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#### Interpretation - “Engagement” requires the provision of positive incentives

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, p. 1-2

The term *engagement* was popularized amid the controversial policy of constructive engagement pursued by the United States toward South Africa during the first term of the Reagan administration. However, the term itself remains a source of confusion. To the Chinese, the word appears to mean simply the conduct of normal relations. In German, no comparable translation exists. Even to native English speakers, the concept behind the word is unclear. Except in the few instances in which the United States has sought to isolate a regime or country, America arguably "engages" states and actors all the time in one capacity or another simply by interacting with them. This book, however, employs the term engagement in a much more specific way, one that involves much more than a policy of nonisolation. In our usage, engagement refers to a foreign policy strategy that depends to a significant degree on positive incentives to achieve its objectives. Certainly, engagement does not preclude the simultaneous use of other foreign policy instruments such as sanctions or military force. In practice, there is often considerable overlap of strategies, particularly when the termination or lifting of sanctions is used as a positive inducement. Yet the distinguishing feature of engagement strategies is their reliance on the extension or provision of incentives to shape the behavior of countries with which the United States has important disagreements.

#### That means the plan must be a quid-pro-quo

De LaHunt 6 - Assistant Director for Environmental Health & Safety Services in Colorado College's Facilities Services department (John, “Perverse and unintended” Journal of Chemical Health and Safety, July-August, Science direct)

Incentives work on a *quid pro quo* basis – this for that. If you change your behavior, I’ll give you a reward. One could say that coercion is an incentive program – do as I say and I’ll let you live. However, I define an incentive as getting something you didn’t have before in exchange for new behavior, so that pretty much puts coercion in its own box, one separate from incentives. But fundamental problems plague the incentive approach. Like coercion, incentives are poor motivators in the long run, for at least two reasons – unintended consequences and perverse incentives.

#### Violation – the plan isn’t

#### Voting issue:

#### Limits --- it functionally narrows the topic because few cases can defend conditioning --- the alternative is hundreds of single import or export cases that explode the Neg’s research burden

#### Ground --- QPQ locks in core generics like soft power and foreign politics DAs, counterplans to add or remove a condition, and critiques of diplomacy

### 1NC – Economy –

\*\*INSERT LINK\*\*

#### Debt ceiling deal will be reached- tough move politically for the GOP but they’ll blink

The Hill, 9-14-2013 <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/322247-confident-democrats-want-separate-showdowns-on-shutdown-and-debt-limit>

Democrats, however, want to force the GOP to debate these issues successively.¶ “We’re not negotiating on the debt ceiling. We think we have the high ground in both of those fights,” said a senior Senate Democratic aide.¶ The Senate Democratic strategy over the next several weeks will be to stand pat and refuse to make any significant concessions in exchange for funding the government or raising the debt ceiling.¶ “If push comes to shove on debt ceiling, I’m virtually certain they’ll blink,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking member of the Senate Democratic leadership. “They know they shouldn’t be playing havoc with the markets.”¶ Schumer said Republicans are on stronger political ground if there’s a government shutdown, but warned “even on that one, they’re on weak ground because the public sort of is finally smelling that these guys are for obstructing.”

#### Clean energy is unpopular and partisan – hurts Obama’s political capital

LVS, ‘12

[Las Vegas Sun, 11-11-12, “Will Republicans play ball on Obama’s lofty second-term agenda?”, http://www.lasvegassun.com/news/2012/nov/11/will-republicans-play-ball-obamas-lofty-second-ter/]

But the phrase “cap-and-trade” makes conservatives see almost as much red as the name Nancy Pelosi. Plus, large swaths of the country — including some longtime Democrats — are beginning to doubt that there’s any real payoff to renewable energy investments. “It’s a lot of hocus-pocus,” said Nick Taylor, 42, a lifelong Las Vegas Democrat and single father of seven who voted for Romney. He used to have a job constructing solar panels with Bombard Electric. “We all made a lot of money doing it, but now the systems don’t work. ... Those are garbage now.” That’s left many lawmakers thinking the status quo may be better than the compromise. “Energy — that just divides the parties so much, and it’s something that the public isn’t really sold on,” Damore said, explaining that despite the arched rhetoric on both sides, the feeling of urgency is still too weak to push the parties to work something out. **“**Clean energy was sold as job creation, and now that doesn’t seem to have happened .. and it's not like the oil and gas industry is going anywhere.”

#### PC Key to avoid prolonged standoff over debt ceiling that tanks economy

McGregor, 13 (Richard, Richard McGregor (born 1958) is a journalist, writer and author. He was the chief political correspondent, Japan correspondent and China correspondent for The Australian. He also worked for the International Herald Tribune, the BBC and the Far Eastern Economic Review. He has worked as a journalist in Taiwan, Sydney, Canberra and Melbourne.[1] He is the former bureau chief for the Financial Times. He has written The Party: The Secret World of China's Communist Rulers.[2] The book was published by Allen Lane from Penguin Press in the UK and HarperCollins in the US in June 2010.[3] McGregor has won the 2010 Society of Publishers in Asia (SOPA) Editorial Excellence Award [1] for reporting on the Xinjiang Riots[10] and the SOPA Award in 2008 for Editorial Intelligences.[1][11] Financial Times, 6/24,

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/3a66c240-dc0f-11e2-8853-00144feab7de.html#axzz2Z7YPAEJQ>

The debt ceiling debate will take place in a very different context this time, with the economy recovering and the US budget deficit falling rapidly after earlier deals on tax rises and spending cuts. “There is also a certain crisis fatigue,” said Stan Collender, a former congressional staffer, at Qorvis Communication, a Washington consultancy. The debt ceiling will probably be increased eventually, even if a prolonged stand-off has the potential to damage confidence in the economy. “This isn’t 2011: if Republicans provoke a debt ceiling confrontation over demands for massive, offsetting spending cuts, the business community is going to come unglued,” said John Lawrence, former chief of staff to Nancy Pelosi, the Democratic minority leader in the House. But the political capital needed to get the statutory debt ceiling raised has the potential to drain the energy and spirit of compromise that both sides will need to forge a majority coalition for immigration.

This outweighs any other internal

Swagel 9-4 [Phillip, professor at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland, assistant secretary for economic policy at the Treasury Department from 2006 to 2009, “Fiscal Collisions Ahead,” <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/09/04/fiscal-collisions-ahead/>, ALB]\*we don’t support the ableist rhetoric of the evidence

A failure to act would harm the economy. Not lifting the debt ceiling in particular would be expected to have catastrophic economic effects. Interest rates could skyrocket if investors question the full faith and credit of the United States government, leading to a credit crunch that pummels business and consumer spending. The calamity might be avoided if the Treasury Department makes payments to bondholders to avoid a default, but even with this contingency plan (which the Treasury shows no sign of putting into place), the spectacle of a government that cannot finance its routine operations would doubtless translate into a severe negative impact on private confidence and spending.¶ A shutdown of nonessential government operations on Oct. 1 would mean an unintended reduction in spending that could retard [halt[ the recovery, but the larger consequence again would be indirect through a hit to confidence. With the government unable to attend to routine matters, it does not take much to imagine that American families and companies would halt plans to spend, invest and hire. This would repeat the natural instinct that contributed to the plunge in economic activity in the fall of 2008.¶ Fiscal uncertainty matters for monetary policy as well, because the Federal Reserve will hesitate to start unwinding its expansionary policy if a serious fiscal drag seems imminent.

#### Best studies prove economic collapse causes war

Royal 10 (Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg. Hess. & Weerapana. 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. 'Diversionary theory' suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1990, DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### K

#### Aff’s quest for energy security represents the final enclosure-reject the aff to rejct this commodification of nature that culminates in extinction

**Marzec, Purdue post colonial studies professor, 2011**

(Robert, “Energy Security”, Radical History Review; Winter2011, Issue 109, p83-99, 17p, ebsco)

The emergence of counterhegemonic groups like the MST reveals the continuing (and growing) presence of the discourse of enclosure and the monomaniacal drive to control production on a macroplanetary and a microbiological scale. One migbt even characterize the present age as the age of the global war against inhabitancy and the fulfillment of the enclosure movement that began almost a millennium ago. This war bypasses the needs of the environment, and the very presence of nature itself, in favor of the technological "advancements" of speed, efficiency, and high production. As with the eighteenth-century enclosure movement, the twenty-first century's enclosure movement related to energy security rewrites nature as a recalcitrant force that must be ruled at all costs. The labor and peasant movements not associated with a privatized international mechanism pose a threat to these feudalistic lords of the land. Struggles like those engaged in by organizations like the MST also reveal the power of the resistant force of inhabitancy, a conception of the human subject fundamentally different from constitutions of subjectivity offered by globalization, nationality, and even individuality. National and international law, because of its foundation in discourses of enclosure, cannot provide a resistant politics for the global poor. Moreover, the ideas of national sovereignty, as we have seen, will remain in the hands of the primary global national actors, particularly nations in the Global North and the West. Individual sovereignty destroys chances for the global poor to organize against large corporate and state landholders. What is needed, ultimately, is a new judicial conception and deployment of food sovereignty and habitation sovereignty. Food sovereignty names immediately the pressing issue of planetary starvation. Habitation sovereignty names the indissoluble connection between the land and its human and nonhuman inhabitants. And the idea of inhabitancy speaks to both of these. However, before these transformations can occur, we will continue to encounter brutal forms of corporate and militarized feudalism. Early feudal enclosures and later parliamentary enclosures have returned in the guise of a corporate and national war on the supposed security of the planet, especially energy security, as both neoconservatives and neoliberals prepare to enclose the land on a planetary scale. In the political push for energy security in the consumer world and in the struggle for basic existence in the developing world, we can observe the evolution of two kinds of human subjects: those that seek to control the environment and those that are connected to (and brutally disconnected from) their environments. If ideas of energy security continue down the path of history's enclosures, environments and their inhabitants will be too compromised to save. The poorest communities on the planet already live with tenuous connections to their habitations. The transformation of corn and other edible crops into fuel for developed countries will inevitably cause prices in staple foods to fluctuate at rates heretofore unknown. Even the World Bank acknowledges that large increases in food prizes will "raise overall poverty in low income countries substantially.''^^ Human subjects without a right to inhabitancy will quickly become citizens of the shadow kingdom of the twentyfirst century. They will take on the mantle of history's dispossessed, the farmers, laborers, villagers, and tenants who lost their rights to inhabitancy during the great waves of enclosure acts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The questions that global players should be asking themselves, then, are: Should we be annexing half the planet's population to the status of a life without the means to live so that consumer society's high yields can be maintained? Or should we be rethinking the status of all from the standpoint of the right to inhabitancy?

### Mexican States CP

#### Text: The People’s Republic of China should provide assistance and investment in renewable technology to Mexico.

#### We get the only internal link to modeling – China is a global leader in renewables

Also the card cites China’s leadership in PV panels, the only type of energy specified in the 1ac other than wind

WorldWatch Institute 13 (China on Pace to Become Global Leader in Renewable Energy, cites “Powering China’s Development: The Role of Renewable Energy” (2007) written by WorldWatch senior fellow Eric Martinot and Vice Chair of China’s Renewable Energy Society in Beijing, Li Junfeng, http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5497 //OP)

Washington, D.C. – China will likely achieve—and may even exceed—its target to obtain 15 percent of its energy from renewables by 2020, according to a new report released by the Worldwatch Institute. If China’s commitment to diversifying its energy supply and becoming a global leader in renewables manufacturing persists, renewable energy could provide over 30 percent of the nation’s energy by 2050.¶ That is the major conclusion of Powering China’s Development: The Role of Renewable Energy, written by Beijing-based researcher Eric Martinot, a Worldwatch senior fellow, and Li Junfeng, Vice Chair of China’s Renewable Energy Society in Beijing. “A combination of policy leadership and entrepreneurial savvy is leading to spectacular growth in renewable energy, increasing its share of the market for electricity, heating, and transport fuels,” said Martinot. “China is poised to become a leader in renewables manufacturing, which will have global implications for the future of the technology.”¶ More than $50 billion was invested in renewable energy worldwide in 2006, and China is expected to invest over $10 billion in new renewables capacity in 2007, second only to Germany. Wind and solar energy are expanding particularly rapidly in China, with production of wind turbines and solar cells both doubling in 2006. China is poised to pass world solar and wind manufacturing leaders in Europe, Japan, and North America in the next three years, and it already dominates the markets for solar hot water and small hydropower.¶ “Our ingenuity and manufacturing prowess are being harnessed to provide leadership to the world on renewables,” said Li Junfeng. “China’s position provides a strong example for other developing countries, while helping to drive down renewable energy costs to become competitive with fossil fuels for all countries the world over.”¶ The report discusses China’s advances in wind power, solar photovoltaics (PV), solar heating, biomass power, and biofuels. Impressive gains in these sectors include:¶ Wind power is the fastest growing power-generation technology in China, with existing capacity doubling during 2006 alone. By 2007, China was home to four major Chinese manufacturers of wind turbines, another six foreign subsidiary manufacturers, and more than 40 firms developing prototypes and aspiring to produce turbines commercially.¶ Solar PV production capacity in China jumped from 350 megawatts (MW) in 2005 to over 1,000 MW in 2006, with 1,500 MW expected in 2007. With high-profile initial public stock offerings for several Chinese companies, some valued in the billions of dollars, global attention has been riveted to China’s solar PV industry. Growth in solar hot water systems has been rapid, rising from 35 million square meters of installed capacity in 2000 to 100 million square meters by the end of 2006. China added 20 million square meters of new capacity in 2006 alone. Chinese companies now produce the solar heaters—an increasingly desirable consumer appliance—at costs one-fifth to one-eighth those found in the United States and Europe.¶ Wastes from agricultural facilities in China could yield 80 billion cubic meters of biogas annually, well above the government’s target of 44 billion cubic meters annually by 2020. In 2006, China had about 2 gigawatts (GW) of biomass power generation capacity, mostly from combined heat-and-power (CHP) plants with sugarcane waste as the primary feedstock.¶ Total ethanol production in China in 2006 was about 1 billion liters, compared with global production of 37 billion liters, primarily in the United States and Brazil. Higher corn prices and concern about competition with food supplies led to a moratorium on corn-based ethanol, leaving sorghum, cassava, and sugar cane as the current feedstocks of choice. Prospects for significant ethanol expansion in China rest primarily on the future of cellulose-to-ethanol technology, the viability of which experts expect will be proven within the next 10 years.¶ With its booming economy and rapidly expanding energy consumption—particularly its use of coal and oil—it is imperative for China to diversify its energy supplies. The country has suffered frequent power shortages due to its breakneck economic development. China’s urban population, which uses nearly three times more electricity and commercial energy per person than rural residents do, increased from 375 million in 1999 to 577 million in 2006. The country’s automobile fleet also continues to balloon, with an estimated 1,000 new cars appearing on Beijing’s streets every day.¶ Coal now provides 80 percent of China’s electricity, and national electricity demand doubled between 2000 and 2006. As a result, China’s economic development, environment, and public health are severely affected: for example, only 1 percent of urban Chinese breathe air that meets European air quality standards. Coal generation also leads to the build up of toxic metals, such as mercury, in water supplies and on agricultural fields throughout China.¶ China’s carbon dioxide emissions are on the rise and are expected to exceed total U.S. carbon dioxide emissions shortly, although Chinese per-capita emissions remain about one-sixth those of the United States. Nuclear power provides just 7 GW of China’s electric capacity, and even with the additional plants planned in the next few decades, it is unlikely to provide more than 5 percent of the country’s electricity.¶ Worldwatch President Christopher Flavin praised China’s growing commitment to renewables: “The combination of ambitious targets supported by strong government policies and entrepreneurial acumen may soon allow China’s renewable energy sector to ’leapfrog’ many developed nations.”

### Renewables

#### Grid expansion now – the plan speeds up renewable development – collapses reliability

Garrison 10 – Environment and Climate Change Consultant for the United States Agency for International Development (John L, “Clean Energy & Climate Change Opportunities Assessment for USAID/Mexico,” USAID, 4/30/10, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\_docs/PNADS950.pdf)//SJF

b. Barriers to a Cross‐Border California‐Baja California Renewable Energy Market

A key issue for renewable energy power development is access to electricity grid infrastructure. A specific priority under the U.S.‐Mexico Bilateral Agreement is to promote the development of a regional renewable energy market between California and Baja California and to help facilitate the construction of new power lines in a sustainable manner.

In response to the adoption of California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS),the California Electricity Commission launched the California Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative (RETI) in the summer of 2007 to identify competitive renewable energy zones(CREZ) and possible transmission corridors and siting options to serve those zones. A year later, in May of 2008,the Western Governors’ Association and U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) launched the Western Renewable Energy Zones (WREZ)initiative, which includesrepresentativesfrom11 states, two Canadian provinces and areas in northern Mexico, to develop a framework for consensus among states and provinces within the Western Interconnection on how to best develop cost‐effective and environmentally sensitive renewable energy zones and transmission plans.41 Under Phase 2 of its renewable energy resource assessment, RETI completed a conceptual plan for expanding the California’s transmission grid to access the CREZ with the lowest costs and impacts needed to reach 33% electric power from renewables. Using National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) data, the RETI assessment identified approximately 9,000 MW of wind potential in La Rumorosa resource area of which 2,400 MW was deemed to be highly competitive developable wind potential.42 The USAID CP/RE program also conducted a study on the export potential for wind energy to California and Texas.43

Existing cross‐border transmission is limited with only 800 MW of transmission capacity through two 230‐kV lines. At present, Sempra is seeking a permit from DOE to build a cross‐border transmission line to carry electricity from its wind turbines at La Rumorosa to the Southwest Powerlink in Imperial County, California with a potential for 1,250 MW. The California Independent System Operator(CAISO) has reportedly submitted interconnection applications for both La Rumorosa and Santa Catarina. Nevertheless, four additional transmission lines will be needed if Baja California’s wind potential is to be fully met.

