduced in December by Robert Menendez, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Mark Kirk, an Illinois Republican.¶ The American Israel Public Affairs Committee, an advocacy group with strong ties to many lawmakers, has said it supports new sanctions that would take effect if Iran violates the interim pact or does not agree to an "acceptable" comprehensive deal.¶ There is strong resistance to the measure by many other Democrats, however. A bloc of 10 Democratic senators, all leaders of committees, sent a letter to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid last month expressing opposition to the bill.¶ The aide said more support could come soon from the bloc of Democrats. "At least two that I know of are inching toward public support for the bill," the aide said on condition of anonymity given the sensitivity of the talks.¶ There has been no public indication from any of the 10 that they were leaning toward shifting position on the issue.¶ The bill seeks to cut Iran's oil exports to zero two years after implementation. It also puts limits on the Obama administration's ability to waive sanctions. In a surprise development in Congress, a long-building effort to impose new sanctions on Iran has reached a near-filibuster-proof majority in the Senate. Despite months of White House lobbying against the bill, 58 Senators now support the so-called "Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act," according to a Senate aide close to the process.

#### The intent of sanctions is to cause war – Obama needs PC to maintain his veto

**Grim 1-9** (Ryan, ,Huff Post, White House Dares Democratic Senators Pushing Iran Sanctions To Admit They Want War, 1-9-14, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/01/09/white-house-iran-war_n_4572003.html//BDS>)

WASHINGTON -- The White House on Thursday challenged a group of senators to admit they are working to push the country toward war with Iran, upping the tension between the administration and Senate advocates of tough new sanctions amid nuclear negotiations.¶ "If certain members of Congress want the United States to take military action, they should be up front with the American public and say so," Bernadette Meehan, National Security Council spokeswoman, said in a statement. "Otherwise, it’s not clear why any member of Congress would support a bill that possibly closes the door on diplomacy and makes it more likely that the United States will have to choose between military options or allowing Iran’s nuclear program to proceed."¶ The "certain members" the White House is referring to are led by Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Bob Menendez (D-N.J.), who is pushing legislation, backed by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, that would tighten sanctions on the Iranian regime despite the ongoing negotiations. ¶ Advocates of a peace deal with Iran warn that toughening sanctions now strengthens the hand of hard-liners in Iran who can argue the U.S. is not negotiating in good faith.¶ The White House has consistently signaled its opposition to the bill, warning that it could unravel the delicate talks underway, and has promised a veto if it passes. But Thursday's statement is the first public accusation that the senators pushing the bill may have motivations they are not "up front with."¶ The bill is backed by a majority of the Senate. A Democratic leadership aide told HuffPost Thursday there were no plans to bring the bill to the floor soon. ¶ After Menendez introduced his bill, 10 Democratic committee chairs released a joint letter warning his action could move the nation closer to war. At least 14 other Democrats have so far joined Menendez in bucking the administration.¶ ¶ "It's important to remember that it was sanctions that brought the Iranians to the negotiating table in the first place," Adam Sharon, Menendez's spokesperson, told HuffPost. "The preferred outcome is successful negotiations conducted by the Obama Administration and our allies that results in a peaceful and verifiable termination of Iran's nuclear weapons program."¶ "Prospective sanctions reinforce this objective should the Iranians fail to negotiate in good faith," he continued. "This legislation endorses the Obama administration's efforts, supports continued negotiations, gives the administration a year of flexibility to secure an agreement, respects the sanctions relief Iran is set to receive, and prevents any new sanctions from taking effect while good-faith negotiations are underway."¶ Below is Meehan's statement in full:¶ This bill is in direct contradiction to the Administration’s work to peacefully resolve the international community’s concerns with Iran’s nuclear program. We know that this proposed legislation would divide the international community, drive the Iranians to take a harder line, and possibly end negotiations. This bill would have a negative bearing on the sanctions regime too. Let us not forget: sanctions work because we convinced our partners to take the steps that we seek. If our partners no longer believe that we are serious about finding a negotiated solution, then our sanctions regime would suffer. ¶ If Congress passes this bill, it will be proactively taking an action that will make diplomacy less likely to succeed. The American people have been clear that they prefer a peaceful resolution to this issue. If certain members of Congress want the United States to take military action, they should be up front with the American public and say so. Otherwise, it’s not clear why any member of Congress would support a bill that possibly closes the door on diplomacy and makes it more likely that the United States will have to choose between military options or allowing Iran’s nuclear program to proceed.¶ The President has been clear that he has a responsibility to fully test whether we can achieve a comprehensive solution through diplomatic means, before he pursues alternatives. Passing new sanctions legislation right now will undermine our efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution.¶
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#### OPIC has the expertise and experience

