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CIR will pass now – house republicans and popular support.

New York Daily News, 11-2 ‘Need to keep pushing’ Congress to pass immigration reform and President to ease deportations, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/pushing-immigration-reform-article-1.1504979#ixzz2jYnSYyeJ

One has to admire those committed immigration leaders who, far from being discouraged by Wobbhv ashington’s petty electoral calculations and — in many cases — underlying racism, stepped up their efforts to pressure Speaker John Boehner and House Republicans to break out of their zombie-like immobility on immigration reform. One has to admire them — and wish them luck — because as days went by without anything happening in Congress, all signs pointed to a sad reality: Despite the flurry of activity by immigration advocates, religious and business leaders to push Boehner to allow a vote in the House, an immigration reform law — in any shape or form — seemed to have as much chance of being passed this year as Republican candidate Joe Lhota has of being elected mayor of New York.

Yet, immigration reform, like the proverbial phoenix, may have risen from the ashes once again now that three House Republicans — Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (Florida), and Jeff Denham and David Valadao, both from California — have signed on to the House Democrats' comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Angela Fernández, the Northern Manhattan Coalition for Immigrant Rights executive director, a savvy and experienced community leader, believes that such a law could become a reality this year. “The focus is on keeping up the pressure to show that the majority of people in this country want an immigration reform that is humane and reflects the American values of justice and fairness,” Fernández said. “The civil disobedience action we held yesterday was part of similar activities in Florida, Arizona and across the country.”

US-Mexico energy cooperation’s controversial

CFR ‘12

standing committee of the United States Senate (12/21, “OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-112SPRT77567/html/CPRT-112SPRT77567.htm)

The TBA further contains requirements of data sharing and notification of likely reserves between the United States and Mexico, opening the opportunity for increased government-to- government collaboration on strategic energy policy choices. Mexico and the United States are relatively less advanced in effective communication and linkages of our energy systems than we are in less politically-controversial economic areas. Improved ties can improve understanding and galvanize cooperation in often unexpected ways. In the immediate term, closer oil sector communication will be beneficial in case of accidents in the Gulf of Mexico or in case of significant disruptions to global oil supplies.

Immigration reform key to increase high skilled workers:

Esther Yu-Hsi Lee, 10/16/2013 (staff writer, “Class Divide Widens Between Low-Wage And High-Wage Workers In Silicon Valley,” <http://thinkprogress.org/immigration/2013/10/16/2779601/wage-immigrants-silicon-valley/>, Accessed 10/17/2013, rwg)

Faced with a growing need for high-skilled foreign workers, Silicon Valley has taken a pointed interest in immigration reform in the past year, as is made clear by FWD.us, Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg’s advocacy group lobbying for comprehensive immigration reform. Zuckerberg has emphasized that high-skilled immigration reform is no different than low-skilled immigration reform. Yet as the tech industry pushes for a more diverse workforce, a worsening class divide is pushing the area’s low-wage immigrants out of their homes and marginalizing them in the immigration debate.¶ As NPR reports this week, less than 7 miles from the Facebook headquarters lies a 4.5 acre mobile home park that is valued at $30 million by Silicon Valley real estate developers. Soon, the 400 mobile home park residents, about 80 percent of whom are Latino, may be squeezed out of the increasingly ritzy area, which has some of the most expensive homes in the country. The median household income is $101,471. In comparison, a two-bedroom, two-bath trailer home costs about $79,000.¶ Children living in the mobile home park would also be forced out of the sixth best school district out of 1,000 California public schools. Latino students in Palo Alto have a 52 point gain on standardized test scores over other Latinos statewide.¶ Some Palo Alto parents want the mobile home park to stay. Nancy Krop, a civil rights attorney said to National Public Radio, “I want every child to have the opportunity that my son’s going to have… My son has gone on play dates to homes where he found out his friend didn’t have a bedroom… You learn what they don’t have; you learn the richness of what they do have too — the strength of their community and culture and heritage.”¶ Silicon Valley companies have mainly focused on immigration reform for highly educated foreign workers. Technology companies spent about $13.8 million in just three months to ensure that the Senate immigration bill would expand temporary visas and green cards for technology workers. The industry successfully influencing senators to nearly double its allotment of high-skilled, H-1B visas from 65,000 to 110,000 in the Senate immigration bill.