For future cross border renewable energy trade to grow, however, a number of barriers must be overcome. For one, power exported from Mexico and sold to California under its RPS must show that it meets California’s environmental quality standards and that it protects the environment to the same extent as if it were located in California.44 The RPS environmental requirements are not clear and need to be better defined. Also of concern is the potential impact that intermittent wind energy might have on CFE’s and Imperial Irrigation District(IID) electrical grids even if not directly connected to them. Such impacts must be identified and addressed to CFE’s satisfaction prior to its concurrence of the CRE’s issuance of an energy export permit. The integration of 5,000 MW of wind from Baja California, for example, may require CFE’s 230‐kV East‐West corridor to be significantly reinforced raising the question, who will pay. CAISO is in contact with CFE and IID to study the impact that the region’s renewable energy cluster might have on their respective systems. Nevertheless, remediation of potential impacts will need to be addressed between the developer and CFE and/orIID.45

Another barrier to cross‐border renewable energy trade is the biennial re‐certification requirement. The designation of Baja California border area as an Energy Resource Area under the RETI process will also be important for future renewable energy development as will the expansion and strengthening of the transmission grid on the California side to reach highly populated areas. Given the current economic climate, the transmission expansion envisioned by RETI may not materialize.

#### Adding Mexico grid interconnections means increased renewable investment kills spare capacity – causes overstretch and blackouts

The Economist 11 (“Difference Engine: Disaster waiting to happen,” Babbage, 9/16/11, http://www.economist.com/blogs/babbage/2011/09/reliability-grid)//SJF

Yet, further down the coast, 6m citizens of southern California and south-west Arizona, along with their cousins across the Mexican border, were just recovering from a man-made disaster that had plunged their sweltering world into darkness—shutting down schools, hospitals, offices, factories, shops and restaurants, as lighting, air-conditioning and other essential equipment ceased to function. Beaches in San Diego had to be closed to the public because raw sewage had seeped into the sea. Passengers on trains stuck between stations and trapped in lifts had to be rescued by the police. Flights from San Diego International Airport were cancelled because security checkpoints were inoperable during the power outage and passenger processing could not be carried out. (Emergency runway lights meant that inbound flights could still land.) With traffic lights out of action and petrol stations unable to pump, motorists abandoned their vehicles and added to the gridlock that ruled the roads. By great good fortune, no-one died or was seriously injured. But normal life, for those so affected, ground to a miserable and unnerving halt. The difference between the two events could not have been more stark. One was all about preparedness and professionalism. The other was a forceful reminder of the chaos wrought by personal negligence and institutional neglect. “We don't need no lousy terrorists to cause mayhem,” San Diegans must have reflected afterwards. “We can manage just fine by ourselves.” The power outage that swept across a large swathe of the American south-west on September 8th was the region's worst cascading blackout in 15 years. It started at the North Gila substation near Yuma, Arizona, where a utility employee “was doing some work” on faulty equipment. Something happened (still under investigation) to cause the substation to shut down, disconnecting a 500kV transmission line connected to it and disrupting the electricity supply to Yuma's 90,000 residents. The immediate power shortage at Yuma caused the current—which normally flows along the grid's key Southwest Power Link from Arizona to California—suddenly to reverse its direction. The result was a violent fluctuation in line voltage that fed back through the grid to trip switches at substations throughout the San Diego area. Altogether, some 15 power stations in the region shut down automatically to protect themselves from voltage swings—the biggest being the 2,200MW San Onofre nuclear power plant up the coast near San Clemente. With the San Onofre plant disconnected and the umbilical cord from Arizona effectively severed, the delicately balanced grid serving San Diego and its adjacent counties quickly became unstable. Such problems would normally be resolved by ratcheting up the output of surrounding power stations. But with so little base-load capacity in the area, standby plants for meeting peak demand could not be spun up fast enough to stabilise the voltage. The overloaded grid promptly crashed, causing blackouts to spread across the region and into Mexico. The lights did not come back on until the following morning. The wind was blowing at only 8mph and the sky was partially overcast. So, California's lauded sources of renewable energy were of little help. If anything, they were part of the problem. Critics point out, with some justification, that California's energy strategy of focusing on conservation and expanding intermittent sources of renewable energy—while ignoring the urgent need for more base-load generating capacity close to big cities—was the primary cause of the grid failure. The wider issue is that the original voltage spike which triggered the monster outage should have been isolated at the Yuma substation in Arizona. The two official bodies responsible for overseeing the distribution and reliability of bulk power in the United States—the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC)—have launched an inquiry to learn why that did not happen. Their report will no doubt apportion blame and recommend changes in maintenance procedures. But few expect it to address the underlying problem. Both FERC and NERC are only too aware of the structural reasons why the American grid has become so fragile. They are equally aware of how intractable to solution those reasons are. As elsewhere, the electrical-power industry in America has changed over recent decades from a collection of heavily regulated regional monopolies to a complex, competitive, national, free-market business. In the process, electricity has become a commodity, with futures and contracts traded by participants just like any other commodity business. Independent power providers and transmission companies construct their own facilities, often paid for with bonds backed by future revenue streams. Retailers sign up customers, buy the electricity from wholesalers around the country, and bill users for it. Managing supply and demand, once the prerogative of the utilities' planners, has become a process shaped largely by an energy company's appetite for risk. Meanwhile, independent system operators who schedule the dispatches of electricity have become, effectively, asset managers—using market-clearing prices to equilibrate between bids by suppliers and those from retailers. By and large, such changes have made energy markets more efficient. For consumers, the competition created by deregulation has kept a lid on electricity prices. But it has had downsides, too. One of the biggest is the way it has removed what little spare capacity the grid once had. In the power industry's new competitive environment, transmission companies operate their lines at near full capacity, leaving little room for those threatening fluctuations in voltage caused by accidental outages. Compounding matters further is the way long-distance transmission lines connecting utilities around the country are being used differently these days. Before deregulation, such links were employed largely for emergencies—for when, say, a utility found its voltage dipping precipitously and a brownout imminent. Today, long-haul power lines are frequently made to handle more power than they were designed to, as wholesalers sell their electricity over longer and longer distances. The juice that comes out of a plug in clean-energy California can easily have come from a dirty coal-fired plant in Wyoming or West Virginia. As a result, the grid now suffers far greater fluctuations in electricity flow than ever before. The continual cycling of power plants up and down to meet demand from elsewhere in the country causes generating and transmission parts to heat up and cool down repeatedly. No surprise that they then wear out faster. Meanwhile, the amount of money the American power industry spends on maintenance has declined steadily, by 1% a year since 1992. With the grid's most critical components—the transformers at substations—now typically 40 years old, there are serious consequences for the stability and reliability of the grid as a whole. Another downside of deregulation has been the decline in investment. As the independent power providers, the electricity retailers and the utilities have no responsibility for the grid's main links, they have little incentive to maintain them properly. And as long as it is possible to purchase electricity elsewhere, there is little further incentive—as in the case of San Diego—to add more capacity locally. More and more blackouts sweeping the country are therefore inevitable. Will the so-called “smart grid” improve matters? It could do the opposite. All the smart grid does is add a communications layer to the local electricity-distribution network—so consumers can see at a glance how much electricity they are using at any time of the day, and how much it is costing them. Alerts sent by the utility at peak periods will allow customers to cut back their consumption and save money—or have it cut back for them to reap extra rewards. The real aim, of course, is to save the utility from having to invest in additional capacity. What is rarely mentioned in all the proselytising about the smart grid is that it adds a vast layer of hackable points to the network—some 440m by 2015, according to Lockheed Martin's Energy and Cyber Services. Every smart meter in the home will be a hackable device. The same goes for all the routers at substations. As the saying goes, if you can communicate with it, you can hack it. Today, you can cut off the power to someone's home by shinning up the nearest electricity pole and throwing a switch at the top. Once smart meters become widespread, you will be able to do that remotely, from the far side of the world. But evil-doers from afar might not stop at that. Instead of switching off the power, they could run the voltage up and down to wreck sensitive electronic equipment, such as computers and television sets. And they could do that not just on single homes, but on whole communities and even to routers in substations—in an attempt to take transformers offline, if not actually fry them. As we saw last week, the failure of just one substation in Yuma was enough to bring a whole chunk of the American south-west to its knees. Unless the grid is made more robust and secure, the threat to the country—from terrorist or technician—can only become more severe.

#### Blackouts risks nuclear meltdowns

Cappiello, 11 (3/29/2011, Dina, “AP IMPACT: Long blackouts pose risk to US reactors,” <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2011/mar/29/ap-impact-long-blackouts-pose-risk-to-us-reactors/)>

WASHINGTON — It's a nightmarish scenario - a days-long blackout at a nuclear power plant leading to a radioactive leak. Though the odds of that happening are extremely remote, an Associated Press investigation has found that some U.S. plants are more vulnerable than others. Long before the nuclear emergency in Japan, U.S. regulators knew that a power failure lasting for days at an American nuclear plant, whatever the cause, could lead to a radioactive leak. Even so, they have only required the nation's 104 nuclear reactors to develop plans for dealing with much shorter blackouts on the assumption that power would be restored quickly. In one simulation presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan's Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors. And like Fukushima Dai-ichi, the Peach Bottom plant has enough battery power on site to power emergency cooling systems for eight hours. In Japan, that wasn't enough time for power to be restored. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Institute trade association, three of the six reactors at the plant still can't get power to operate the emergency cooling systems. Two were shut down at the time. In the sixth, the fuel was removed completely and put in the spent fuel pool when it was shut down for maintenance at the time of the disaster. A week after the March 11 earthquake, diesel generators started supplying power to two other two reactors, Units 5 and 6, the groups said. The risk of a blackout leading to core damage, while extremely remote, exists at all U.S. nuclear power plants, and some are more susceptible than others, according to an Associated Press investigation. While regulators say they have confidence that measures adopted in the U.S. will prevent or significantly delay a core from melting and threatening a radioactive release, the events in Japan raise questions about whether U.S. power plants are as prepared as they could and should be. As part of a review requested by President Barack Obama in the wake of the Japan crisis, a top Nuclear Regulatory Commission official said Tuesday that the agency will investigate whether the nation's nuclear reactors are capable of coping with station blackouts and whether regulatory requirements need to be strengthened. Bill Borchardt, the agency's executive director for operations, said an obvious question is whether nuclear plants need enhanced battery supplies, or ones that can last longer. "There is a robust capability that exists already, but given what happened in Japan there's obviously a question that presents itself: Do we need to make it even more robust," he said at a hearing before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. "We didn't address a tsunami and an earthquake, but clearly we have known for some time that one of the weak links that makes accidents a little more likely is losing power," said Alan Kolaczkowski, a retired nuclear engineer who worked on a federal risk analysis of Peach Bottom released in 1990 and is familiar with the updated risk analysis. Risk analyses conducted by the plants in 1991-94 and published by the commission in 2003 show that the chances of such an event striking a U.S. power plant are remote, even at the plant where the risk is the highest, the Beaver Valley Power Station in Pennsylvania. These long odds are among the reasons why the United States since the late 1980s has only required nuclear power plants to cope with blackouts for four or eight hours. That's about how much time batteries would last. After that, it is assumed that power would be restored. And so far, that's been the case. Equipment put in place after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks could buy more time. Otherwise, the reactor's radioactive core could begin to melt unless alternative cooling methods were employed. In Japan, the utility has tried using portable generators and dumping tons of seawater, among other things, on the reactors in an attempt to keep them cool. A 2003 federal analysis looking at how to estimate the risk of containment failure said that should power be knocked out by an earthquake or tornado it "would be unlikely that power will be recovered in the time frame to prevent core meltdown." In Japan, it was a one-two punch: first the earthquake, then the tsunami. Tokyo Electric Power Co., the operator of the crippled plant, found other ways to cool the reactor core and, so far, avert a full-scale meltdown without electricity. "Clearly the coping duration is an issue on the table now," said Biff Bradley, director of risk assessment for the Nuclear Energy Institute. "The industry and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will have to go back in light of what we just observed and rethink station blackout duration." David Lochbaum, a former plant engineer and nuclear safety director at the advocacy group Union of Concerned Scientists, put it another way: "Japan shows what happens when you play beat-the-clock and lose." At Tuesday's Senate committee hearing, he said the government and the nuclear power industry have to do more to cope with prolonged blackouts, such as having temporary generators on site - or at nearby military bases - that can recharge batteries. A complete loss of electrical power, generally speaking, poses a major problem for a nuclear power plant because the reactor core must be kept cool, and back-up cooling systems - mostly pumps that replenish the core with water- require massive amounts of power to work. Without the electrical grid, or diesel generators, batteries can be used for a time, but they will not last long with the power demands. And when the batteries die, the systems that control and monitor the plant can also go dark, making it difficult to ascertain water levels and the condition of the core. Eleven U.S. reactors are designed to cope with a station blackout lasting eight hours, while 93 are designed for four-hour blackouts.

#### Impact is on par with nuclear warfare – fallout will be massive and global

Drell, 9 Professor emeritus of theoretical physics at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory at Stanford University, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, and a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board and Science Advisory Committee, 12 (THE NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE High-Consequence Accidents: How to Enhance Safety and Minimize Risks in Nuclear Weapons and Reactors, pg. 1-3)

We live in dangerous times for many reasons. Prominent among them is the existence of a global nuclear enterprise made up of weapons that can cause damage of unimaginable proportions and power plants at which accidents can have severe, essentially unpredictable consequences for human life. For all of its utility and promise, the nuclear enterprise is unique in the enormity of the vast quantities of destructive energy that can be released through blast, heat, and radioactivity. We addressed just this subject in a conference in October 2011 at Stanford University's Hoover Institution. The complete set of papers prepared for the conference is reproduced in this book. The conference included experts on weapons, on power plants, on regulatory experience, and on the development of public perceptions and the ways in which these perceptions influence policy7. The reassuring outcome of the conference was a general sense that the U.S. nuclear enterprise currently meets very high standards in its commitment to safety and security. That has not always been the case in all aspects of the nuclear enterprise. And the unsettling outcome of the conference was that it will not be the case globally unless governments, international organizations, industry7, and media recognize and address the nuclear challenges and mounting risks posed by a rapidly changing world. The acceptance of the nuclear enterprise is now being challenged by concerns about the questionable safety and security of programs primarily in countries relatively new to the nuclear enterprise, and the potential loss of control to terrorist or criminal gangs of fissile material that exists in such abundance around the world. In a number of countries, confidence in nuclear energy production was severely shaken in the spring of 2011 by the Fukushima nuclear reactor plant disaster. And in the military sphere, the doctrine of deterrence that remains primarily dependent on nuclear weapons is seen in decline due to the importance of non-state actors such as al Qaeda and terrorist affiliates that seek destruction for destruction's sake. We have two nuclear tigers by the tail. When risks and consequences are unknown, undervalued, or ignored, our nation and the world are dangerously vulnerable. Nowhere is this risk-consequence equation more relevant than with respect to the nucleus of the atom. The nuclear enterprise was introduced to the world by the shock of the devastation produced by two atomic bombs hitting Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Modern nuclear weapons are far more powerful than those early bombs, which presented their own hazards. Early research depended on a program of atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. In the early years following World War II, the impact and the amount of radioactive fallout in the atmosphere generated by above-ground nuclear explosions was notfully appreciated. During those years, the United States and also the Soviet Union conducted several hundred tests in the atmosphere that created fallout. The recent Stanford conference focused on a regulatory weak point from that time that exists in many places today, as the Fukushima disaster clearly indicates. The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) was initially assigned conflicting responsibilities: to create an arsenal of nuclear weapons for the United States to confront a growing nuclear-armed Soviet threat; and, at the same time, to ensure public safety from the effects of radioactive fallout. The AEC was faced with the same conundrum with regard to civilian nuclear power generation. It was charged with promoting civilian nuclear power and simultaneously protecting the public. Progress came in 1963 with the negotiation and signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) banning all nuclear explosive testing in the atmosphere (initially by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom). With the successful safety7 record of the U.S. nuclear weapons program, domestic anxiety about nuclear weapons receded somewhat. Meanwhile, public attitudes toward nuclear weapons reflected recognition of their key role in establishing a more stable nuclear deterrent posture in the confrontation with the Soviet Union. The positive record on safety of the nuclear weapons enterprise in the United States—there have been accidents involving nuclear weapons, but none that led to the release of nuclear energy—was the result of a strong effort and continuing commitment to include safety as a primary criterion in new weapons designs, as well as careful production, handling, and deployment procedures. The key to the health of today's nuclear weapons enterprise is confidence in the safety7 of its operations and in the protection of special nuclear materials against theft. One can imagine how different the situation would be today if there had been a recognized theft of material sufficient for a bomb, or if one of the two four-megaton bombs dropped from a disabled B-52 Strategic Air Command bomber overflying Goldsboro, North Carolina, in 1961 had detonated. In that event, just one switch in the arming sequence of one of the bombs, by remaining in its "off position" while the aircraft was disintegrating, was all that prevented a full-yield nuclear explosion. A close call indeed! In the twenty-six years since Chernobyl, the nuclear power industry has strengthened its safety practices. Over the past decade, growing concerns about global warming and energy independence have actually strengthened support for nuclear energy in the United States and many nations around the world. Yet despite these trends, the civil nuclear enterprise remains fragile. Following Fukushima, opinion polls gave stark evidence of the public's deep fears of the invisible force of nuclear radiation, shown by public opposition to the construction of new nuclear power plants in close proximity. It is not simply a matter of getting better information to the public but of actually educating the public about the true nature of nuclear radiation and its risks. Of course, the immediate task of the nuclear power component of the enterprise is to strive for the best possible safety record with one overriding objective: no more Fukushimas. Another issue that must be resolved involves the continued effectiveness of a policy of deterrence that remains primarily dependent upon nuclear weapons, and the hazards these weapons pose due to the spread of nuclear technology and material. There is growing apprehension about the determination of terrorists to get their hands on weapons or, for that matter, on the special nuclear material—plutonium and highly enriched uranium—that fuels them in the most challenging step toward developing a weapon. The global effects of a regional war between nuclear-armed adversaries such as India and Pakistan would also wield an enormous impact, potentially involving radioactive fallout at large distances caused by a limited number of nuclear explosions. This is true as well for nuclear radiation from a reactor explosion—fallout at large distances would have a serious societal impact on the nuclear enterprise. There is little understanding of the reality and potential danger of consequences if such an event were to occur halfway around the world. An effort should be made to prepare the public by providing information on how to respond to such an event.