O’Hanlon 13 (Brian O’Hanlon, Director of Business Development, Political and Sovereign Risk, OPIC, “Collaboration among development institutions can catalyze more green investments in the developing world,” OPIC Blog, 9-10-2013, http://www.opic.gov/blog/investment-funds/collaboration-among-development-institutions-can-catalyze-more-green-investments-in-the-developing-world)

Why is this significant? Largely, because of the unique role development institutions play in promoting investment in developing countries. Like OPIC, DFIs around the world catalyze private investment in regions where private financing may not be available. They know how to leverage limited finance resources, how to stretch public dollars, and how to mitigate the risk of doing business in some of the world’s most challenging business environments. In my role in OPIC’s insurance department, I’ve seen many promising renewable resources projects move forward with the support of political risk insurance. OPIC was the first public or private institution to provide political risk insurance to a forest carbon offset project, designed to limit deforestation. The agency has also provided political risk insurance to protect investors in projects to rehabilitate municipal water purification systems in Ghana, rebuild a flour mill that was destroyed by the earthquake in Haiti, and build affordable housing with sustainable materials in Liberia.¶ Individually, development finance institutions such as OPIC are a powerful force for addressing major development challenges around the world. In recent years, OPIC has increasingly focused on renewable resources projects from wind and solar power to sustainable agriculture, which comprise a large and growing share of the agency’s global portfolio.

#### OPIC financing solves energy development and tech competitiveness

Gómez 13 (Christian Gómez, Jr., director of energy at the Council of the Americas, “Financing Renewable Energy in Latin America,” Americas Quarterly, 8-2-2013, http://www.americasquarterly.org/content/financing-renewable-energy-latin-america)

Several institutions are engaged in project finance transactions in Latin America. These include the Inter-American Development Bank, the Andean Development Corporation, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. These institutions are either based in Washington DC or well represented in the city, so one could argue that the capital of emerging markets finance is also the capital of the United States. These institutions work with developers to put new projects online, along with other entities such as commercial banks.¶ Renewable energy financing is likely to continue its upward trajectory in the region as long as policies continue to favor its development. Through initiatives such as feed-in tariffs, private-public partnerships and renewable energy targets, the public and private sectors can work together toward making renewable energy viable, affordable and effective.

#### Empirical success in funding energy projects in Mexico

OPIC 5 (Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Office of External Affairs, “Supporting Private Sector Investment in Mexico,” OPIC Highlights, February 2005, http://www.opic.gov/sites/default/files/docs/HL05mexico.pdf)

OPIC Financing Promotes¶ Energy Infrastructure¶ Development¶ OPIC has pledged up to $250 million¶ in financing for the Mexican¶ affiliate of a U.S. company to¶ finance its working capital¶ needs and issue letters of¶ credit when it builds energy¶ infrastructure projects¶ in Mexico.¶ The OPIC financing will¶ guaranty a credit facility¶ to commercial banks on¶ behalf of ICA-Fluor, a¶ Mexican joint venture¶ company that provides¶ engineering procurement¶ and construction services,¶ in the energy sector, to finance its¶ working capital needs on construction¶ contracts in Mexico on a¶ longer term tenor than is generally¶ available.¶ These contracts will generate considerable¶ tax revenues for Mexico¶ and catalyze significant local¶ expenditures on goods and services.