Skilled worker access will determine the future of the biotech industry

Dahms 3, executive director of the California State University System Biotechnology Program (CSUPERB); chair of the Workforce Committee, Biotechnology Industry Organization; and a member of the ASBMB Education and Professional Development Committee, (A. Stephen, “ Foreign Scientists Seen Essential to U.S. Biotechnology,” in Pan-Organizational Summit on the U.S. Science and Engineering Workforce: Meeting Summary, National Academy of Sciences, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/picrender.fcgi?book=nap10727&blobtype=pdf>)

The scarcity of skilled technicians is seen by the biotechnology industry in the U.S. and Canada as one of its most serious challenges. The success of this industry is dependent on the quality of its workforce, and the skills and talents of highly trained people are recognized as one of the most vital and dynamic sources of competitive advantage. The U.S. biotechnology industry workforce has been growing 14 to 17 percent annually over the last six years and is now over 190,000 and conservatively estimated to reach 500,000 by 2012. Despite efforts by the industry to encourage U.S. institutions to increase the production of needed specialists, a continual shortfall in the needed expertise requires access to foreign workers. Foreign workers with unique skills that are scarce in the U.S. can get permission to stay in the U.S. for up to six years under the H1B classification, after which they can apply for permanent resident status. There are currently over 600,000 foreign workers in this category across all industries, and they are critical to the success and global competitiveness of this nation. Of these H-1B visa holders, 46 percent are from India and 10 percent are from China, followed in descending order by Canada, Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, U.K., Pakistan, and the Russian Federation. Our annual national surveys have demonstrated that between 6 and 10 percent of the biotechnology workforce have H-1B visas. The constant shortfall in specialized technical workers that has been experienced by the biotechnology industry over the past six years has been partially alleviated by access to talented individuals from other nations. However, the industry’s need is sufficient to justify a 25 percent increase in H-1Bs in 2004. Biotechnology industry H-1B visa holders are mainly in highly sought after areas such as analytical chemistry, instrumentation specialization, organic synthesis, product safety and surveillance, clinical research/biostatistics, bio/pharm quality, medicinal chemistry, product scale-up, bioinformatics and applied genomics, computer science, cheminformatics, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics. Forty percent of H-1B foreign workers are at the Ph.D. level, 35 percent M.S., 20 percent B.S., and 5 percent M.D. In comparison, the U.S. biotechnology industry technical workforce is estimated to be 19 percent Ph.D., 17 percent M.S., 50 percent B.S., and 14 percent combined voc-ed/ community college trained. These and other survey data by industry human resource groups clearly show that the H-1B worker skills match the most pressing employment needs of the biotechnology industry. The data demonstrate that maintaining a reasonably-sized H-1B cap is critical to the industry. Although the national annual H-1B visa cap was raised from 115,000 to 195,000 in the 106th Congress via S. 2045, the cap has already been exceeded. The increased cap remains in effect until 2003 and efforts are under way to ensure that it remains high. The Third Annual National Survey of H-1Bs in the biotechnology industry found that 80 percent are from U.S. universities, and 85 percent of those eventually get green cards. Companies now spend, on average, $10,200 in processing fees and legal expenses to obtain each green card, an estimated cost to the industry of more than $150 million over the past 5 years. In the wake of the 9/11 World Trade Center attacks, debate has been focused on more restrictions on foreign students, a development that would have a severe impact upon the competitiveness of the U.S. biotechnology industry. Clearly, the H-1B route provides a temporary solution to shortages in the national and domestic biotechnology labor pools, shortages mirroring the inadequate production of appropriately trained U.S. nationals by U.S. institutions of higher learning. The reality is that universities have inadequate resources for expanding the training pipeline, particularly in the specialized areas of the research phase of company product development. Efforts should be directed toward influencing greater congressional and federal agency attention to these important topics.

Solves bioterror

Bailey, 1 [Ronald, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine and Reason.com, where he writes a weekly science and technology column. Bailey is the author of the book Liberation Biology: The Moral and Scientific Case for the Biotech Revolution (Prometheus, 2005), and his work was featured in The Best American Science and Nature Writing 2004. In 2006, Bailey was shortlisted by the editors of Nature Biotechnology as one of the personalities who have made the "most significant contributions" to biotechnology in the last 10 years. 11/7/1, “The Best Biodefense,” Reason, <http://reason.com/archives/2001/11/07/the-best-biodefense>]