#### Mexican energy poverty is low and decreasing – 95% of population accesses energy

**IEF 09** – world's largest gathering of energy “ministers”; includes IEA and OPEC countries, and key international actors such as Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Russia, and South Africa; IEF countries account for more than 90 percent of global oil and gas supply and demand (International Energy Forum, “Reducing Energy Poverty through Cooperation and Partnership”, IEF Symposium on Energy Poverty, December 2009, <http://www.ief.org/_resources/files/content/events/ief-symposium-on-energy-poverty/background-paper.pdf)//AY>

Despite the alarming figures for energy poverty worldwide, significant efforts are underway to reduce the number of people suffering from a lack of access to modern energy services. Although a decidedly international problem, energy poverty can be improved through domestic energy policy reform. For example, Mexico identified energy poverty as an obstacle to its development in the 1990s and made access to electricity a budget priority. Through the 1990s, Mexico put over $2 billion toward electrification, drawing heavily on international capital and donor markets. As part of a larger initiative to reform and redraw its energy sector, from oil to power lines, Mexico managed to eradicate much of its energy poverty. As of 2006, over 95% of Mexico’s population was enjoying regular access to electricity.13 The Mexican example demonstrates that access can be achieved through comprehensive reform and dedicated funding.

#### War for oil’s fiction – best ev disproves

Hossein-zadeh 09 An Iranian-born Kurd, Ismael Hossein-zadeh came to the United States in 1975 to pursue his formal education in economics. After completing his graduate work at the New School for Social Research in New York City (1988), he joined Drake University faculty where he has been teaching classes in political economy, comparative economic systems, international economics, history of economic thought and development economics. His published work covers significant topics such as financial instability, economic crises and restructuring policies, currency-trade relations, globalization and labor, international/sovereign debt, determinants of presidential economic policies, economics of war and military spending, roots of conflict between the Muslim world and the West, long waves of economic expansion and decline, and the Soviet model of non-capitalist development

The Political Economy of US Wars of Choice: Are They Really Oil Wars? Author: Hossein-Zadeh, Ismael Journal: Perspectives on global development and technology ISSN: 1569-1500 Date: 04/2009 Volume: 8 Issue: 2 Page: 295 DOI: 10.1163/156914909X423908

Despite the fact that oil companies nowadays view war and political turmoil in the Middle East as detrimental to their long-term interests and, therefore, do not support policies that are conducive to war and militarism, and despite the fact that war is no longer the way to gain access to oil, the widespread perception that every US military engagement in the region, including the current invasion of Iraq , is prompted by oil considerations continues. Th e question is why? Behind the Myth of War for Oil The widely-shared but erroneous view that recent US wars of choice are driven by oil concerns is partly due to precedence: the fact that for a long time military force was key to colonial or imperialist control and exploitation of foreign markets and resources, including oil. It is also partly due to perception: the exaggerated notion that both President Bush and Vice President Cheney were “oil men” before coming to the White House. But, as noted earlier, George W. Bush was never more than an ineff ective minor oil prospector and Dick Cheney was never really an oil man; he headed the notorious Halliburton company that sold, and still sells, services to oil companies and the Pentagon .

**Squo solves energy dependence**

Drezner 12, IR prof at Tufts, “Predictions about the death of American hegemony may have been greatly exaggerated”, January 22, <http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/22/predictions_about_the_death_of_american_hegemony_may_have_been_greatly_exaggerated>

A predicted decline in energy insecurity. British Petroleum has issued their Energy Outlook for 2030. The Guardian's Richard Wachman provides a useful summary: Growth in shale oil and gas supplies will make the US virtually self-sufficient in energy by 2030, according to a BP report published on Wednesday. In a development with enormous geopolitical implications, the country's dependence on oil imports from potentially volatile countries in the Middle East and elsewhere would disappear, BP said, although Britain and western Europe would still need Gulf supplies. BP's latest energy outlook forecasts a growth in unconventional energy sources, "including US shale oil and gas, Canadian oil sands and Brazilian deepwater, plus a gradual decline in demand, that would see [North America] become almost totally energy self-sufficient" in two decades. BP's chief executive, Bob Dudley, said: "Our report challenges some long-held beliefs. Significant changes in US supply-and-demand prospects, for example, highlight the likelihood that import dependence in what is today's largest energy importer will decline substantially." The report said the volume of oil imports in the US would fall below 1990s levels, largely due to rising domestic shale oil production and ethanol replacing crude. The US would also become a net exporter of natural gas. Note that this will take a while, and doesn't mean that the U.S. will be energy independent. Still, it's quite a trend. Or, rather, trends.

**No resource wars or conflict over scarcity**

**Tetrais 12**, Senior Fellow at Foundation for Strategic Research, (Bruno- Editorial Board at TWQ, July, “The Demise of Ares: The End of War as We Know It?” The Washington Quarterly, Vol 35 Issue 3, p 7-22, T&F Online)

**The invasion of Kuwait may go down in history as being the last great resource war**. **Future resource wars are unlikely**. There are fewer and fewer conquest wars. Between the Westphalia peace and the end of World War II, nearly half of conflicts were fought over territory. Since the end of the Cold War, it has been less than 30 percent.61 The invasion of Kuwait—a nationwide bank robbery—may go down in history as being the last great resource war. The U.S.-led intervention of 1991 was partly driven by the need to maintain the free flow of oil, but not by the temptation to capture it. (Nor was the 2003 war against Iraq motivated by oil.) As for the current tensions between the two Sudans over oil, they are the remnants of a civil war and an offshoot of a botched secession process, not a desire to control new resources.¶ China's and India's energy needs are sometimes seen with apprehension: in light of growing oil and gas scarcity, is there not a risk of military clashes over the control of such resources? This seemingly consensual idea rests on two fallacies. One is that there is such a thing as oil and gas scarcity, a notion challenged by many energy experts.62 As prices rise, previously untapped reserves and non-conventional hydrocarbons become economically attractive. The other is that spilling blood is a rational way to access resources. As shown by the work of historians and political scientists such as Quincy Wright, the economic rationale for war has always been overstated. And because of globalization, it has become cheaper to buy than to steal. We no longer live in the world of 1941, when fear of lacking oil and raw materials was a key motivation for Japan's decision to go to war. In an era of liberalizing trade, many natural resources are fungible goods. (Here, Beijing behaves as any other actor: 90 percent of the oil its companies produce outside of China goes to the global market, not to the domestic one.)63 There may be clashes or conflicts in regions in maritime resource-rich areas such as the South China and East China seas or the Mediterranean, but they will be driven by nationalist passions, not the desperate hunger for hydrocarbons.¶ Only in civil wars does the question of resources such as oil, diamonds, minerals, and the like play a significant role; this was especially true as Cold War superpowers stopped their financial patronage of local actors.64 Indeed, as Mueller puts it in his appropriately titled The Remnants of War, “Many [existing wars] have been labeled ‘new war,’ ‘ethnic conflict,’ or, most grandly ‘clashes of civilization.’ But in fact, most…are more nearly opportunistic predation by packs, often remarkably small ones, of criminals, bandits, and thugs.”65 It is the abundance of resources, not their scarcity, which fuels such conflicts. The risk is particularly high when the export of natural resources represents at least a third of the country's GDP.66¶ What about fighting for arable land, in light of population growth in Africa and Asia? Even in situations of high population densities, the correlation between the lack of arable lands and propensity to collective violence remains weak.67 Neo-Malthusians such as Jared Diamond believe that the Rwanda tragedy was driven by such scarcity.68 But there was no famine in Rwanda at the time. And the events of 1994 were not a revolt of the poor: Hutu landowners were amongst the most active perpetrators of genocide. There was, however, a significant youth bulge: the 15–24 age group represented 38 percent of the adult population.69 Land scarcity played a role, but at best as a factor explaining the intensity of the violence in some areas.70

#### No country will ever turn away from US commitment – even if they are tempted, they know they need a superpower

Alterman 11 (Jon, director and senior fellow of the Middle East Program at CSIS, Former member of the Policy Planning Staff at the U.S. Department of State and as a special assistant to the assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern affairs, June 2011, “Capacity and Resolve: Foreign Assessments of U.S. Power,” http://csis.org/files/publication/110613\_Cohen\_CapacityResolve\_Web.pdf

Beneath the surface, however, is an appreciation of how much of the region’s security order is a consequence of U.S. action and how little ability any other country or collection of countries has to do anything close to what the United States does. While there is fear for the future of the U.S. role, there is at the same time no alternative to it. No other country has the military resources or the will to safeguard what is, in the end, a global commons. Rather than seek to eliminate the U.S. role, regional countries—both friendly and unfriendly—are determined to try to shape it in order to advance their own interests. It is worth pointing out two things at the outset. The first is that much of this is a speculative exercise. Decisions on foreign policy are closely held, with no public consultation, at the highest levels of the Gulf leadership. Those leaders are often mannered when talking with Americans, almost seeming as if they are calibrating their messages to achieve the desired response rather than to give insight into their own thinking. Although it is worth paying attention to words spoken in private, those words need to be supplemented with attention to the actions the leaders take as well as to the parameters of the public debate that they allow to exist. Second, there is a tremendous range of views within the Gulf, not only between Iran, Iraq, and their GCC neighbors, but even within the GCC itself. The United Arab Emirates feels most vulnerable to Iran, for example, while Oman and Qatar seem intent on finding a modus vivendi with Iran. Kuwait feels threatened by everyone in its neighborhood, while Saudi Arabia relies on U.S. backing in order to seek to lead the neighborhood. **For each country, the bilateral relationship with the United States is the most important relation, not least because it protects each country from the predatory actions of its neighbors.** Correspondingly, there is no single “Gulf” or “Arab” view of the United States, nor a single view of U.S. power or U.S. commitment to the region. Even within countries, there seems to be considerable diversity. **Where there is unanimity**, however, **is in the expectation that the region must have some external guarantor, as it has had since the early sixteenth century.**

### Reform

#### Weigh consequences—moral absolutism *reproduces evil*.

Isaac 2 — Jeffrey C. Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, 2002 (“Ends, Means, and Politics,” *Dissent*, Volume 49, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via EBSCOhost, p. 35-36)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. [end page 35] This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### China solves the case

Xinhua 6-5

(“China, Mexico vow to enhance cooperation in culture, technology,” http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/786969.shtml#.UcpIbD5KlnY)//BB

Chinese President Xi Jinping and his Mexican counterpart Enrique Pena Nieto on Tuesday pledged to enhance bilateral cooperation in culture, education, technology and social development.¶ In a joint statement released after talks between Xi and Pena Nieto, they stressed the importance of culture in boosting mutual understanding between the two peoples.¶ The two leaders agreed to promote cultural and artistic exchanges in traditional and emerging areas and cooperation in cultural industries.¶ The statement said that the two governments will enhance educational exchanges in such areas as Spanish and Chinese teaching, adding that they will also support youth exchanges.¶ China promised to offer 300 government scholarships to Mexican students, while the National Autonomous University of Mexico will establish a center of Mexican studies in Beijing Foreign Studies University.¶ In technology, the two sides will promote cooperation in such areas as clean and renewable energy, the prevention and control of environmental pollution, biotechnology and nanotechnology.¶ As developing countries, China and Mexico face similar challenges in economic and social fields, the statement said.¶ The two governments will promote cooperation in achieving sustainable and inclusive economic growth, reducing poverty, narrowing gap between the rich and the poor and improving social welfare, according to the statement.¶ The two leaders witnessed the signing of a dozen agreements covering bilateral cooperation in energy, mining, infrastructure, trade, investment, education and banking.¶ During talks earlier in the day, Xi and Pena Nieto agreed to lift their countries' relations to a comprehensive strategic partnership.

#### China’s beating the US in wind development now---it’s key to their overall clean-tech leadership---the plan reverses this

Zoninsein 10 Manuela is a writer for Climatewire, New York Times. “Chinese Offshore Development Blows Past U.S.,” Sept 7, http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/09/07/07climatewire-chinese-offshore-development-blows-past-us-47150.html?pagewanted=all

As proposed American offshore wind-farm projects creep forward -- slowed by state legislative debates, due diligence and environmental impact assessments -- China has leapt past the United States, installing its first offshore wind farm. Several other farms also are already under construction, and even the Chinese government's ambitious targets seem low compared to industry dreaming. "What the U.S. doesn't realize," said Peggy Liu, founder and chairwoman of the Joint U.S.-China Collaboration on Clean Energy, is that China "is going from manufacturing hub to the clean-tech laboratory of the world." The first major offshore wind farm outside of Europe is located in the East China Sea, near Shanghai. The 102-megawatt Donghai Bridge Wind Farm began transmitting power to the national grid in July and signals a new direction for Chinese renewable energy projects and the initiation of a national policy focusing not just on wind power, but increasingly on the offshore variety. Moreover, "it serves as a showcase of what the Chinese can do offshore ... and it's quite significant," said Rachel Enslow, a wind consultant and co-author of the report "China, Norway and Offshore Wind Development," published in March by Azure International for the World Wildlife Fund Norway.

#### Chinese clean tech leadership is key to their economy, internal stability, and solves extinction

Paul Denlinger 10, consultant specializing in the China market who is based in Hong Kong, 7/20/10, “Why China Has To Dominate Green Tech,” http://www.forbes.com/sites/china/2010/07/20/why-china-has-to-dominate-green-tech/

On the policy level, the Chinese government has to perform a delicate balancing act, it has to balance the desire of many Chinese to live a Western lifestyle, together with its high energy consumption and waste, with the need to preserve the environment, since China, and the world, would suffer enormous damage if 1.3 billion people got all their energy needs from coal and oil, the two most widely used fossil fuels. China’s political and social stability depends on finding the right balance, since the party has an implicit mandate: it will deliver economic growth to the Chinese people. This is why the Chinese government has chosen to invest in developing new green energy technology. The country is very fortunate in that most of the discovered deposits of rare earths used in the development of new technologies are found in China. While these deposits are very valuable, up until recently, the industry has not been regulated much by the Chinese central government. But now that Beijing is aware of their importance and value, it has come under much closer scrutiny. For one, Beijing wants to consolidate the industry and lower energy waste and environmental damage. (Ironically, the rare earth mining business is one of the most energy-wasteful and highly polluting industries around. Think Chinese coal mining with acid.) At the same time, Beijing wants to cut back rare earth exports to the rest of the world, instead encouraging domestic production into wind and solar products for export around the world. With patents on the new technology used in manufacturing, China would control the intellectual property and licensing on the products that would be used all over the world. If Beijing is able to do this, it would control the next generation of energy products used by the world for the next century. That is the plan. It would be like if the oil-producing nations in the 1920s and 1930s said that they didn’t need Western oil exploration firms and refineries to distribute oil products; they would do all the processing themselves, and the Western countries would just order the finished oil products from them. This is how China obviously plans to keep most of the value-added profits within China’s borders. Before any Western readers snap into “evil Chinese conspiracy to take over the world” mode, it’s worth pointing out that Chinese rare earth experts and government officials have repeatedly warned Western visitors that this policy change would be introduced. Unfortunately, these warnings have gone largely unheeded and ignored by the Western media and politicians who, it seems, have been largely preoccupied by multiple financial crises and what to do about the West’s debt load. The debt crisis in the West means that it is very hard for Western green energy companies to find financing for their technologies, then to market them as finished products. New energy technologies are highly risky, and initial investments are by no means guaranteed. Because they are considered high-risk and require high capital expenditure (unlike Internet technologies which are very cheap and practically commoditized), banks are reluctant to finance them unless they are able to find government-secured financing. Because most U.S. banks are recapitalizing their businesses after the debt bubble burst, there are very few, if any western banks who will finance new green energy technologies. This has opened a window of opportunity for the Chinese government to finance, and for Chinese technology companies to develop, then manufacture these new green products. But just making these technologies is not enough; they need to be competitive against traditional fossil fuels. When it comes to the amount of energy released when coal or oil is burned, the new green technologies are still way behind. This means that, at least in the early stages of adoption, Chinese businesses will still be reliant on coal and oil to bridge that energy chasm before the new energy technologies become economically competitive. Much depends on how much the Chinese government is willing to spend to promote and incentivize these new technologies, first in China, then overseas. Because of China’s growing energy demands, we are in a race for survival. The 21st century will be remembered as the resurgent coal and oil century, or as the century humanity transitioned to green technologies for energy consumption. While China is investing heavily now in green tech, it is still consuming ever larger amounts of coal and oil to drive its economic growth. Right now, we all depend on China’s success to make the transition to green energy this century. For all practical purposes, we’re all in the same boat.