#### OPIC accesses *every one* of these internal links for the *same reasons* the AFF does – their *only* reason Ex-Im is allegedly *unique* is because of the sheer amount of money they spend – but OPIC’s share of global green finance is more than *three times bigger* – particularly in *developing nations*

Harmon 13 (James A. Harmon, Reuters, “Shifting global investments to clean energy,” 7-29-2013, http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/07/28/shifting-global-investments-to-clean-energy/)

When President Barack Obama announced the country’s first national climate strategy, many people wondered what it would mean across the nation. Yet, the strategy may carry even more significant implications overseas.¶ The plan restricts U.S. government funding for most international coal projects. This policy could significantly affect energy producers and public and private investors around the globe.¶ Why is this important?¶ Global energy-related greenhouse gas emissions, a major driver of climate change, hit a record high in 2012. Meanwhile, there are more than 1.2 billion people worldwide still without access to electricity. The global middle class is booming — especially in the developing world — and with it, energy demand is surging. In fact, global energy demand is expected to grow by one-third by 2035.¶ This surge in demand, however, does not need to lead to a surge in carbon pollution. It is well past time for the world to embrace the shift to renewable energy — a shift that would bring economic opportunities while leaving a better planet for future generations.¶ In fact, this transition is already underway. Renewable energy (including hydro) is the fastest-growing power generation sector in the world, according to a recent International Energy Agency report. Renewable energy is on pace to comprise one-quarter of the electricity mix by 2018. It is also increasingly cost-competitive with fossil fuels.¶ Many developing nations, like South Africa, China and Brazil, are setting the pace. Renewable energy investments in developing countries hit $112 billion in 2012, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance, close to the $132 billion from developed countries.¶ Obama’s announcement should have a significant ripple effect, especially on major U.S. lending institutions. The U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), which works with the private sector to invest abroad in support of development activities, committed around $1 billion to renewable energy projects in each of the past two years, with its annual commitments increasing nearly 10-fold since 2009. Its recent renewable energy investments are focused on Peru, South Africa and Pakistan, among others.¶ The U.S. Export-Import Bank, where I was chairman from 1997 to 2001, has similarly increased its share of renewable energy financing. The Export-Import Bank provided $355 million for renewable energy investments in 2012 — more than triple the amount in 2009. Exports to wind farms in Honduras are now powering job growth in states like Pennsylvania and Oklahoma.

#### Their only internal link to green leadership is whether the tech gets financed – which the counterplan fiats – no warrant for a deficit and no reason Ex-Im is key – counterplan solves just as well

Pentland 10 (William Pentland, Contributor, Forbes, “Clean Energy Exports? Think Energy Audits, Not Solar Panels,” 12-14-2010, http://www.forbes.com/sites/williampentland/2010/12/14/clean-energy-exports/)

The United States has accelerated efforts to promote clean-energy exports, but not necessarily the kind of exports you expect.¶ In the 2010 State of the Union address, President Barack Obama proposed to double exports within five years by facilitating exports in high-growth sectors like renewable energy and biotechnology. The Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Export Initiative, a coordinated effort to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency exports, is the most recent program launched as part of this national export effort.¶ “Expanding U.S. clean technology exports is a critical step to ensuring America’s economic competitiveness in the years ahead,” said U.S. Department of Energy Secretary Stephen Chu in a press release announcing the export initiative last week. The DOE will identify U.S. manufactured energy efficiency products likely to be competitive in global markets. The clean-energy export initiative is also being sponsored by the Departments of Commerce, State, and Agriculture and a clutch of federal agencies like the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.¶ The prospects for U.S. clean technology exports are vast. Despite a global recession and uncertainty regarding the global response to climate change, $162 billion of private-sector capital was invested in clean-energy technologies globally in 2009. For example, GE Energy Financial Services, a unit of General Electric, recently reached its multi-year target of building a $6 billion portfolio of renewable energy investments by the end of 2010. Renewable-energy accounts for nearly one third of GE Energy Financial Services’ overall portfolio, up from about 6 percent in 2006. ¶ To put this in perspective, in 2009, the U.S. exported roughly $2 billion of manufactured renewable energy goods. But, the prospects for manufactured products are likely dwarfed by the far more substantial opportunities for the export of U.S. services in the cleantech space. Services account for more than 70% of private-sector’s U.S. gross domestic product.

#### Ex-Im only finances bad investments – flips signal and solvency

Williams 13 (David Williams, “Government Bankers Do Nothing But Harm,” Town Hall, 8-8-2013, <http://townhall.com/columnists/davidwilliams/2013/08/08/government-bankers-do-nothing-but-harm-n1658480/page/full>)

Taxpayers look to Congress to seize upon opportunities to stop federal agencies when they run amok. Congress had unique opportunity to reign in the Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank), which has a litany of egregious practices, by not re-confirming Fred Hochberg as the agency’s chairman and president. Under his leadership, the Bank has a detailed history of promoting crony capitalism and mismanaging taxpayer-backed deals.