#### Plan causes a dysprosium shortage

The Economist 12 ("In a hole?" 5/17, http://www.economist.com/node/21550243)

MANY plans for reducing the world's emissions of carbon dioxide—at least, those plans formulated by environmentalists who are not of the hair-shirt, back-to-the-caves persuasion—involve peppering the landscape with wind turbines and replacing petrol-guzzling vehicles with electric ones charged up using energy gathered from renewable resources. The hope is that the level of CO2 in the atmosphere can thus be kept below what is widely agreed to be the upper limit for a tolerable level of global warming, 450 parts per million.¶ Wind turbines and electric vehicles, however, both rely on dysprosium and neodymium to make the magnets that are essential to their generators and motors. These two elements, part of a group called the rare-earth metals, have unusual configurations of electrons orbiting their nuclei, and thus unusually powerful magnetic properties. Finding substitutes would be hard. Motors or generators whose magnets were made of other materials would be heavier, less efficient or both.¶ At the moment, that is not too much of a problem. Though a lot of the supply of rare earths comes from China, whose government has recently been restricting exports (a restriction that was the subject of a challenge lodged with the World Trade Organisation by America, Europe and Japan on March 13th), other known sources could be brought into play reasonably quickly, like the Mountain Pass mine in California, pictured above, which re-opened for business in February. At current levels of demand any problem caused by the geographical concentration of supply would thus be an irritating blip rather than an existential crisis.¶ But what if the environmentalists' dream came true? Could demand for dysprosium and neodymium then be met? That was the question Randolph Kirchain, Elisa Alonso and Frank Field, three materials scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, asked themselves recently. Their answer, just published in Environmental Science and Technology, is that if wind turbines and electric vehicles are going to fulfil the role environmental planners have assigned them in reducing emissions of carbon dioxide, using current technologies would require an increase in the supply of neodymium and dysprosium of more than 700% and 2,600% respectively during the next 25 years. At the moment, the supply of these metals is increasing by 6% a year. To match the three researchers' projections it would actually have to increase by 8% a year for neodymium and 14% for dysprosium.

#### Shortage kills the Japanese economy

Handwerger 11 (Jeb, "Ucore: David Among The Goliaths Of Rare Earths," http://ucore.com/JebHandwerger\_Aug2011.pdf)

There was an impressive turnout of international rare earth ¶ experts, the investment community and major political heavyweights ¶ to the Ucore’s “Alaska Rare Earth Conference”. GST was right in the ¶ middle of this illustrious gathering. I couldn’t wait to impart my ¶ ﬁndings to my loyal subscribers. ¶ Let me begin by giving you the positive side of the story. It is the ¶ only company in the United States which has the goods for which the whole world is looking: dysprosium and terbium! These are heavy ¶ rare earths that industrial nations such as Japan absolutely require ¶ for their economic survival.

#### Nuclear war

The Guardian 2/11/02 (lexis)

Even so, the westcannot afford to be complacent about what is happening in Japan**,** unless it intends to use the country as a test case to explore whether a full-scale depression is less painful now than it was 70 years ago. Action is needed, and quickly because this is an economy that could soak up some of the world's excess capacity if functioning properly. A strong Japan is not only essential for the long-term health of the global economy, it is also needed as a counter-weight to the growing power of China. A collapse in the Japanese economy, which looks ever more likely, would have profound ramifications; some experts believe it could even unleash a wave of extreme nationalism that would push the country into conflict with its bigger (and nuclear) neighbour.

#### Several barriers prevent sustainable development

Garrison 10 – Environment and Climate Change Consultant for the United States Agency for International Development (John L, “Clean Energy & Climate Change Opportunities Assessment for USAID/Mexico,” USAID, 4/30/10, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\_docs/PNADS950.pdf)//SJF

3.1.2 Barriers to Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency in Mexico a. Renewable Energy Barriers Low Energy Rates Based on Short‐Term Marginal Costs. There is significant renewable energy and energy efficiency potential in Mexico. Nevertheless, both sectors in Mexico have been slow to grow. By far the greatest barrier to renewable energy in Mexico lies in the price of electricity paid by CFE to electricity producers. At present, CFE is required to produce power at the lowest cost. The rate paid for power from small producers or for surplus power from self‐supply projects is established by the short term marginal cost of gas‐fired plants.28 As environmental externalities are not taken into account, even with the rise in natural gas prices the rate remains too low to cover the costs of current renewable energy technologies. CFE’s first concession attempt for the 101 MW La Venta III wind project, for example, failed despite a grant from the World Bank to provide financial incentives.29 Electricity rates are based on generation, transmission and distribution costs provided by CFE. Rates are set by the Secretary of Treasury and Public Credit(Secretaría deHacienda y Crédito Público – SHCP) with input from CFE and SENER. At present, such rates do not take into account environmental externalities of fossil fuels, which puts renewable energy at a disadvantage. Fortunately, the new renewable energy law requires that SENER develops a methodology for determining environmental externalities for electric power generation to be considered in setting the price of electricity. In addition, according to a World Bank study, electricity subsidies in Mexico are among the highest in the world costing the country approximately $9 billion, roughly equal to one‐third of electricity sector revenues in 2006.30 Two thirds of the subsidies go to residential users. Agricultural electricity use receives the highest rate ofsubsidy.31 The residential and agricultural electricity use subsidies are a disincentive to improving efficiency. Tariffs for the commercial sector and for public services, on the other hand are high, 32 and large users are increasingly turning to independent power generation (in many cases from wind)through self‐supply agreements to protect themselves against the potential rise in electricity costs.33 High prices in theory make energy conservation and efficiency projects more attractive. Other Barriers to Renewable Energy. While price is the main barrier to renewable energy development in Mexico, the following is a list of additional renewable energy barriers identified by the Inter‐American Development Bank’s “A Blueprint for Green Energy in the Americas” and the Bank’s “Mexico Public‐Private Sector Renewable Energy Program” Clean Technology Fund (CTF) Proposal: Regulatory Barriers: There is a lack of transparency and uncertainty in CFE’s independent power producer tendering process including the definition of ceiling prices and the selection criteria. For auto‐generation projects, there is a lack of legal clarity in terms of CFE’s purchase of excess electricity.34 Lack of Incentives: Even under the new regulatory framework, it remains to be seen whether new measures to promote renewables will be sufficient to enable renewable energy to compete with combined‐cycle natural gas fired plants. CFE renewable energy projects have also been hampered by the expectation that such investments must obtain aminimum12% return.35 Transmission Access, Capacity and Fees: Many viable small scale hydro projects that take advantage of existing irrigation channels are far from existing transmission lines. This is also true for wind energy projects. Transmission capacity in areas with large renewable energy potential is also an issue. For example, additional transmission capacity will be required to expand the cross‐border sale of renewable energy to the State of California. In the state of Oaxaca, 13 private auto‐generation developers on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec were required to build the interconnection infrastructure to bring the wind generated power to the main transmission network at a cost of $200million.36 Furthermore, grid interconnection charges are set on a case‐by‐case basis with no clear methodology for calculating the charges.37 Permitting Time: Small hydro projects, in particular, require extensive permits including water‐use and land‐use concessions, and project approval from the National Water Commission (Comisión Nacional del Agua ‐ CNA).38 CFE approval procedures for renewable energy projects lead to high up‐front and transaction costs.39 Limited Access to Finance: Rural communities are often unable to pay the cost of off‐grid renewable electricity without some form of outside assistance. Mexico’s national development banks have not developed financial instruments that adequately address the renewable energy sector’s risks and liquidity needs.40 Environmental Concerns: Apart from the environmental concerns associated with large hydroelectric dams, potential geothermal sites are located near or in ecological reserves. Wind and large solar projects also have potentially negative environmental and social impacts. Class Seven Winds: High winds in the States of Oaxaca and Baja California limit the types of wind turbines available for such high wind conditions.

#### Long time-frame

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

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

#### **Doublebind – either Mexican renewable energy is cheap and doesn’t qualify for state funding, or it’s expensive and never gets adopted**

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

The most significant hurdle to renewable energy development is that CFE, which controls most of the country's generation, currently cannot build renewable energy projects because the levelized cost of all types of renewable energy in the country is more expensive than conventional energy. According to federal law, CFE must develop new capacity additions that will provide the cheapest electricity for citizens. Currently, there are no regulatory mandates like domestic renewable energy targets or financial incentives like feed-in tariffs, which offer generators a fixed price for renewable energy based on installed capacity or energy produced, or production tax credits, which provide extra revenue per kWh of renewable energy produced, to make this type of generation competitive with fossil-fuel based generation. Also, in the planning process for new capacity additions, there is no incorporation of a future carbon tax, which would make renewables more competitive with conventional energy. The revenue that can be derived from the CDM for renewable energy projects is also not a part of the economic analysis made when considering new capacity additions [16]. If a project does not pass the financial analysis and get selected as the least-cost technology, then it is not published in the long-term planning process book that is presented before Congress and passed yearly. Capacity additions that are not in this book will not be considered for CFE development. However, if renewable energy is found to be the least-cost option and published in the long-term planning book, then this renewable energy would most likely not qualify for CDM revenues because it would fail both financial and regulatory additionality tests, which require that the project cause emission reductions beyond what would have occurred in a business-as-usual scenario [16].

#### No transmission capacity

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

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

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

#### Renewables worsen the quality of life for the poor

Cecelski, 2k – (Elizabeth, worked for more than twenty-five years in problems of energy and developing countries, specializing in energy, poverty and gender issues, especially in household and rural energy; and in rural electrification and rural development; holds a BA from Duke University and an MA from John Hopkins.¶ As an energy economist at Resources for the Future, she co-authored Household Energy and the Third World Poor (1979) and Energy Strategies for Developing Nations (1981). She later worked for an appropriate technology NGO, VITA, and in the Rural Employment Policies Branch of the International Labour Organisation in Geneva. She is a founding member, and presently member of the Advisory Group and Technical Adviser for Advocacy & Research of ENERGIA, the International Network on Gender and Sustainable Energy, and is the author of several standard references on gender and energy; “ENABLING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO RURAL ¶ ELECTRIFICATION: CURRENT THINKING AND MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN ENERGY, POVERTY AND GENDER,” 27 January 2000, http://www.sarpn.org/genderenergy/resources/cecelski/energypovertygender.pdf//HO

Sustainable energy development (SED) has been defined as sustainability in economic, ¶ social and environmental terms (deLucia, 1992; Munasinghe, 1995). Renewable energy ¶ and energy efficiency are usually characterized as "win-win" options in SED, meeting the ¶ objectives both of environmental improvement and poverty alleviation (with economics ¶ being the principal challenge). ¶ It is increasingly clear however that this is unlikely to be true in every case. The situation ¶ is considerably more complicated. Any technology when applied in a field situation ¶ represents gains and losses for different groups. More likely, there are "win-win" ¶ situations, "win-lose" situations, and "trade-offs" between environmental objectives and ¶ poverty reduction, to use a framework proposed by Munasinghe (1995)1¶ . ¶ A recent review of renewable energy activities in ESMAP (1999) points out that¶ The 'mainstreaming' of 'renewable energy' is not an end in itself, but is a means to ¶ satisfying two objectives namely the objective to reduce poverty and the objective to ¶ reduce global environmental damage that results from energy use. Under current ¶ incentive structures there will frequently be a trade off between these two objectives.¶ and concludes that although ¶ renewables may be the best choice in some circumstances, restricting support to ¶ renewable energy sources alone places severe additional burdens on poor people, ¶ and denies them the opportunity for productivity growth that fossil fuelled ¶ technologies facilitate.

#### Mexico will say no to decentralized energy production

Huacuz, 5 – (Jorge, Director of the Non-Conventional Energies Unit, Mexican Electric Research Institute; “The road to green power in Mexico—reflections on the prospects for the large-scale and sustainable implementation of renewable energy”, *Energy Policy*, Vol. 33, Issue 16, pages 2087–2099, November 2005, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421504001041)//HO

Technical, economic and institutional barriers had to be removed at the onset of the large-scale deployment of green power facilities in countries where new renewables are now becoming an important option (IEA, 1997). Individual countries have implemented strategies according to their particular circumstance, most of them embedded in their legal framework. For instance, in the United States, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) issued in 1978, was instrumental in the early implementation of a large variety of green power technologies. PURPA required utilities to purchase green power from small non-utility producers at avoided cost rates. In more recent times Spain introduced a special regime for renewables in which green power producers can get either a fixed price for the kWh fed to the grid, or a variable price calculated from the average price of the market pool plus a bonus per every kWh produced (Avia, 2000). In Germany an Electricity Feed Law was introduced in 1991, obligating utilities to buy green power from independent generators at preferential rates. This law was replaced in the year 2000 by the “Act on Granting Priority to Renewable Energy Sources” also known as the “Renewable Energy Sources Act”, which regulates the prioritization of grid-supplied electricity from renewable sources (FMENCNS, 2000). In India, a whole Ministry for Non-Conventional Energy Sources was created over a decade ago, while in China a law issued in 1999 allows renewable energy projects to receive loans at reduced rates and guarantees access to the grid and premium buy-back prices (Lew and Logan).¶ The large-scale introduction of renewables in Mexico will not be easy. A number of barriers of different kinds have to be removed for this to happen (Huacuz, 2001). As already mentioned, the current legal framework does not favour the adoption of new renewables by the EPS, and virtually excludes any possibility of adopting incentive mechanisms based on preferential feed-in tariffs. On the other hand, distributed generation may be perceived as risky within a centrally structured utility (due to possible loss of political control over the electricity business; negative impacts on the integrity, safety and quality of the grid, etc.), or the “bigger is better” paradigm, followed by many power engineers can inhibit needed decisions. From the planning point of view, availability of fossil fuels challenges the wisdom of developing local renewable energy sources.¶ International experience shows that success in creating a market for renewables is contingent upon private sector involvement. Based on this premise, a number of stakeholders in Mexico would like to see the hands of the government off the renewables business. However, experience also shows that government participation in the early stages of market development is critical in creating a favourable legal framework, providing adequate institutional support and setting long-term goals. It is unlikely that, due to budgetary constraints, the GOM will finance capital-intensive renewable energy projects, beyond early pilots or demonstrations. But experience in the commercial development of renewable power projects does not exist in Mexico, and hence, participation of the government is expected in many areas. For instance, a number of elements from the potential financial network useful for this purpose need to be identified and strengthened; regulatory barriers, which turn into financial constraints by perpetuating perceived high investment risks, associated with elevated project preparation costs and long lead times, need to be removed, along with subsidies now applied to conventional energy, which negatively impact the economic viability of renewable energy projects. No credits for capacity are currently granted for intermittent power production facilities, and CFE is under no obligation to purchase any renewable energy production, although in the case of self-supply with intermittent sources CFE is mandated to serve as an energy storage as explained earlier. Otherwise the regulatory framework is such that CFE cannot unilaterally grant exceptions or provide incentives for renewables, unless the legal framework is modified or alternative attractive market-based solutions are identified.

#### Status quo solar power solves lack of access

Cichon 12 (Meg Cichon, associate editor of renewable energy world, 12-14-12, “Clear Horizon for Mexican Solar,” <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/12/clear-horizon-for-mexican-solar>) gz

Most solar development in Mexico has been focused on small scale, off-grid rural electrification for the 3% of Mexicans without grid access. More than 80,000 rural systems have already been installed. But interest in developing larger and utility-scale projects is rising, especially in Northern Mexico.¶ In October, President Felipe Calderon inaugurated a 1 MW plant in Baja California. Developed by Microm, the facility provides an experimental model for the CFE, as the first large-scale plant to connect to the grid. Yet Calderon, while hailing this achievement for Mexico, stressed the need for more grid-connected residential solar

#### Case outweighs—scope and urgency.

Kennan 86 — George F. Kennan, Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union (1952) and Yugoslavia (1961-1963), 1985 (“Morality and Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1985/1986, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 216)

Except perhaps in some sectors of American government and opinion, there are few thoughtful people who would not agree that our world is at present faced with two unprecedented and supreme dangers. One is the danger not just of nuclear war but of any major war at all among great industrial powers—an exercise which modern technology has now made suicidal all around. The other is the devastating effect of modern industrialization and overpopulation on the world's natural environment. The one threatens the destruction of civilization through the recklessness and selfishness of its military rivalries, the other through the massive abuse of its natural habitat. Both are relatively new problems, for the solution of which past experience affords little guidance. Both are urgent. The problems of political misgovernment, to which so much of our thinking about moral values has recently related, is as old as the human species itself. It is a problem that will not be solved in our time, and need not be. But the environmental and nuclear crises will brook no delay.
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#### Renewables get adopted before grids can undergo the improvements their ev references – increases volatility and risk of black-outs which thwarts long-term renewable development – Europe proves

Neslen 12 -- EurActiv, part of the Guardian Environment Network (Arthur, 2/10/12, "Grid blackout threat weighs on renewables take-up," http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/feb/10/grid-blackout-threat-renewables)

The policy chief of Europe's electricity industry association has told EurActiv that Europe will have to slow down its integration of renewable energies or risk power cuts and systems instability because of the slow pace of cross-border grid improvements. "Either you go very fast in the transition - which is impossible [because] smart grids are expensive and the storage is not there in the needed scope – or you diminish the speed for integrating renewables into the system," Susanne Nies of Eurelectric told EurActiv in a phone interview. Given a choice between meeting the EU's target of getting 20% of energy – and 35% of the EU's electricity mix – from renewables by 2020 or keeping the system stable, "I would rather say that system stability and avoiding blackouts is more important," she said. Nies cited a report claiming a rise of serious systems stability incidents last year from 300 to 1,000 across a swathe of northern Europe, and said that the Czech Republic came close to power black-outs in November and December 2010. "We want to meet the 2020 targets but we need to be very careful," she said, "because the worst case scenario is one in which we have a series of blackouts in Europe and there would be a loss of support first for the utilities but maybe also for the renewables. That would be a disaster." Her words reflect pessimism in the electricity transmission industry about the likelihood of balancing capacity for variable energy sources like wind and solar in time for 2020. Usually though, this is voiced off the record. Speaking to EurActiv last month, another industry insider said that renewables advocates "want to increase solar panels and we want to keep the lights on, but if the lights go out because PV [solar photovoltaic energy] has not maintained the power quality, it's not in either of our interests." "If we're connecting things that the system wasn't designed for," the source continued, "we're putting stresses on it. Some people think it is a bit conservative for network operators to say that, but maybe it's good to have a bit of conservatism when you're thinking about a constant electricity supply. There is a bit of a trade-off between security of supply and reliability" and renewables.

#### New renewable electricity collapses the grid – they assume subsequent grid developments that are too costly

Perlstein 12 -- Dr. Perlstein has over 25 years' experience consulting on energy- and financial risk- related strategy, management, policy, and valuation related issues; has taught at Columbia University's Graduate School of Public & International Affairs and Northeastern University, and lectured at M.I.T. and Brandeis University. He holds a Ph.D. in Economics and Politics from Brandeis University and an Sc.M. in Finance and Applied Economics from M.I.T.'s Sloan School of Management (Bruce, 8/9/12, "Can Demand Response Programs Help Meet the Renewable Energy Integration Challenge?" http://energy.aol.com/2012/08/09/can-demand-response-programs-help-meet-the-renewable-energy-inte/)

Achieving these goals will require a number of states to rely much more heavily on electricity generated by intermittent and solar resources. In California, wind and solar generation are expected to provide virtually all of the additional renewable energy needed to achieve the state's RPS target (see Figure 2). In order to maintain the stability of the electricity grid, supply and demand must be in balance at all times. Wind and solar generation, however, tend to be intermittent. As a result, heavier reliance on wind and solar generation will make it harder to maintain the stability of the grid from moment to moment. This will increase the need for the "ancillary" services (3) and load following services grid operators use to maintain the stability of the grid, and avoid the supply and demand imbalances that, in a worst-case scenario, could lead to load shedding, brownouts, and/or blackouts. The need for these services used to manage the effect of variable renewable generation on grid stability is the "renewables integration" challenge. Ancillary and load following services are typically provided by quick start fossil-fueled power plants. (4) However, California may not have enough of these resources to meet the additional need created by its increased reliance on wind and solar, due largely to a state environmental policy requiring the retrofitting or retirement of 17,000 MW of "once through cooling" fossil-fueled power plant capacity by 2017. The potential retirement of that much capacity is a serious issue because those units already account for more than 36 percent of the capacity available to meet forecasted peak demand during the summer of 2012. (5) And, adding new back-up generation capacity would be costly.

#### Renewables technically impossible – cause massive grid failure – California proves

Simmons 12 -- Inst for Energy Research, Director of Regulatory and State Affairs (8/13/12, "California’s Flex Alert: A Case Study in Intermittent Energy," http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2012/08/13/wind-and-solar-have-little-value-when-trying-to-keep-the-lights-on-the-example-of-california-and-its-current-flexalert/)

California has long been a leader in promoting wind and other renewables to power the electricity grid. Recently, California has gone even further and in 2011, Gov. Jerry Brown signed a law to force an increase in the amount of renewables utilities must use to 33 percent of the state’s electricity by 2020. Currently, the state is experiencing a stressed electricity grid because of high demand and because some nuclear and natural gas plants are offline. Mandated renewable energy is proving itself incapable of filling the void. This situation show how little actual value wind, solar and other politically correct renewables have in the real world work of supplying people with electricity when they need and want it. California is currently experiencing a “flex alert” which strongly urges Californians to use less electricity. According to the California ISO, the operator of the region’s power grid, it is “critical” to conserve electricity today to make sure there aren’t blackouts. Here’s the graphic representing the alert: Because California is rushing headlong toward more and more renewables in the electricity grid it is important to look at how renewables are contributing to keeping the electricity grid stable. For example, California has 4.297 gigawatts of installed wind capacity which could really help California balance the grid if the wind blew at the right times (spoiler alert—the wind doesn’t blow at the right times). The first chart below shows the supply and demand for August 9, 2012 in the California ISO electrical grid. The actual demand is in blue and the available generation is in orange. The second chart shows the renewable generation in California at that time. There are some very important things to note with respect to the renewable generation. Wind’s production peaked just before 1 am, when electricity demand was dropping as people went to bed and nighttime temperatures reduced the need for air conditioning. At the time, wind was producing 6 percent of California’s electricity, but after 1 am, wind began to falter and wind production fell by 90 percent by 11 am. At that time, wind was producing less than 100 megawatts of electricity—a mere 0.2 percent of the electricity in California. This shows how wind fails to produce electricity when needed most. At 11 am, as electricity demand was rapidly increasing and electricity producing was needed most, wind was at a low ebb. Fortuitously, wind production increased in the afternoon, but by 5:30 pm, wind was only producing a little more than 1 percent of California’s total electricity. Solar helped meet demand more than wind, because solar has the advantage of producing electricity when the sun is shining and households are using more power. But even solar failed to produce much electricity during the period of highest demand, producing just 2 percent of the state’s electricity at its peak. Solar production peaked at nearly 1 gigawatt at 11 am and continued to produce about 1 gigawatt until 3 pm. The problem is that the state’s highest period of demand occurred at about 5 pm, when solar’s production had fallen by over 50 percent from its peak. This data shows how little value wind and solar have in producing electricity when people really need it, and should be a wake-up call to California—one of the many states with mandates—as well as the Obama administration and other promoters of wind and solar. Even though wind and solar production might be growing in California, it isn’t helping to balance the grid and keep the lights on. Electricity production has to balance electricity demand and wind and solar aren’t doing a good job contributing. Moreover, it does not matter how many wind and solar installations are built because natural gas and other reliable power plants will be required to be built to meet peak electricity demand.

#### Germany proves – renewables causes blackouts – that then turns renewables

Bach 12 -- more than 40 years experience in power system planning, worked with grid and generation planning at ELSAM (Euan, 6/1/12, "German Power Grids Increasingly Strained," http://www.theoildrum.com/node/9205)

With a steep growth of power generation from photovoltaic (PV) and wind power and with 8 GW base load capacity suddenly taken out of service the situation in Germany has developed into a nightmare for system operators. The peak demand in Germany is about 80 GW. The variations of wind and PV generation create situations which require long distance transport of huge amounts of power. The grid capacity is far from sufficient for these transports. The result is a remarkably large number of curtailments of RES (Renewable Energy Sources). Reports from the European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E)[1] and the German Grid Agency[2] reflect concern for the operational security of the power system. The risk of a prolonged and widespread power blackout was earlier recognized by the German Bundestag and discussed in an interesting report[3]

#### Renewables increase grid volatility in the short-term

Hodge 12 -- freelance journalist specialising in legal and business issues (Neil, last cited Nuclear Waste Act of 2012, "Power trip," http://www.agcs.allianz.com/assets/PDFs/GRD/GRD%20individual%20articles/Power\_blackout\_risks\_article.pdf)

While renewable energy is on the rise in many countries, a major drawback is the “volatility” of supply. This leads to several challenges. The unsteady production of energy, especially from wind or solar power, strains the stability of the network. Further, if wind turbines need to be stopped for safety reasons in extreme weather conditions, this can cause power gaps equal to the loss of two nuclear power plants within just one hour. In such cases, conventional reserve power plants would need to step in instantly. Last but not least, renewable energy has to be transmitted from sparsely populated areas to the metropolitan centers of demand. To handle these enormous technical challenges, grids need to become much smarter. “Governments should develop new grids with metering, control and communication functions to handle the future growth of renew able energies,” says Larry Hunter. They should also promote storage facilities for excess energy such as pumped storage hydropower plants or underground vaults for compressed air. Overhauling national grids comes at a considerable cost. Estimates suggest that European Union (EU) member states need to invest between €23 and €28 billion over the next five years in their national grid networks, particularly as the demand for power supply is now cross-border. However, the fact that the European electricity grid consists of multiple regulatory bodies, owners and operators makes it difficult to form a consensus on prioritizing areas for investment – and responsibility. More widely, the International Energy Agency (IEA) says that the world will need to invest US$13.6 trillion between now and 2030 to boost power supply to meet increasing demand. The IEA says that 50 percent of this amount needs to be invested in transmission and distribution and another 50 percent in the generation of electricity.

## Renewables Adv

### Oil Wars

**No resource wars over oil**

**Victor 07** (David G., Professor of Law – Stanford Law School and Director – Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, “What Resource Wars?”, The National Interest, 11-12, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16020)

RISING ENERGY prices and mounting concerns about environmental depletion have animated fears that the world may be headed for a spate of “resource wars”—hot conflicts triggered by a struggle to grab valuable resources. Such fears come in many stripes, but the threat industry has sounded the alarm bells especially loudly in three areas. First is the rise of China, which is poorly endowed with many of the resources it needs—such as oil, gas, timber and most minerals—and has already “gone out” to the world with the goal of securing what it wants. Violent conflicts may follow as the country shunts others aside. A second potential path down the road to resource wars starts with all the money now flowing into poorly governed but resource-rich countries. Money can fund civil wars and other hostilities, even leaking into the hands of terrorists. And third is global climate change, which could multiply stresses on natural resources and trigger water wars, catalyze the spread of disease or bring about mass migrations. **Most of this is bunk,** and nearly all of it has focused on the wrong lessons for policy. Classic resource wars are good material for Hollywood screenwriters. They rarely occur in the real world. To be sure, resource money can magnify and prolong some conflicts, but the **root causes** of those hostilities usually lie elsewhere. Fixing them requires focusing on the underlying institutions that govern how resources are used and largely determine whether stress explodes into violence. When conflicts do arise, the weak link isn’t a dearth in resources but a dearth in governance.

### Squo Solves

#### New NIC report squo solves

Burrows & Kojm 12 [Dr. Matthew Burrows - Counselor to the National Intelligence, Christopher - Chairman, National Intelligence Council, “Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds a publication of the National Intelligence Council”, P. 47]

Experts are virtually certain that demand for energy will rise dramatically—about 50 percent—over the next 15-20 years largely in response to rapid economic growth in the developing world. The US Energy Information Agency anticipates steadily rising global production through 2035, driven primarily by a combination of OPEC production increases and larger unconventional sources. The main or reference scenario of the International Energy Agency also posits growing global production of key fossil fuels through 2030 (about 1 percent annually for oil).

Much of this increased production—and recent optimism—derives from unconventional oil and gas being developed in North America. The scale-up of two technologies, horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing, (see box on page 37) is driving this new energy boom. Producers have long known shale as “source rock”—rock from which oil and natural gas slowly migrated into traditional reservoirs over millions of years. Lacking the means economically to unlock the massive amounts of hydrocarbon in the source rock, producers devoted their attention to the conventional reservoirs. Once the industry discovered how to combine hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, the vast gas resources trapped in shale deposits became accessible.

The economic and even political implications of this technological revolution, which won’t be completely understood for some time, are already significant. In a for the US in as short a period as 10-20 years. Increased oil production and the shale gas revolution could yield such independence. US production of shale gas has exploded with a nearly 50 percent annual increase between 2007 and 2011, and natural gas prices in the US have collapsed. US has sufficient natural gas to meet domestic needs for decades to come, and potentially substantial global exports. Service companies are developing new “super fracking” technologies that could dramatically increase recovery rates still further. Shale oil production in the US is still in its early stages, and its full potential remains uncertain, but development is happening at a faster pace than shale gas. Preliminary estimates for 2020 range from 5-15 million barrels per day with a production breakeven price as low as $44-68 per barrel depending upon the fields. By the 2020, the US could emerge as a major energy exporter.

### Rescource Wars

**No resource wars – we have untapped resources we can access and it’s cheaper to buy them from others than to steal them – that’s Tetrais**

No resource wars—trade, insurgencies and technology.

Deudney, 91 (Daniel, Hewlett Fellow in Science Technology and Society at the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies at Princeton University, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, April)

Many analysts have begun calling ecological degradation a national secuiity problem because they think environmental stress will cause or exacerbate wars. If states become much more concerned with repources and ecological decay, particularly if they think such decay is a threat to their security, they may well fight resource and pollution wars. For example, Arthur Westing has observed: "Global deficiencies and degradation of natural resources. both renewable and non-renewable, coupled with the uneven distribution of these raw mateiials, can lead to unlikely-and thus unstable-alliances, to national rivalries, and, of course, to war."3 Few ideas seem more intuitively sound. and many ideas about resource war are derived from the cataclysmic world wars of the first half of the twentieth century. Influenced by geopolitical theories that emphasized the importance of land resources for Great Power status, Hitler in significant measure fashioned Nazi war aims to achieve resource autonomy.' Lachng indigenous fuel and ninerals, and faced with a tightening embargo by the Western colonial powers in Asia, the Japanese invaded Southeast Asia for oil, tin, rubber.' Although the United States had a richer resource base than the Axis ers, fears of shortages and industrial strangulation played a central role in U.S. strategic thinking. During the Cold War. the presence of natural resources in the Third World helped stimulate East-West conflict in this vast area.' But scenarios of resource war may be diminishing in plausibility. The robust character of the world trade system means that resource dependency is no longer a major threat to a nation's military security and political autonomy. During the 1930s the world trading system had collapsed, driving states to pursue autarkic economies. In contrast, contemporary states routinely meet their resource needs without controlling the territory containing the resources. Moreover, it is becoming more difficult for states to exploit foreign resources through territorial conquest. It is very costly for any invader, even one equipped with advanced technology. to subdue a resisting population-as France discovered in Indochina and Algeria, the United States in Vietnam, and the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait fits the older pattern but wasbased upon a truly exceptional imbalance between power (Iraq had the fourth-largest military force in the world) and wealth (Kuwait had the third-largest oil reserves and a tiny military). In addition, the world is entering what H.E. Goeller and Alvin M. Weinberg have called the "age of substitutability," in which industrial technology makes it possibleto fashion virtually everything needed from substances such as iron, aluminum, silicon, and hydrocarbons which are ubiquitous and plentiful. Evidence for this trend is that prices for virtually every raw material have been stagnant or falling for the last several decades despite the continued growth in world output, and despite espectations many voiced during the 1970s that resource scarcity would drive up commodity piices to the benefit of Third World raw mateiial suppliers.

#### Great powers won’t engage in resource wars—empirically denied and tech solves.

Meierding 07 – PhD Student @ U Chicago, Emily, “Strategic Substitution and the Declining Likelihood of International Resource Wars”, Prepared for the International Studies Association Conference; Chicago, IL; March, http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/8/0/3/5/pages180355/p180355-1.php

If these intra-disciplinary critics collectively call into question the resource pessimists’ claim that resource scarcity frequently leads to violent conflict, a more fundamental critique has emerged from resource economists. Resource “cornucopians” argue that the very concept of scarcity is flawed. Julian Simon, the most prominent of these claimants, asserts that marketdemand for increasingly scarce goods inspires technological innovation, which resolves supply problemsthrough improvements in productive efficiency or through the creation of substitute inputs. When consumers demand a resource, more of it, or of a functional substitute, is supplied. Human knowledge, he claims, is “the ultimate resource.” 29 The cornucopian argument suggests that natural resource scarcity should not have a significant impact on the likelihood of conflict. Future resource-inspired violence will be rare. The cornucopians overstate their case; because of their lack of attention to the uneven distribution of global natural resources, they miss an important source of international conflict. Nonetheless, they offer an important corrective to the dismal predictions issued by resource pessimists. They also encourage us to be more attentive to the historical record. 30 The intensity of current resource alarmism arises in large part from authors’ tendency to presents contemporary resource pressures as historically unprecedented. However, even a casual examination of the historic record reveals that the current panic is only the latest in a long line of anticipated resource crises. 31 Among the most recent were the petroleum-related fears of the 1970s and predicted “mineral wars” in the 1980s. 32 The pessimists’ predictive record is poor. Their apocalyptic expectations have rarely come to pass. Malthus himself provides a prominent example of miscalculation; he predicted that Europe would experience an overpopulation-induced famine during the nineteenth century. 33 Instead, food production consistently kept pace with demand. No Great Power wars were fought over minerals. The 1970s oil crisis did not lead to blows between major oil-consuming states. And, while the two recent Gulf Wars suggest that oil has had a more mixed record than most natural resources, I argue that the amount of petroleum-inspired violence occurring in the international system is very low, relative to the extremity of states’ dependence on the commodity. 34 Modern, developed states do not fight over natural resources.

# Reform

## DA

### 2NC Impact Overview

#### Chinese economic downturn guarantees lash-out and war

Gunness US Navy and Newmeyer Strategist Center for National Policy ‘9 (Kristen and Jacqueline, “Economic Crisis: Impact on Chinese Military Modernization,” http://cnponline.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/12503, Mike)

So I think either way, either because of the insecurity that is stoked by what’s happening inside China and perceptions about economic slowdown, and/or because of demonization issues and popular discourse, I think that there’s a real chance that the Chinese leadership could feel compelled, for reasons of state security, to take actions that appear more belligerent abroad. And that could have effects leading up to possibly even military conflict or the use of military force against outside actors in addition to whatever force is used inside China to maintain stability. So I think that would be a real, kind of operational test for the PLA, a modernized force now. So, in conclusion, what struck me in thinking about and preparing for this presentation was there was less divergence between the sort of steady state and the more dramatic impact of the economic downturn scenarios than I expected. Either way, I think there is a chance, or a likelihood, of increased friction between China and other external countries, particular countries, that would affected in the case of increased arm transfers, actors in the Middle East would be affected, possibly also the U.S., and in the case of more serious concern about internal unrest in China, I think China’s relations with the West, and with India, or with Japan would be implicated there. So I think contrary to our hopes which would be that the downturn would have the effect of causing China to turn inwards and reduce the chances for any kind of external problem, I think, in fact, there’s reason to think, and to worry, that the downturn would lead to a greater chance of conflict abroad for China.