Throughout Hochberg’s tenure, the Bank has exemplified fiscal recklessness, providing loans to companies that would not pass the scrutiny of private investors. These transactions are best exemplified by the Ex-Im’s penchant for subsidizing lackluster green energy companies. In the past, the Bank foolishly approved $455.7 million in loan guarantees to First Solar, which in turn used the taxpayer backed subsidies to sell the solar panels to itself. Such investments are quite typical of the Export-Import Bank, as it has also provided loan guarantees to energy companies that eventually went bankrupt, like Enron and Solyndra.

These risky loans are not even the tip of the iceberg. The Bank has also usurped the American free market by picking winners and losers based on political patronage, rather than thoughtful analysis. The Boeing Company, which coincidentally retains a vast army of lobbyists, has been the largest benefactor of the Bank’s corporate welfare, so much so that Ex-Im is often referred to as “Boeing’s Bank.” In fact, last fiscal year Boeing received roughly $12.2 billion in financial assistance from Ex-Im, which equates to more than 80 percent of Ex-Im’s total loan guarantees.

While this might be great for Boeing shareholders, these actions have harmful consequences on the broader American economy, most notably the U.S. airline industry. Ex-Im’s loans are predominately used to finance foreign airlines’ purchases of Boeing aircrafts at below market level rates and with favorable loan terms. This results in a competitive advantage, where foreign carriers can cut costs from their budget and prices from their tickets. In order to remain competitive, American carriers are forced to scale back in other areas, resulting in job losses and lower revenue. According to some estimates, the Export-Import Bank costs the U.S. airline industry as many as 7,500 jobs and $684 million.

Ex-Im’s deleterious transactions are not a recent development and have actually garnered significant attention in the past, which is why in 2012 Congress demanded reforms to the Ex-Im Bank. Members of Congress passed legislation that called on the Bank to analyze its economic impact on future transactions and avoid any loans that could negatively impact American jobs. Unfortunately, Hochberg has gone rogue, continuing to facilitate financial ventures that hurt American job growth and are anything but risk-adverse.

The new law also required that the Treasury Secretary begin to wind down American subsidies to foreign carriers, but both former Secretary Geithner and current Secretary Lew have ignored the law and this requirement.

Despite these revelations, the U.S. Senate recently approved Fred Hochberg’s nomination to serve a second term as president of the Export-Import Bank. The Senate’s approval of Hochberg is tantamount to the endorsement of his market distorting and job-killing policies. Congress’s confirmation of Hochberg means that Ex-Im will unfailingly continue to operate in a manner that is detrimental to the American people unless something changes.

In order to prevent the Ex-Im Bank from further eroding the free market and hurting American employers, it is critical that Congress pass Senator Mike Lee (R-Utah) and Congressman Justin Amash’s (R-Mich.) legislation to phase-out the Export-Import Bank. It is vital that the United States support exports, but it is more important that we do not allow the government to create an unequal playing field by intruding into the free market, leaving taxpayers on the hook much like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac did years ago as the housing bubble popped. Congress should enact the Lee-Amash legislation, so that we can finally bring an end to an institution that inserts government into an area where the private sector could be engaged while exposing American taxpayers and hurting our employers.

#### Particularly to energy tech in Mexico

Katherine Rosario, 1/29/13, Heritage Foundation, "cronyism chronicles: export-import bank's pet solar energy project," <http://heritageaction.com/2013/01/cronyism-chronicles-export-import-banks-pet-solar-energy-project/>