#### Nuclear war – defense doesn’t apply

Kulacki Senior Analyst for the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists 9-21-12 (Gregory, “The Risk of Nuclear War with China,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gregory-kulacki/the-risk-of-nuclear-war-w\_b\_1903336.html¸MIke)

Last week two separate studies warned that China and the United States are pursuing military strategies and implementing defense policies that could lead to a nuclear war. John Lewis and Xue Litai of Stanford University concluded a detailed exposition of China's nuclear war plans with a very sober warning. "Both sides, clinging to incongruous assessments, run the risk of provoking unanticipated escalation to nuclear war by seeking a quick victory or tactical advantages in a conventional conflict. This dilemma is not only real, but perilous." Thomas Christensen of Princeton expressed concern about the same problem; the possibility that a conventional military conflict between the United States and China could end in a nuclear exchange. "For example, if strikes by the United States on China's conventional coercive capabilities or their critical command and control nodes and supporting infrastructure were to appear in Beijing as a conventional attack on its nuclear retaliatory capability or as a precursor to a nuclear first strike, even a China that generally adheres to a No-First-Use posture might escalate to the nuclear level." Neither study suggests that the military or political leadership of China or the United States intends to resort to nuclear weapons in the event of a military conflict. China's commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons "at any time under any circumstances" is drilled into the officers and soldiers of China's strategic missile forces. A classified text used to train those forces, The Science of Second Artillery Operations, unambiguously instructs, "In accord with our national principle not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, the Second Artillery's strategic nuclear forces can carry out a retaliatory nuclear attack against the enemy, following the command of the 'high leadership,' only after the enemy has first attacked us with nuclear weapons." Although the United States is unwilling to make a similar commitment, U.S. superiority in conventional weapons and overall military capabilities makes it unlikely the United States would consider using nuclear weapons for any purpose other than preventing a Chinese nuclear attack on the United States. The most recent U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, in an effort to deemphasize the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy, declared that the "fundamental role of U.S. nuclear weapons...is to deter a nuclear attack on the United States, our allies and partners." The risk of a nuclear war with China lies in the potential for misunderstanding or miscommunication during a conventional conflict. China's current strategy for employing its conventional and nuclear missile forces during a future conflict with the United States is self-consciously designed to create uncertainty, with the expectation that uncertainty will restrain U.S. military action. Unfortunately, China's strategy could also precipitate a large-scale U.S. attack on China's missile forces. There are several Chinese military policies that might confuse U.S. decision-makers in a time of war. Some Chinese conventional missiles are located on the same missile bases as Chinese nuclear missiles. Some Chinese missiles, particularly the DF-21, can be armed with either a conventional or a nuclear warhead. Chinese conventional war plans call for long-range "strategic" conventional missile strikes at key enemy targets, including U.S. military bases on allied soil and the continental United States. If this were not confusing enough already, The Science of Second Artillery Operations contains a section on "lowering the nuclear threshold" that details procedures for alerting China's nuclear forces in a crisis for the express purpose of forcing a halt to an enemy's conventional attacks on a select group of targets, such as Chinese nuclear power plants, large dams and civilian population centers. Although the Science of Second Artillery Operations unambiguously states that if alerting China's nuclear missile forces fails to halt conventional enemy attacks China will hold firm to its "no first use" commitment, U.S. decision-makers might not believe it. Indeed, U.S. interlocutors have repeatedly told their Chinese counterparts that they do not find China's "no first use" pledge credible. The combination of these factors makes a nuclear exchange between the United States and China not only plausible, but also probable if the two countries were to become embroiled in a military conflict. As Lewis and Xue explain, "If, in a time of high tension, the Chinese command authorized a conventional missile attack as an act of preemptive self-defense, the enemy and its allies could not know if the incoming missiles were conventional or nuclear. In a worst-case scenario, a Chinese first-strike conventional attack could spark retaliation that destroys Chinese nuclear assets, creating a situation in which escalation to full-scale nuclear war would not just be possible, but even likely." The Obama administration is "rebalancing" U.S. military forces in response to perceived relative increases in Chinese military capabilities. China sees this so-called "pivot" to Asia, especially when pared with new U.S. military strategies such as "Air-Sea Battle," as a policy of containment. Both sides downplay the risks of conflict, but they also see each other as potential adversaries, and are hedging their diplomatic bets with expensive investments in new military hardware, including new technologies that will expand the conflict into cyberspace and outer space. Territorial disputes between China and U.S. allies, rising nationalist sentiment in the region, and the potential for domestic political instability within China could produce any number of casussen belli that could trigger the conventional conflict that carries the risk of ending in a nuclear war. It is disturbing, therefore, that both the United States and China have failed to find a productive way to discuss the risks of nuclear war, much less begin to take steps to mitigate those risks. The Chinese government appears trapped in a psychology of political and military insecurity that fosters a strategic dependency on secrecy and deception as its "trump card" in a potential conflict with the United States. The U.S. government, as Jeffrey Lewis points out in a recent essay in Foreign Policy, is held captive by "the illusion of the winning move" that "holds out the prospect of fighting and winning a nuclear war against China." U.S. unwillingness to admit it is vulnerable to a Chinese nuclear attack is driving a slow motion arms race, reminiscent of the Cold War, where each new U.S. effort to find the winning move is checked by the latest Chinese advance in military technology. On the edges of the official competition, misanthropes in both nations spread sensational and frightening disinformation that poisons public discussion, making steps towards dialog and cooperation more difficult for political leaders to take. In the face of growing strategic distrust, neither government seems willing to accept the risks for peace that are necessary to minimize the risks of war, which, while still small, continue to grow.

#### Social instability coming now – pollution and urbanization prove

WSJ 2-8-13 (“China’s Urbanization Risk: Magnified Unrest,” http://blogs.wsj.com/chinarealtime/2013/02/08/chinas-urbanization-risk-magnified-unrest/, Mike)

China’s new leaders seem to be placing their hopes for economic growth on urbanization. They see an upsurge in demand for a whole range of services – from housing to schooling and health care as the rural population is increasingly pulled into the urban economy. But high urbanization has its costs, argues a new report from Beijing Anbound Information, a private think tank that advises a number of local governments around China. Chief among those costs, the report says, is the magnification of social problems – and in a country with a considerable amount of social friction, that certainly is something to consider. Anbound contends that once urbanization reaches 50%, the potential for social unrest rises considerably. China has already crossed that line, having reached 51.27% at the end of 2011, according to data from the National Bureau of Statistics. “An urbanization rate of 50% is correlated with rising social risks in urban areas,” Anbound said. “It is a significant level.” The study points to some interesting cases in other countries that illustrate how urbanization – along with a wide range of other social and political issues – led to more serious social unrest and, in some cases, much deeper instability. Mexico, for example, saw a population shift in the 1960’s, with urbanization crossing 50% in that decade. In 1968, just days ahead of the Summer Olympics in Mexico City, social and political pressures exploded with the killing of dozens students and other protesters unhappy with government policies. Anbound’s researchers also drew lessons from 1979 Iran — where angry crowds overthrew the pro-Western shah and fundamentally altered the development path of that country. At that time Iran’s urbanization rate was also around the 50% level, according to Beijing Anbound, which advises a number of local governments around China. In 2010, China was rocked by 180,000 protests, riots and other “mass incidents” — a term coined by the Chinese government to refer to protests and demonstrations. Those mass incidents were more than four times the tally from a decade earlier, according to Sun Liping, a professor at Tsinghua University. Land is always a ready source of conflict and urbanization aggravates existing tensions linked to development projects. More than one-fifth of the mass incidents in 2012 were related to land disputes, according to the government-backed Legal Daily. The newspaper also says that the conflicts have been shifting towards the cities. While it gives no comparative figures, it says 51.1% of mass incidents involved urban residents in 2012. As rural residents flock to the cities in search of higher paying jobs, residents of the cities and migrants will have to share the same resources, including social welfare benefits. That has the potential to create conflicts, Anbound said. It pointed to clashes with police in Zengcheng in Guangdong province in 2011 following a dispute between local authorities and street vendors who had moved to the town from rural Sichuan. Wang Lianmei, a villager from Sichuan, was injured during a struggle with local government officials, who accused her and her husband of blocking traffic, the Zengcheng government said in a statement posted on its website. Hundreds of people later clashed with local officials and police, the statement added. A total of 19 suspects, most of them out-of-towners, were arrested for “obstructing justice, looking for trouble and sabotaging property,” the local government said a separate statement. Densely populated cities also lead to traffic congestion and greater pollution, and if the issues are not addressed, they too could plant the seeds of social instability, Anbound added. In January, Beijing was blanketed by toxic smog that air that captured headlines around the world. Netizens, fed up with the pollution, screamed for solutions and even the official media called for action from the government. “These potential risks could eventually turn into political issues,” the think tank said. China has already signaled it aims to address some of these sources of tension. On Tuesday the State Council, or the cabinet, unveiled sweeping policy guidelines to close the growing gap between rich and poor, vowing to provide for the needy, strengthen its social safety net and force powerful state companies to turn over more of their profits to the government to pay for these ambitious welfare programs (in Chinese).

#### Pollution is sufficient to cause collapse – nuclear war ensues

Yee Professor of Politics and IR at Hong Kong Baptist University and Storey Professor of Defense Studies at Deakin ‘2 (Herbert and Ian, *The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality*, pg. 5, Mike)

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability. Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialization and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government’s ability to govern effectively. Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees seeking asylum in neighboring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China’s neighbours. A fragmented China could also result in another nightmare scenario—nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords. From this perspective, a disintegrating China would also pose a threat to its neighbors and the world.

#### Renewables are key to preserving the CCP – it’s a matter of survival

Hart PhD. In Political Science @ UC San Diego 12-6-12 (Melanie, “Why China is so Wary of Ambitious International Climate Targets,” http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/12/06/1296241/why-china-is-so-wary-of-ambitious-international-climate-targets/?mobile=nc, Mike)

Central leaders in Beijing are devoting a huge amount of political will toward increasing energy efficiency and replacing fossil fuels with renewables. They view this as a survival issue, and not just because of the negative environmental effects of pollution. The Chinese Communist Party cannot maintain enough citizen support to stay in power unless they keep the economy growing. That will require continued access to energy supplies at stable rates, and because Chinese demand is growing so rapidly, the global market simply will not be able to provide enough coal to meet those needs without sending prices skyrocketing. Environmental pollution is also increasingly becoming a deal-breaker for the Chinese citizens. They are turning out in droves to protest the construction of new coal plants, and Beijing is taking notice.

#### Pollution-induced CCP collapse causes a unique ripple effect – countries rally around the flag and enter nuclear conflict

Nankivel Senior Researcher at the Office of the Special Advisory Policy for the Canadian Department of National Defense ‘9 (Nathan, “China’s Pollution and the Threat to Domestic and Regional stability, March 21, http://japanfocus.org/-Nathan-Nankivell/1799, Mike)

For the CCP and neighboring states, social unrest must be viewed as a primary security concern for three reasons: it is creating greater political mobilization, it threatens to forge linkages with democracy movements, and demonstrations are proving more difficult to contain. These three factors have the potential to challenge the CCP’s total political control, thus potentially destabilizing a state with a huge military arsenal and a history of violent, internal conflict that cannot be downplayed or ignored. Protests are uniting a variety of actors throughout local communities. Pollution issues are indiscriminate. The effects, though not equally felt by each person within a community, impact rich and poor, farmers and businessmen, families and individuals alike. As local communities respond to pollution issues through united opposition, it is leaving Beijing with no easy target upon which to blame unrest, and no simple option for how to quell whole communities with a common grievance. Moreover, protests serve as a venue for the politically disaffected who are unhappy with the current state of governance, and may be open to considering alternative forms of political rule. Environmental experts like Elizabeth Economy note that protests afford an opportunity for the environmental movement to forge linkages with democracy advocates. She notes in her book, The River Runs Black, that several environmentalists argue that change is only possible through greater democratization and notes that the environmental and democracy movements united in Eastern Europe prior to the end of the Cold War. It is conceivable that in this way, environmentally-motivated protests might help to spread democracy and undermine CCP rule. A further key challenge is trying to contain protests once they begin. The steady introduction of new media like cell phones, email, and text messaging are preventing China’s authorities from silencing and hiding unrest. Moreover, the ability to send and receive information ensures that domestic and international observers will be made aware of unrest, making it far more difficult for local authorities to employ state-sanctioned force. The security ramifications of greater social unrest cannot be overlooked. Linkages between environmental and democracy advocates potentially challenge the Party’s monolithic control of power. In the past, similar challenges by Falun Gong and the Tiananmen protestors have been met by force and detainment. In an extreme situation, such as national water shortages, social unrest could generate widespread, coordinated action and political mobilization that would serve as a midwife to anti-CCP political challenges, create divisions within the Party over how to deal with the environment, or lead to a massive show of force. Any of these outcomes would mark an erosion or alteration to the CCP’s current power dynamic. And while many would treat political change in China, especially the implosion of the Party, as a welcome development, it must be noted that any slippage of the Party’s dominance would most likely be accompanied by a period of transitional violence. Though most violence would be directed toward dissident Chinese, a ripple effect would be felt in neighboring states through immigration, impediments to trade, and an increased military presence along the Chinese border. All of these situations would alter security assumptions in the region. Other Security Concerns While unrest presents the most obvious example of a security threat related to pollution, several other key concerns are worth noting. The cost of environmental destruction could, for example, begin to reverse the blistering rate of economic growth in China that is the foundation of CCP legitimacy. Estimates maintain that 7 percent annual growth is required to preserve social stability. Yet the costs of pollution are already taxing the economy between 8 and 12 percent of GDP per year [1]. As environmental problems mount, this percentage will increase, in turn reducing annual growth. As a result, the CCP could be seriously challenged to legitimize its continued control if economic growth stagnates. Nationalists in surrounding states could use pollution as a rallying point to muster support for anti-Chinese causes. For example, attacks on China’s environmental management for its impact on surrounding states like Japan, could be used to argue against further investment in the country or be highlighted during territorial disputes in the East China Sea to agitate anti-Chinese sentiment. While nationalism does not imply conflict, it could reduce patterns of cooperation in the region and hopes for balanced and effective multilateral institutions and dialogues. Finally, China’s seemingly insatiable appetite for timber and other resources, such as fish, are fuelling illegal exports from nations like Myanmar and Indonesia. As these states continue to deplete key resources, they too will face problems in the years to come and hence the impact on third nations must be considered. Territorial Expansion or Newfound Alliances In addition to the concerns already mentioned, pollution, if linked to a specific issue like water shortage, could have important geopolitical ramifications. China’s northern plains, home to hundreds of millions, face acute water shortages. Growing demand, a decade of drought, inefficient delivery methods, and increasing water pollution have reduced per capita water holdings to critical levels. Although Beijing hopes to relieve some of the pressures via the North-South Water Diversion project, it requires tens of billions of dollars and its completion is, at best, still several years away and, at worst, impossible. Yet just to the north lies one of the most under-populated areas in Asia, the Russian Far East. While there is little agreement among scholars about whether resource shortages lead to greater cooperation or conflict, either scenario encompasses security considerations. Russian politicians already allege possible Chinese territorial designs on the region. They note Russia’s falling population in the Far East, currently estimated at some 6 to 7 million, and argue that the growing Chinese population along the border, more than 80 million, may soon take over. While these concerns smack of inflated nationalism and scare tactics, there could be some truth to them. The method by which China might annex the territory can only be speculated upon, but would surely result in full-scale war between two powerful, nuclear-equipped nations.

#### Russia-China war causes extinction

Alexander Sharavin (Director of the Political and Military Analysis Institute) October 1 2001, What The Papers Say (Russia), Nezavisimoe Voennoe Obozrenie, No. 28, “The Third Threat,” Translated by Andrei Ryabochkin

Now, a few words about the third type of war. A real military threat to Russia from China has not merely been ignored; it has been denied by Russia’s leaders and nearly all of the political forces. Let’s see some statistic figures at first. The territory of Siberia and the Russian Far East comprises 12,765,900 square kilometers (75% of Russia’s entire area), with a population of 40,553,900 people (28% of Russia’s population). The territory of China is 9,597,000 square kilometers and its population is 1.265 billion (which is 29 times greater than the population of Siberia and the Russian Far East). China’s economy is among the fastest-growing economies in the world. It remains socialistic in many aspects, i.e. extensive and highly expensive, demanding more and more natural resources. China’s natural resources are rather limited, whereas the depths of Siberia and the Russian Far East are almost inexhaustible. Chinese propaganda has constantly been showing us skyscrapers in free trade zones in southeastern China. It should not be forgotten, however, that some 250 to 300 million people live there, i.e. at most a quarter of China’s population. A billion Chinese people are still living in misery. For them, even the living standards of a backwater Russian town remain inaccessibly high. They have absolutely nothing to lose. There is every prerequisite for “the final throw to the north.” The strength of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (CPLA) has been growing quicker than the Chinese economy. A decade ago the CPLA was equipped with inferior copies of Russian arms from late 1950s to the early 1960s. However, through its own efforts Russia has nearly managed to liquidate its most significant technological advantage. Thanks to our zeal, from antique MiG-21 fighters of the earliest modifications and S-75 air defense missile systems the Chinese antiaircraft defense forces have adopted Su-27 fighters and S-300 air defense missile systems. China’s air defense forces have received Tor systems instead of anti-aircraft guns which could have been used during World War II. The shock air force of our “eastern brethren” will in the near future replace antique Tu-16 and Il-28 airplanes with Su-30 fighters, which are not yet available to the Russian Armed Forces! Russia may face the “wonderful” prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia’s entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such “trifles” like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia’s armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the “Chechen” and the “Balkan” variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter. An aforementioned prospect is, undoubtedly, rather disagreeable and we would not like to believe it can be true. However, it is a realistic prospect - just like a war against NATO or Islamic extremists.

### UQ

#### China’s leading the global race for wind now---long term strategy

Bozzato 6/4 Fabrizio Bozzato is a Researcher Assistant at the Centre for International and Regional Affairs of the University of Fiji. He is a PhD candidate at the Graduate Institute of International Affairs and Strategic Studies – Tamkang University, Taiwan. “The Wind Dragon: a Chinese tale of wind power,” 2012, http://chinaforesight.net/2012/06/04/the-wind-dragon-a-chinese-tale-of-wind-power/

Because of the hectic pace of China’s economic and social development, Chinese energy demand will continue to grow rapidly in next 40 years. Beijing appears determined to pursue a low-carbon development strategy, and wind energy is going to be one of the main resources for achieving China’s low carbon goals. According to figures released in March 2012 by the China Wind Energy Association, last year China consolidated its position as the global wind power leader in both newly and cumulative installed capacities, deploying an impressive 17.6 gigawatts of wind turbines. Notably, by the end of 2011, the added production capability took the national cumulative installed wind power electrical generation to 62.4 gigawatts, up 39.4 percent from the previous year. In December 2011, Longyuan Power, China’s largest wind power developer, connected 99.3 megawatts of wind turbines to the grid in a pilot intertidal wind farm in the Eastern province of Jiangsu. Meanwhile, deep inland, the desert province of Gansu is becoming the frontline of the country’s efforts toward a greener energy mix by massively investing in renewable energy, which includes the erection of wind turbines at the rate of more than one per hour. As impressive as these figures and developments are, so far wind power generation accounts only for 1.5 percent of national power generation. However, China has a grand vision for wind energy. Such a long-term “big plan” is outlined into China’s Wind Power Development Roadmap 2050, a key-document recently issued by the Energy Research Institute of National Development and Reform Commission. The Roadmap foresees Chinese wind power capacity reaching 200 GW by 2020, 400 GW by 2030 and 1 000 GW by 2050, making up 17 percent of the country’s electricity consumption.

### Ext – Link – Clean Tech Leadership Zero Sum

#### China’s ahead in clean tech development now and it’s zero sum---key to their economic growth

Bennhold 10 Katrin is a writer for the New York Times. “Race Is on to Develop Green, Clean Technology,” Jan 29, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/30/business/global/30davos.html?dbk&\_r=0

DAVOS, SWITZERLAND — It is shaping up to be the Great Game of the 21st century. To top officials and business executives here at the World Economic Forum, Topic A this year was the race to develop greener, cleaner technology, which is emerging as one of the critical factors in reshaping the world economy as emerging powers snap at the heels of battered Western economies. With the United States and China sizing each other up across the Pacific and Europe seeking to maintain its economic stature, it is a battle for potentially millions of jobs and trillions of dollars in export revenues. The outcome — which pits a venture capital-driven market approach relying on government subsides against a top-down system of state capitalism — has the potential to influence how economic and political systems evolve. Concern that China may be edging ahead in potentially lucrative growth sectors like renewable energy was palpable here, where senior officials from the United States and Europe warned that the West could not afford to be complacent. “Six months ago my biggest worry was that an emissions deal would make American business less competitive compared to China,” said Senator Lindsay Graham, a Republican from South Carolina who has been deeply involved in climate change issues in Congress. “Now my concern is that every day that we delay trying to find a price for carbon is a day that China uses to dominate the green economy.” He added: “China has made a long-term strategic decision and they are going gang-busters.” Christine Lagarde, the French finance minister, agreed. “It’s a race and whoever wins that race will dominate economic development,” she said. “The emerging markets are well-placed.”

## Poverty

### Energy Poverty

#### Mexican energy poverty is low and decreasing – 95% of population accesses energy

**IEF 09** – world's largest gathering of energy “ministers”; includes IEA and OPEC countries, and key international actors such as Brazil, China, India, Mexico, Russia, and South Africa; IEF countries account for more than 90 percent of global oil and gas supply and demand (International Energy Forum, “Reducing Energy Poverty through Cooperation and Partnership”, IEF Symposium on Energy Poverty, December 2009, <http://www.ief.org/_resources/files/content/events/ief-symposium-on-energy-poverty/background-paper.pdf)//AY>

Despite the alarming figures for energy poverty worldwide, significant efforts are underway to reduce the number of people suffering from a lack of access to modern energy services. Although a decidedly international problem, energy poverty can be improved through domestic energy policy reform. For example, Mexico identified energy poverty as an obstacle to its development in the 1990s and made access to electricity a budget priority. Through the 1990s, Mexico put over $2 billion toward electrification, drawing heavily on international capital and donor markets. As part of a larger initiative to reform and redraw its energy sector, from oil to power lines, Mexico managed to eradicate much of its energy poverty. As of 2006, over 95% of Mexico’s population was enjoying regular access to electricity.13 The Mexican example demonstrates that access can be achieved through comprehensive reform and dedicated funding.

# 1nr

## Politics

### Econ

#### Prolonged, politicized discussion crush the economy – credit rating, biz con, consumer spending

Madigan 13

[Kathleen, Special Writer-Economics for Dow Jones Newswires, “Reminder That Debt Ceiling Debate Still Looms,” Wall Street Journal, 6/11, <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2013/06/11/reminder-that-debt-ceiling-debate-still-looms/>]

Investors are focused on how monetary policy will play out this summer. But on Monday rating agency Standard & Poor’s sent a reminder that fiscal policy could also shift the economic outlook this summer. Within its announcement that it was lifting its U.S. long-term debt-rating outlook to stable from negative, S&P gave high marks to the Federal Reserve, the private economy and the U.S. dollar. The rating agency then returned to a theme mentioned back in August 2011 when it shocked markets by cutting the rating of U.S. sovereign debt to AA+ (a rating affirmed in Monday’s release): increased partisanship in Washington has made it more difficult to resolve budget disagreements. The next big fiscal debate will come this summer when Congress must raise the government’s debt ceiling. Because Washington leaders avoided pushing the economy off the fiscal cliff early this year, the rating agency is hopeful the White House and Republican congressional leaders will find a way to play nice. “Although we expect some political posturing to coincide with raising the government’s debt ceiling, which now appears likely to occur near the Sept. 30 fiscal year-end, we assume with our outlook revision that the debate will not result in a sudden unplanned contraction in current spending–which could be disruptive — let alone [a pause in] debt service,” the S&P release said. Yet with recent episodes — such as the IRS scandal and the phone surveillance program — distracting the White House and emboldening GOP members of Congress, expectations of an easy agreement may be overly optimistic. Remember that the 2011 debt debacle rippled through the economy. Consumer sentiment plunged, and business uncertainty rose. With the recovery now finally firming up, a new source of volatility is not needed. Even if the ceiling is lifted, S&P is very clear that more fiscal progress needs to be done. “We see some risks that the recent improved fiscal performance, due in part to cyclical and to one-off factors, could lead to complacency,” the report said. “A deliberate relaxation of fiscal policy without countervailing measures to address the nation’s longer-term fiscal challenges could place renewed downward pressure on the rating.” In other words, fiscal squabbling and budget inaction could still mar the economic outlook — and the U.S. credit rating.

#### Causes dollar collapse – confidence is key

Masters, 13

Jonathan Masters, Deputy Editor, Renewing America, Council Foreign Relations, 1-2-13, <http://www.cfr.org/international-finance/us-debt-ceiling-costs-consequences/p24751>

What are the implications for the dollar? Historically, the U.S. Treasury market has been driven by huge investments from surplus countries like Japan and China, which view the United States as the safest place to store their savings. A 2011 Congressional Research Service report suggests that a loss of confidence in the debt market could prompt foreign creditors to unload large portions of their holdings, thus inducing others to do so, and causing a run on the dollar in international markets. However, others claim that a sudden sell-off would run counter to foreign economic interests, as far as those interests run parallel to a robust U.S. economy. While many U.S. exporters would benefit from dollar depreciation because it would increase foreign demand for their goods (effectively making them cheaper), the same firms would also bear higher borrowing costs from rising interest rates. A potential long-term concern of some U.S. officials is that persistent volatility of the dollar will add force to recent calls by the international community for an end to its status as the world's reserve currency. A 2010 survey performed by the McKinsey Global Institute found fewer than 20 percent of business executives surveyed expected the dollar to be the dominant global reserve currency by 2025.

### UQ

### 2NC Will Pass

#### And- their 2AC ev is PC key warrants- most conclusive evidence says a deal will ultimately be reached

Alyssa Hertig, written for the Wisconsin Reporter, Define: Liberty and History News Network 9-15-2013 http://www.policymic.com/articles/63647/debt-ceiling-2013-we-will-raise-the-debt-ceiling-even-though-55-of-americans-don-t-want-to

It's debt-ceiling season again! In 2011 Congress raised the debt ceiling to $16.7 trillion, an increase of over $2 trillion. Based on projections from the U.S. Treasury, the federal government will hit the limit again in mid-October, much sooner than anticipated.¶ According to Jack Lew, secretary of the Treasury, Obama is unwilling to negotiate over a raise.¶ However, raising the debt ceiling is unpopular. Seventy percent of Americans oppose another raise in the debt ceiling, according to public opinion polls released by Reason-Rupe on Thursday. Even if this move would result in a default, 55% would still support not raising the debt ceiling. Furthermore: "If equal spending cuts accompany an increase in the debt ceiling, 45% say they'd support raising it and 46% would oppose. Thirty-five percent favor raising the debt ceiling in exchange for cutting off funding to the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, with 56% opposed."¶ Before the last debt ceiling raise in 2011, Gallup released a similar poll. Forty-two percent wanted their member of Congress to vote against the raise, 22% wanted their member of Congress to vote for the raise, 35% percent were not sure. It seems raising the debt ceiling has become less popular than ever — but o n the other hand, Congress has never failed to raise its debt ceiling.¶ The debt ceiling was first imposed in 1917 amid cries for accountability before President Woodrow Wilson led the United States into World War I. Before the debt-ceiling raise in 2011, James K. Galbraith summarized in Salon:¶ "The debt ceiling was first enacted in 1917. Why? The date tells all: we were about to enter the Great War. To fund that effort, the Wilson government needed to issue Liberty Bonds. This was controversial, and the debt ceiling was cover, passed to reassure the rubes that Congress would be “responsible” even while the country went to war. It was, from the beginning, an exercise in bad faith and has remained so every single second to the present day."¶ It has been raised dozens of times since its inception and 14 times since the turn of the century. It is a meaningless formality.¶ Despite the unpopularity of another raise and demands for a stricter budget (as the Reason-Rupe survey also demonstrates), we will see faux sparks fly between Democrats and Republicans in October, but ultimately the ceiling will be raised.

#### Time is tight but they’ll reach a deal

Fox News, 9-11-2013, “House pulls spending bill amid backlash as government shutdown looms,” <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/09/11/house-leaders-pull-temporary-spending-bill-after-conservative-backlash/>

House Republican leaders pulled their plan Wednesday to temporarily fund the federal government after rank-and-file party members said it sidestepped “defunding” ObamaCare. The action further narrowed Congress’ time to strike a budget deal before an Oct. 1 government shutdown. House Speaker John Boehner and his team pulled the plan, which could have gotten a full chamber vote as early as Thursday, after a conservative backlash led by the Tea Party movement and Heritage Action for America. The plan essentially called for the House to vote on defunding ObamaCare and the temporary spending bill, then send the package to the Democrat-controlled Senate, which almost certainly would have jettisoned the defund part and allowed the chambers to negotiate on a “clean” funding bill. “The Ruling Elite is up to it again,” the Tea Party Patriots group said Wednesday. “They want you to think they have voted for defunding ObamaCare. But it’s another shell game.” Meanwhile, Congress must also work on several other pressing issues, especially agreeing to increase the debt ceiling, which the government could hit as soon as mid-October, according to a recent Treasury Department assessment. Boehner defended his defund-spending plan Tuesday, saying his chamber has already voted 40 times to “defund, repeal and change” ObamaCare, so the Senate must now take up the fight. Although Boehner pulled the bill because he didn’t have the votes, sources tell Fox News the speaker has no intention of changing the plan and might revisit it next week -- after members realize its strengths. Meanwhile members from both parties appear optimistic about avoiding a partial government shutdown, despite the looming deadline and the potential for another internal House struggle. “We've got some time left,” Kentucky Republican Rep. Hal Rogers, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, told Fox News. “It's not time to panic.” The postponement of a Capitol Hill vote on a military strike on Syria will indeed eliminate the related hearings and classified briefings that slowed work on other pending issues, including immigration reform, the Farm Bill and whether to limit the extent to which the National Security Agency can collect data on Americans in its efforts to thwart terrorism.

#### GOP will cave on the health care demands

Alexander Bolton, 9-12-2013, "Reid 'really frightened' over potential for government shutdown ," The Hill, <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/321923-reid-really-frightened-of-possible-government-shutdown-after-meeting-with-boehner>

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said he is scared of a possible government shutdown after meeting with Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) Thursday morning. “I’m really frightened,” he told reporters after a press conference to discuss the morning meeting he had with Boehner, Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.). “I think they’re looking like the House is having trouble controlling themselves,” he said. Earlier in the day, Reid declared that the lower chamber had been taken over by anarchists after an energy efficiency bill stalled on the Senate floor. “We’re diverted totally from what this bill is about. Why? Because the anarchists have taken over,” he said. “They’ve taken over the House and now they’ve taken over the Senate. Reid on Thursday delivered a blunt message to Boehner that he will not delay the 2010 Affordable Care Act in exchange for keeping the government open past the end of the month. Reid also made clear he will not grant Republicans any concessions in order to pass legislation to raise the debt limit. Reid told reporters that he will strip out any language defunding or delaying the new healthcare law included in House-passed legislation funding government beyond Sept. 30. “Go to something else, get away from ObamaCare. Send us something else,” he said. He plans to pass a “clean” stopgap spending measure to keep the government open through year’s end. Reid characterized Thursday morning’s bicameral leadership meeting as cordial and said he offered to help Boehner circumvent Tea Party-affiliated conservatives who are threatening a government shutdown. “I said to him, ‘What can I do to help?’,” Reid said. “It was not a yelling-at-each-other meeting. It was a very nice meeting we had. Hey listen, I like John Boehner.” Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking Senate Democratic leader, predicted House Republican leaders will fold before allowing the government to shut down. “I still think at the last minute they’ll have to blink,” Schumer said. “The fact that Boehner came up with his sort-of concoction shows that he knows that a government shutdown plays badly for him,” he added, referring to the stopgap spending measure House GOP leaders presented to their colleagues on Tuesday. “Should he go forward and let the Tea Party win on the government shutdown, then everyone will come down on him and say, ‘Why’d you allow them to do it?’.”

### A2: Healthcare Blocks

#### Separate vote avoids shutdown

Weisman 9/16

“Amid Revolt Over Fiscal ‘Gimmicks,’ Options Dwindle for G.O.P.” JONATHAN WEISMAN, September 16, 201, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/17/us/politics/amid-revolt-over-fiscal-gimmicks-options-dwindle-for-gop.html?src=recg

“It’s fair to say it looks a little gimmicky, but at least it would prevent a government shutdown,” said Representative Charlie Dent, a moderate Republican from Pennsylvania who backs the plan. “It’s important that Republicans stop pretending that Mitch McConnell is the Senate majority leader and Mitt Romney is the president,” he said, referring to Mr. McConnell of Kentucky, who as leader of Senate Republicans heads the minority party. Conservatives say they are tired of losing, and they are being egged on by activist organizations that are demanding a hard line. From his new perch heading the right-leaning Heritage Foundation, former Senator Jim DeMint has demanded an end to “pretend votes” and “gimmicks.” The conservative activist L. Brent Bozell III is rallying supporters around legislation that would strip all funds from the Affordable Care Act immediately, saying he’ll accept no less.