When you read an article about the Export-Import Bank and all the jobs it’s helping to create by “investing” in green energy technologies around the world, hold your applause. One such article touts the $780,000, 10-year loan guarantee for the export of photovoltaic (PV) solar modules from a Georgia-based company, Suniva Inc., to a rooftop solar-power project in Mexico.¶ While some characterize Suniva as a “fast-growing solar startup often held up as an example of American innovation,” the Norcross, GA-based company is no stranger to the Washington game. According to Open Secrets, the company has spent $360,000 lobbying lawmakers.¶ In 2011, after expressing “displeasure” with Department of Energy’s “terms and conditions, Suniva abandoned efforts to secure a $141 million loan. Instead, the company received a hefty tax incentive from the Michigan Economic Growth Authority “to open a $250 million solar cell manufacturing facility in the Great Lakes Technology Solar Park.”¶ Not surprisingly, one of the cheerleaders for this new deal is the man who heads up the Ex-Im Bank, Fred P. Hochberg:¶ “With this authorization, Ex-Im Bank is continuing its strong support for Suniva’s high-efficiency exports that are sustaining high-quality jobs in Georgia. Our financing also benefits GMI, which will reap clean-energy savings for years to come. We hope to support many more such projects in Mexico and around the world.”¶ You don’t “sustain” jobs by using taxpayers to guarantee loans that – based on past experience and the current state of solar energy technology – are rather likely to fail. More importantly, though, if Suniva Inc. cannot compete in the free market by creating a good enough product, it becomes the American taxpayers’ undue duty to “sustain” said jobs.¶ Ultimately, what this is about is cronyism and the left’s green energy agenda. As Mr. Hochberg said, he and his friends hope to support more such projects in Mexico and around the world, with the backing of our taxpayer money, of course.¶ If that news doesn’t make you happy, maybe this will. The Ex-Im Bank’s loan guarantee is so generous, that it will also support approximately $130,000 of related local costs for the project’s installation and connection to the grid. Talk about lending a helping hand, eh?¶ Conservatives take no issue with innovation. Photovoltaic technology may one day be viable in the free market and consumers may demand it. But as the Heritage Foundation’s Nick Loris said:¶ Renewable sources may very well play a greater role in our energy portfolio, but that should be driven by markets and competition, not subsidies and mandates.¶ Similarly, they should not be propped up by taxpayer-backed loan guarantees. The folks at the Ex-Im Bank don’t understand that. They never have. Nor do the folks at companies like Suniva. They recognize that they have a “longstanding and valuable relationship” with the Ex-Im Bank. Yes, but valuable to whom? It may be valuable to Suniva, but it puts taxpayers in a precarious situation. If the company fails to repay the loan, it will be repaid by U.S. taxpayers.

#### Export subsidies are declining now – only the counterplan sends a signal which triggers limitless escalatory protectionism

James 12 (Sallie James, policy analyst, CATO Institute, “Expanding Ex-Im's Mandate Is A Big Mistake,” Free Trade Bulletin, No.48, 3-14-2012, http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/expanding-exims-mandate-is-big-mistake)

The fourth justification for the bank's existence is that it "levels the playing field" by stepping in to match official export credit provided to U.S. firms' rivals by their own governments. This justification is slightly more defensible than the others, but it is still motivated by a misguided mercantilist worldview in which foreign governments' subsidies are seen as something to lament and correct.¶ In any event, spending by rich-country governments on official export credit has actually fallen in recent years, although the bank and its supporters claim that export credit financing has increased markedly in fast-growing developing countries against which U.S. firms have to compete. It is this last role that the Obama administration hopes to expand in size and scope, by increasing Ex-Im's exposure cap and by allowing the bank to finance domestic sales. It is not difficult to imagine a never-ending cycle of subsidies and countersubsidies as official export credit agencies seek to gain advantages at home and abroad.¶ Veiled Countervailing¶ It is worth examining just how much of the bank's resources are currently devoted to "countervailing" subsidies given to U.S. exporters' competitors abroad, simply because the administration and the bank's supporters stress that as a vital role of the bank. It is also useful to gauge how big the bank's footprint could become if its countervailing role is expanded and broadened.¶ Historically, that role has been small, although it has increased in recent years. Buried in appendices of the bank's annual competitiveness reports and its annual report are aggregate expenditure figures and numbers of transactions by funding rationale (i.e., whether the finance was sought because no private sector financing was available, or to "meet competition" — that is, to match official export credit financing given to competitors.) Table 1 was constructed from data in those appendices.3 ¶ The data reveal a few salient points. First, we could cut the bank's funding and size by half immediately, and the bank would still be able to play the "countervailing" role that is ostensibly so vital. The data show that between 2002 and 2010 just under 40 percent of the bank's transactions by value were authorized to "meet competition." A majority of its activities — just over 60 percent by value, and over 90 percent by number of transactions — occurred because "no private sector financing was available."4 ¶ Second, the information provided by Ex-Im about its funding activities is of limited quality and value. The bank provides little to no detail about how it evaluates the accuracy or legitimacy of applicants' claims, what the standards are (if they even exist), or how much effort applicants undertook to justify their claims. Taxpayers are entitled to know more about the process of how the bank determines which firms "deserve" their support, and to have that information easily accessible.¶ Third, even though "countervailing" financing accounted for 40 percent of the bank's business by dollar value, it constituted just 4 percent of the bank's transactions. The obvious implication is that those seeking countervailing finance are responsible for disproportionately large transaction values. The beneficiaries of the bank's largesse are, in other words, a small number of firms. Knowing more about those firms and those transactions would seem to be a minimal requirement of transparent government.¶ A New and More Costly Role for the Bank¶ Clearly the Obama administration is keen to emphasize and increase the countervailing role of the bank. In February 2012 President Obama used the occasion of a speech at a Boeing plant in Washington State to announce that he would "give American companies a fair shot by matching the unfair export financing that their competitors receive from other countries."5 A concerted marketing push by the administration will presumably see the handful of countervailing financing recipients joined by many more.¶ Not made explicit during that speech but clarified in the release of a subsequent White House statement was the administration's intention to increase significantly the scope of Ex-Im's activities to include domestic sales. This is perhaps the most disconcerting aspect of the proposal. The statement read "The Administration will actively employ its existing authorities so that the Export-Import Bank can provide U.S. firms competing for domestic or third-country sales with matching financing support to counter foreign non-competitive official financing that fails to observe international disciplines" (emphasis added).6 ¶ The Ex-Im Bank has traditionally focused on financing exports — sales in countries abroad. So the intention to begin financing sales in the United States is a significant departure from the bank's traditional role. The idea that financing domestic sales is a legitimate and legal use of Ex-Im resources requires a convoluted, if not perverted, reading of the Ex-Im Bank charter. Two particular provisions of the bank's charter would come into play.7 The first provision (12 U.S.C. §635a-3) would ordinarily allow Ex-Im to finance sales in the United States if the foreign countries' export credit agencies were violating international rules. According to an unnamed administration official, quoted in World Trade Online, another provision in the bank's charter (12 U.S.C. §635a-1(b)) would allow the bank to intervene regardless of whether or not the export credits were given in accordance with international export credit guidelines, on the basis that the foreign export credit agency's activity was disadvantaging U.S. firms.8 In other words, the bank can cover all angles when it dispenses taxpayers' money: if the firm is "harmed," then it can receive financing regardless of whether or not its competitor's financing meets international rules. On the other hand, a firm can receive "competitiveness" financing even if it is not harmed, so long as its competitor received financing subsidies.¶ So it seems that the statement released by the administration was not accurate; matching support would not be conditional upon a competitor's official assistance "fail[ing] to observe international disciplines," at least if the above analysis of the bank's charter provisions (specifically 12 U.S.C. §635a-1(b)) is correct. This is of more than rhetorical interest: if no internationally agreed-upon norms need to be violated for Ex-Im to step in, then what (if any) are the standards for assessing applicants' claims? This significant loophole means that Ex-Im financing could continue effectively without limit.¶ Aside from the somewhat shaky legal justifications for this sort of expansion of the bank's activity, it is worth reiterating the following questions: On what basis are decisions made about who gets financing? According to the quoted official, the administration would make the determination of "competitive disadvantage" in accordance with Treasury officials and "on a case-by-case basis."9 A loose definition of "competitive disadvantage" and the absence of consistent standards or even guidelines opens the door wider to lobbying and politically motivated financing, and suggest that the extent and scope of Ex-Im activities would be potentially limitless. Any firm put at what Ex-Im and treasury bureaucrats consider a "competitive disadvantage" by imports could conceivably apply for Ex-Im assistance. It all sounds like a license to dole out favors.¶ Moreover, U.S. producers already have access to the U.S. countervailing duty law, which results in the imposition of duties on imports found to be subsidized and injurious to a domestic industry. At least there is some semblance of a standard in countervailing duty cases. Under the administration's proposal for the bank, it is conceivable that U.S. industry could hide behind protectionist tariffs and also receive subsidized financing in the event imports manage to penetrate the protection, so they would be protected two-fold, and at consumers' and taxpayers' expense.¶ Firms are oversubsidised and overprotected enough already without opening up a new front.