### Coal Lobby

#### Plan is unpopular – green energy

Ludwig 6/28 (Mike Ludwig, 6/28/13 “Why Big Coal and the Anti-Frackers Are Up in Arms Over Obamas Climate Plan”, truth-out.org)

President Obama laid out an ambitious national plan to tackle climate change last Tuesday that includes new regulations for power plants and support for the ongoing natural gas boom facilitated by fracking, the enhanced oil-and-gas drilling technique that has sparked nationwide controversy. Mainstream environmental groups are applauding the plan, but it's already the target of backlash from the coal industry's powerful allies and, on the opposite end of the spectrum, the anti-fracking movement, which has emerged as a powerful grassroots force within the world of environmental activism. Coal's War on Obama At the top of Obama's climate action agenda is a memorandum directing the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to place the first-ever caps on carbon emissions from both new and existing power plants, which are the nation's largest concentrated source of carbon dioxide pollution. America's power plants largely rely on coal, and the EPA reports that they are responsible for 40 percent of domestic carbon dioxide emissions and one-third of domestic greenhouse gas emissions overall. For years, environmental groups have pushed for a federal cap on carbon emissions from coal-burning power plants. As Obama acknowledged in his speech, some power companies are already investing in pollution control technology and cleaner fuels such as natural gas. The coal industry and its allies in Washington, however, are still expected to challenge the proposed caps in court and continue an aggressive media campaign to accuse Obama of waging a job-killing "war on coal." A similar effort by the EPA to cap emissions of toxic chemicals and metals from power plants - which contribute to child asthma, premature deaths and cancer - was stalled for nearly a decade by industry challenges and opposition from Republicans in Congress before being implemented in 2011. Legal challenges to the standards, which the EPA calls "long overdue," are still pending.Republicans are already repeating the "war on coal" rhetoric to attack Obama's plan to cut carbon emissions from power plants. "Declaring a war on coal is tantamount to declaring a war on jobs," said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell on the Senate floor on Tuesday. "It’s tantamount to kicking the ladder out from beneath the feet of many Americans struggling in today’s economy, and I will be raising this issue at the White House with the president later today."

### Politics Link – Spending

#### Spending unpopular – Grants prove

Rogers 6/18 (David Rogers, Rogers has covered congress for more than 30 years and is a regular writer for Politico, 6/18/13 “GOP spending bill targets community development grants”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/06/gop-spending-transportation-bill-cdbg-92998.html?hp=l4,//> JG

Forget Ronald Reagan and the Bushes. House Republicans are taking Community Development Block Grants back to the 70s and Gerald Ford. That’s the bottom line to a $44.1 billion transportation and housing bill rolled out Tuesday which would cut $1.3 billion from the popular CDBG program created with Ford’s help in 1974. Indeed, between sequestration and the GOP’s appetite for defense spending, President Barack Obama can’t even get what Ford, a Republican, got nearly 40 years ago. Obama requested $2.79 billion for CDBG in the coming 2014 fiscal year. Ford won an almost identical sum, $2.7 billion, in September 1975 according to old appropriations reports reviewed by POLITICO. The Republican-backed bill Tuesday provides $1.6 billion. Just one piece in a larger budget puzzle, CDGB’s fall is the most striking example yet of what’s become a genuinely historic rollback of domestic discretionary spending. The first across-the-board cuts ordered in March under sequestration brought appropriations down to $984 billion. A second round, this winter could take discretionary spending down to $967 billion. And in the midst of this, House Republicans are proposing to shift about $54 billion from domestic programs to defense-related spending. As the GOP pushes Obama more into a corner, the chances of a shutdown fight after Labor Day increase. Obama already faces deep cuts from appropriations for nutrition and renewable energy programs. Tuesday’s bill fits the same pattern. When adjustments are made for the president’s budget, the funding is almost $14 billion under the administration’s requests for the programs impacted. Increased funding from the Highway Trust fund will soften the blow in transportation. But Amtrak faces major cuts, and after all the furor over furloughs of air traffic controllers this past spring, the Federal Aviation Administration ends up at $11.8 billion, $103.3 million below its current post-sequestration funding.

### 2NC Link Turn Shield – AT: Investment Now

#### Irrelevant – Even if They win the plan is popular new funding creates redundancies in the budget – magnifies the momentum of the opposition

**Wolf 11** – Washington Correspondent for ABC News (Z. Byron, ABC News, “GAO: Duplication, Waste Costs Taxpayers Billions Each Year, Coburn Says Report Makes Congress Look Like ‘Jackasses’,” 3/1/11, http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2011/03/gao-duplication-waste-costs-taxpayers-billions-each-year-coburn-says-report-makes-congress-look-like/)//ACJS

With Congress currently embroiled in a contentious spending fight, a Congressional watchdog has found that a staggering level of duplication is plaguing the bloated federal budget – and chewing up billions of dollars in funding every year. In a new report obtained by ABC News, the Government Accountability Office determined that “reducing or eliminating duplication, overlap, or fragmentation could potentially save billions of taxpayer dollars annually and help agencies provide more efficient and effective services.” For instance, the GAO found, the Department of Defense could save up to $460 million every year by undertaking a “broader restructuring” of its military health care system. The cost of such programs with duplicative and overlapping purposes is eye-opening. The military came in for special scrutiny: over $10 billion on defense-wide business systems every year; $49 billion in military and veterans health services; and at least $76 billion since 2005 in urgent processing systems for the military. But the military is by no means alone. $58 billion at the Department of Transportation for over 100 separate surface transportation programs. And almost $1 trillion in government-wide tax expenditures listed by the Treasury Department, some of which the GAO found “may be ineffective at achieving their social or economic purposes.” “Considering the amount of program dollars involved in the issues we have identified, even limited adjustments could result in significant savings,” the GAO said. The GAO was forced to conduct the report on the behest of Sen. Tom Coburn, R-OK., who pushed a Senate vote in January 2010 to direct the GAO to assess duplication in the budget. The report, Coburn told reporters at the Capitol Monday evening, will “make us all look like jackasses.” According to the GAO, not only has Congress been busy spending money on duplicative efforts, but the government has neglected to investigate numerous programs, making the expenditure of some funds not only redundant but wasteful. For instance, only five of 47 job training and employment programs surveyed by the GAO had been studied to evaluate whether outcomes were the result of the program itself or another cause altogether. “Little is known about the effectiveness of most programs,” the watchdog observed. That point also applies to domestic food assistance, where “little is known about the effectiveness of [11 of the 18 programs] because they have not been well studied,” the GAO said. In fiscal year 2008, for example, the government spent $62.5 billion on those 18 programs. Ultimately, it all makes the $4 billion in cuts included in the latest two-week spending proposal seem paltry in comparison. Update at 3:40pm ET, March 1: Republicans in Congress are pouncing all over this report today as evidence that Democrats should not be fighting against spending cuts, but supporting them. “None of us would run our families this way. None of us would run our businesses this way,” said Sen. Tom Coburn, R-OK. “And there is tremendous potential for us to still take care of those that require a safety net by eliminating duplication and the dollars that we’re spending that we don’t get anything in return for.” The Senate’s top Republican Mitch McConnell went even further, denouncing the report as a sign of “virtual incompetence” in the federal government. Across the aisle, Senate Democrats were predictably more restrained in their comments. “I think there are duplicative programs we’ve got around here that we can eliminate,” said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who applauded Coburn for insisting on the GAO report. One interesting tidbit from the report: at a time when the national debt has soared over the $14 trillion mark, the government has 20 different agencies – housing 56 different programs – all working on the same thing… improving financial literacy.

### AT: PC Low – General

#### The plan is the straw that breaks the camel’s back- our ev assumes ALL recent failures

Lawrence 9/17/13

“Staying aloof to appearances could endanger both Democratic chances in 2014 and the president's legacy.” JILL LAWRENCE-National correspondent at National Journal. She was previously a columnist at Politics Daily, national political correspondent at USA Today and national political writer at the Associated Press., SEP 17 2013, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/09/obama-says-he-s-not-worried-about-style-but-he-should-be/279743/

Indeed, the year's setbacks are accumulating and that is dangerous for Obama.¶ "At some point people make a collective decision and they don't listen to the president anymore. That's what happened to both Jimmy Carter and George W. Bush," Cannon says. "I don't think Obama has quite gone off the diving board yet in the way that Carter or Bush did … but he's close to the edge. He needs to have some successes and perceptions of success."¶ That is going to be difficult, given the near total lack of bipartisanship on Capitol Hill. In fact, Cannon's description of Reagan's successes -- every time a bipartisan bill passed, his poll numbers went up -- is reason enough for Republicans to keep blocking Obama at every turn. Style points could be one way to stave off irrelevance. "Had we rolled out something that was very smooth and disciplined and linear" on Syria, Washington would have "graded it well, even if it was a disastrous policy," Obama told ABC. But the two don't have to be mutually exclusive. A smooth, disciplined and linear approach to budget negotiations and the debt limit would be a step back from the edge of the Carter-Bush cliff, even if a clear win proves elusive.

### 2NC CIR IL

#### Quick Debt ceiling resolution allows CIR passage – reverses status quo time crunch

Matthews 7/10

[Laura, economics correspondent for the International Business Times, “Looming Debt Ceiling, Budget Talks Could Help Kill 2013 Immigration Reform,” IBT, 2013, <http://www.ibtimes.com/looming-debt-ceiling-budget-talks-could-help-kill-2013-immigration-reform-1339789>]

House Republicans are meeting Wednesday to decide on a 2013 immigration reform strategy, but the prospects that an immigration bill will ever make it to President Barack Obama’s desk seems less and less likely. And that’s partly because of two other big issues looming: the debt ceiling and the budget. US Debt Ceiling Debate May Help Kill Immigration Reform Compared to the debt ceiling debacle of the summer of 2011, there is relative composure on Capitol Hill now, since the debt ceiling negotiations that caused a summer showdown two years ago have shifted to a likely fall brawl. Thanks to improvement in revenues and the “extraordinary measures” the Treasury has taken to manage its cash and borrowing, the U.S. will avoid hitting its debt ceiling until after Labor Day. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has projected a deficit reduction that will bring the shortfall down to about $642 billion this year, the least since 2008 and less than half, as a percentage of the economy, what it was in 2009. But the CBO also said those extraordinary measures will likely be exhausted around October or November. That said, chances are, if the House and Senate haven't gotten immigration bills into conference by the August recess, immigration reform will be pushed to the back burner, in favor of issues that the Republicans who control the House perceive as far more pressing. Republicans know acting on immigration reform is essential for the party’s long-term survival. But in the shorter term they are likely going to hit Democrats where it could hurt in the 2014 midterms -- the one-year delay of the Obamacare employer mandate. For US House, Immigration Reform Is A Low-Priority Item “Things will get ugly in September, in the fall, and I think it will have a negative impact on immigration reform legislation in the House,” said Steve Bell, senior director for the Economic Policy Project at the Bipartisan Policy Center. “I hate to say that, but I think it will.” The reason, said Bell, a former staff director of the Senate Budget Committee, is that immigration reform involves money. It took a “border surge” bill costing more than $30 billion, written by two Republican senators and establishing tighter controls, to attract 14 of their colleagues to the broader immigration legislation that passed the Senate 68-32 last month. Aside from a fight about money, Bell thinks there will also be a fight over the legalization process for undocumented immigrants that many conservatives label as “amnesty.” Bell is not the only one who thinks time isn’t on the side of immigration reform this year. That’s also the sentiment shared by Republican strategist Ron Bonjean of Singer Bonjean Strategies in Washington, who said the debt ceiling will consume a lot of time. For him, the Republicans’ immigration reform strategy is evolving. But there's no need to scramble on that issue yet. “It becomes harder after Labor Day because we’re dealing with the debt ceiling,” Bonjean said. “Because we’re facing an election year it’s just going to be very, very difficult for Congress to get something to the president’s desk by the end of this year, especially when they have a fiscal crisis on their hands.”

### CIR Turns – Energy

#### CIR key to solve worker shortage that thumps the aff

Vicki Smith, Associated Press, 3-21-2013 <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/money/56042758-79/report-energy-mining-says.html.csp>

The United States isn’t producing enough qualified workers to meet the future needs of the mining and energy sectors, from coal digging and gas drilling to solar and wind power, a new report says.¶ The report released Thursday by the National Research Council urges new partnerships to tackle the problem of retiring Baby Boomers who cannot readily be replaced. That includes a retooling of higher education to produce more young people competent in science, technology, engineering and math.¶ The report predicts a "bright present and future" for energy and mining jobs, with continuing demand for workers and good pay for those who are hired. But it says some industries already face labor shortages and others soon will because the nation’s colleges and universities aren’t cranking out graduates with the skills that growing companies need.¶ Federal Mine Safety and Health Administration data, for example, show 46 percent of the workforce will be eligible to retire within five years, but there are too few younger workers in the pipeline to replace them.¶ The oil and gas industry, meanwhile, has a workforce that’s currently concentrated at both the older and younger ends of the spectrum, the report says, "creating a gap in experience and maturity" in between and making it difficult to replace retiring leadership.¶ The report recommends several wide-ranging solutions, including outreach efforts to improve both the public’s understanding and perception of energy-producing industries such as oil and gas.¶ Negative perception driven by concern over pollution, environmental damage and health issues, it notes, "dissuades some from pursuing careers."¶ It also notes that universities are seeing a faculty shortage that could affect oil and gas, mining and geothermal employers.¶ "Unless this is corrected," the report says, "the nation risks losing its capacity to provide new science and engineering professionals for the workforce."¶ The independent, nonprofit National Research Council is the main operating agency of the National Academy of Sciences. The nearly 400-page document was authored by 14 experts from universities, government and the private sector.

#### Worker shortage short circuits future energy development

Sarah Battaglia in-house Copywriter and the Social Media Specialist for Energy Curtailment Specialists , Bachelors degree in Business Management and Marketing from the State University of New York at Buffalo 3-21-2013 <http://www.energyblogs.com/YourEnergyBlog/index.cfm/2013/3/21/Energy-Industry-Faced-with-a-Possible-Workforce-Shortage>

The energy industry may be booming, but the amount of skilled workers seems to be dwindling. The industry is looking at a possible shortage of employees within the next decade, a huge inconvenience with many major projects soon to be underway.¶ Daniel Lumma, senior vice president of Kiewit Oil, Gas, and Chemical North America, confirmed that the North American oil and gas industry is made up of roughly five million skilled trade workers, which is about one million fewer than it was during the mid 2000s. Lumma also described his concern that about half of these workers will likely retire within the next 10 years, leaving millions of gaps to fill.¶ With the current oil and gas boom happening in the United States, a great number of projects are in progress and many will be starting shortly. “If all those projects happen, the peak workforce would have to multiply five to six times about what it is right now. The fact is, that’s not going to happen,” stated Lumma. He continued, “We’re heading into a very, very significant demographic issue.”¶ There is a solution to every problem, and in this case, there may be a few options. Planning is crucial. Making sure each project has enough workers to be efficient will be beneficial if done in advance. Joining forces with local union halls could also act as a solution to the worker shortage. Unions can assist with recruiting and employee training for any major project. Lumma recommends employers set up extensive training in non-union areas, and consider expanding recruiting initiatives to veterans.¶ Large-scale projects will require the work of thousands of employees, and the Keystone XL pipeline is a great example. TransCanada states,¶ Construction of the 1,179-mile pipeline will require 9,000 skilled American workers. The project will provide jobs for welders, mechanics, electricians, pipefitters, laborers, safety coordinators, heavy equipment operators and other workers who rely on large construction projects for their livelihoods. In addition to construction jobs, an estimated 7,000 U.S. jobs are being supported in manufacturing the steel pipe and the thousands of fittings, valves, pumps and control devices required for a major oil pipeline.¶ Oil and gas projects are not the only ones that require skilled workers. The Obama administration recently approved three large renewable energy projects in the U.S. These projects include NextEra Energy’s 750-megawatt McCoy Solar Energy Project in southern California, EDF Renewable Energy’s 150-megawatt Desert Harvest Solar Farm also in California, and the 200-megawatt Searchlight Wind Energy Project in Nevada. Each of these developments will need to employ thousands of workers.¶ With so many large energy projects in the works for the U.S., companies will certainly be conducting extensive recruiting, hiring, and training for potential employees. The need for skilled workers continues to grow, and with these projects, companies can only hope they don’t run out of talent.

#### Even if they solve the aff collapse is more widespread that turns the advantages (EPECIALLY TRUE FOR NUCLEAR)

COC, 2009 [COMPETE – Council on Competitiveness, “Mobilizing a World-Class Energy Workforce,” Dec., <http://www.compete.org/images/uploads/File/PDF%20Files/CoC_-_Pillar_6_Handout_-_Mobilizing_a_World-Class_Energy_Workforce,_Dec09.pdf>]

America currently lacks an energy workforce of sufficient size and capabilities to meet the needs of a sustainable, secure energy system.1 With increasing demand come abundant job opportunities in both traditional and emerging energy industries. Unfortunately, U.S. workers are neither aware nor sufficiently prepared to take them. Moreover, with an aging population and the retirement of the baby boomers well under way, there is an inadequate pipeline of replacement workers, technicians and managers to succeed them The United States stands to lose half of its electric power industry workforce within the next five to ten years due to retirement. America's oil and gas workforce averages 50 years in age; half are likely to retire soon. Workers in these conventional energy sector jobs, from power plant operators to transmission line and pipeline workers, are retiring at a much faster rate than they are being replaced. The introduction of any new energy technologies will not compensate for this workforce shortage. For example, in the nuclear industry, the fact that there has been no new construction of a nuclear facility in the United States in over 30 years has led to the atrophy of skills, the loss of technicians, the dearth of American students in nuclear engineering and a national security risk for the primarily nuclear-powered U.S. Navy.2 The development, installation and maintenance of new technologies require skills at all levels of educational training. Many of these jobs, such as building new power plants, cannot be exported and will remain in the United States. So-called "green collar" jobs could fill this gap over time and provide for significant domestic employment growth, but capitalizing on this opportunity will require government being proactive in developing programs to provide the necessary skills. Government should provide a 21st century education to match the 21st century job opportunities, requirements and needs.¶ There is growing global competition for scientific and engineering talent today, and the U.S. pipeline of students is slowing. The private sector, where the overwhelming majority of careers will be, knows best the current opportunities that are not being met. Executives cite the lack of scientific, engineering and skilled talent as among the most serious challenges facing their businesses today.4 They know what skills will be required and can assist in developing the workforce of the future by working closely with educational institutions as well as within their own organizations.