#### Ignore their assertions – Ex-Im doesn’t solve jobs, exports, or trade – even if it did, risks outweigh benefits

NCPA 12 (National Center for Policy Analysis, “Expanding the Export-Import Bank's Mandate Is a Big Mistake,” 3-22-2012, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21731)

The Export-Import Bank has been focused throughout its existence almost exclusively on export assistance for American companies. Proponents justify this mandate through four chief rationales, yet each of these actually demonstrates the injurious nature of the bank, says Sallie James, a policy analyst at the Cato Institute.

•Supporters argue that by financing companies, the bank creates jobs; however, because it essentially diverts national savings away from market-selected projects toward specific niche goals, the bank is actually inefficient in job creation.

•It is also supposed that by improving exports, the bank helps correct America's trade imbalance; this fails to consider that the exports of products is only a small component of the trade balance, and that the resources to help some companies are allocated at the expense of others.

•Proponents emphasize that the bank provides assistance to companies when the private sector won't, but this line of thought actually emphasizes the inherent risk in the bank's objectives -- if the private sector won't step in, the risks likely outweigh the benefits.

•Finally, the bank is justified on the grounds that by subsidizing certain exports, it allows domestic exporters to compete fairly with foreign firms who receive their own subsidies.

This last justification is perhaps the most crucial. This is because it is so contrary to the stated trade goals of the United States, which seek to eliminate barriers to trade and free up international commerce. Thus, reactionary subsidies in response to foreign subsidies undermine American objectives.

Additionally, the Obama administration has stated in a recent press release that the president would like to expand this subsidized assistance to domestic sales as well, thereby compounding the creation of trade barriers and distorting free trade.

•Data provided by the bank show that between 2002 and 2010 just under 40 percent of its transactions by value were authorized to "meet competition."

•Given that these allocations constituted just 4 percent of the bank's transactions, it becomes clear that this financing is given in large amounts to a small number of firms.

•That the president wishes to expand this mandate would further exacerbate this problem, putting taxpayers at risk while allowing federal bureaucrats to pick winners and losers.

#### No positive economic effects

Kasperowicz 12 (Pete Kasperowicz, “GOP Reps. Amash, Flake attack corporate welfare with bill ending Ex-Im Bank,” The Hill, 3-29-2012, http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/218981-gop-reps-amash-flake-attack-corporate-welfare-with-bill-ending-ex-im-bank)

Reps. Justin Amash (R-Mich.) and Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) this week introduced legislation that would abolish the Export-Import Bank, the export credit agency that the two members say is a major source of corporate welfare.¶ Under their Export-Import Bank Termination Act, H.R. 4268, the bank would be abolished three years after the bill becomes law, and would not be able to accept new loan or loan guarantee applications after just 30 days.¶ In a "Dear Colleague" letter seeking support for the bill, Amash said Ex-Im allows the federal government to subsidize loans to overseas companies and pick winners and losers in the marketplace through its ability to decide which loans and guarantees to approve, and tinker with the conditions of these loans.¶ "Ex-Im has become a tempting vehicle for social engineering and red tape, as well," Amash wrote. "Examples include extensive economic and environmental impact reports, limits on foreign content, shipping restrictions and mandates for renewable energy.¶ "Ex-Im does not create jobs or expand the economy," he added. "At best, it simply redistributes jobs from other exporters and import-using businesses to the bank's clients."¶ With their bill, Amash and Flake are siding with conservative groups like the Club for Growth and the Heritage Foundation, both of which oppose the reauthorization of Ex-Im.¶ "Conservatives should strongly oppose the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank," Amash said in a discussion with Heritage this month. "Ex-Im provides below-market loans and loan guarantees to foreign entities that purchase domestic goods. Principled conservatives recognize that this type of corporate welfare violates the Rule of Law because it unjustly enriches some companies at the expense of others, while putting taxpayers on the hook for billions of dollars of loans."¶ Authorization for the Bank expires in May. In 2011, the Bank helped more than $40 billion in export sales by providing more than $30 billion in financing for them.¶ The Senate tried but failed to put language reauthorizing Ex-Im in the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act earlier this month.