But Cipro and other antibiotics are just a small part of the arsenal that could one day soon be deployed in defending America against biowarfare. Just consider what’s in the pipeline now that could be used to protect Americans against infectious diseases, including bioterrorism. A Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Research Association survey found 137 new medicines for infectious diseases in drug company research and development pipelines, including 19 antibiotics and 42 vaccines. With regard to anthrax, instead of having to rush a sample to a lab where it takes hours or even days to culture, biotech companies have created test strips using antibody technologies that can confirm the presence of anthrax in 15 minutes or less, allowing decontamination and treatment to begin immediately. Similar test strips are being developed for the detection of smallpox as well. The biotech company EluSys Therapeutics is working on an exciting technique which would "implement instant immunity." EluSys joins two monoclonal antibodies chemically together so that they act like biological double-sided tape. One antibody sticks to toxins, viruses, or bacteria while the other binds to human red blood cells. The red blood cells carry the pathogen or toxin to the liver for destruction and return unharmed to the normal blood circulation. In one test, the EluSys treatment reduced the viral load in monkeys one million-fold in less than an hour. The technology could be applied to a number of bioterrorist threats, such as dengue fever, Ebola and Marburg viruses, and plague. Of course, the EluSys treatment would not just be useful for responding to bioterrorist attacks, but also could treat almost any infection or poisoning. Further down the development road are technologies that could rapidly analyze a pathogen’s DNA, and then guide the rapid synthesis of drugs like the ones being developed by EluSys that can bind, or disable, segments of DNA crucial to an infectious organism's survival. Again, this technology would be a great boon for treating infectious diseases and might be a permanent deterrent to future bioterrorist attacks. Seizing Bayer’s patent now wouldn’t just cost that company and its stockholders a little bit of money (Bayer sold $1 billion in Cipro last year), but would reverberate throughout the pharmaceutical research and development industry. If governments begin to seize patents on the pretext of addressing alleged public health emergencies, the investment in research that would bring about new and effective treatments could dry up. Investors and pharmaceutical executives couldn’t justify putting $30 billion annually into already risky and uncertain research if they couldn’t be sure of earning enough profits to pay back their costs. Consider what happened during the Clinton health care fiasco, which threatened to impose price controls on prescription drugs in the early 1990s: Growth in research spending dropped off dramatically from 10 percent annually to about 2 percent per year. A far more sensible and farsighted way to protect the American public from health threats, including bioterrorism, is to encourage further pharmaceutical research by respecting drug patents. In the final analysis, America’s best biodefense is a vital and profitable pharmaceutical and biotechnology industry.

Extinction

Steinbrenner, 97

John Steinbrenner, Senior Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22-1997, Lexis  
Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.
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Economic engagement requires that the means of the plan be exclusively economic interdependence between the USFG and the target government

Çelik 11 – Arda Can Çelik, Master’s Degree in Politics and International Studies from Uppsala University, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies, p. 11

Introduction

Economic engagement policies are strategic integration behaviour which involves with the target state. Engagement policies differ from other tools in Economic Diplomacy. They target to deepen the economic relations to create economic intersection, interconnectness, and mutual dependence and finally seeks economic interdependence. This interdependence serves the sender stale to change the political behaviour of target stale. However they cannot be counted as carrots or inducement tools, they focus on long term strategic goals and they are not restricted with short term policy changes.(Kahler&Kastner,2006) They can be unconditional and focus on creating greater economic benefits for both parties. Economic engagement targets to seek deeper economic linkages via promoting institutionalized mutual trade thus mentioned interdependence creates two major concepts. Firstly it builds strong trade partnership to avoid possible militarized and non militarized conflicts. Secondly it gives a leeway lo perceive the international political atmosphere from the same and harmonized perspective. Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows "It is a policy of deliberate expanding economic ties with and adversary in order to change the behaviour of target state and improve bilateral relations ".(p523-abstact). It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term economic gains and more importantly; political gains. The main idea behind the engagement motivation is stated by Rosecrance (1977) in a way that " the direct and positive linkage of interests of stales where a change in the position of one state affects the position of others in the same direction.

“its” means belonging to something already mentioned

Oxford Dictionaries no date

(Oxford Dictionaries online, no date, “its”, <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/its?view=uk>)

determiner¶ belonging to or associated with a thing previously mentioned or easily identified:¶ turn the camera on its side¶ he chose the area for its atmosphere¶ belonging to or associated with a child or animal of unspecified sex:¶ a baby in its mother’s womb

Violation: the affirmative doesn’t work through the United States federal government and doesn’t engage the Mexican government- rather they just work through an Export/Import Bank with private Mexico biofuel companies.

C. Voting issue

1. Ground- relations disads, politics, and PICs out of government engagement are the core of the topic

2. Limits- only predictable limit on a near infinite combination of companies, NGOs and individuals
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Text: The United States federal government should propose through binding consultation to Brazil that the Export Import Bank of the United States should substantially increase financing for advanced biofuels in Mexico. The United States federal government should support this proposal during consultation and abide by the results of the consultation.

Brazil says yes – they want closer ties with Mexico for ethanol purposes

MercoPress 12 (UTC, MercoPress, a south Atlantic news agency, 12/19/12, "Brazil wants closer links with Mexico; Rousseff plans to travel next March", http://en.mercopress.com/2012/12/19/brazil-wants-closer-links-with-mexico-rousseff-plans-to-travel-next-march)GNL

And the big excuse for the approach is Petrobras, the Brazilian oil and gas giant with strong private participation and which has been a success in discovering and developing hydrocarbons offshore. This capacity could turn Brazil into one of the world’s leading oil producers and exporters in a few years time. Executives from Mexico’s petroleum giant, Pemex are fascinated with the success of Petrobras as a model for their own country and wish to continue on the first collaboration steps planted by Peña Nieto and Rousseff when the then elected president visited Brazil last September. “Peña Nieto caused a very good impression in Brasilia”, said diplomatic sources and “President Rousseff is travelling to Mexico probably next March” The trip should also help to make the ups and downs relation more fluid, particularly since the early 2012 spat when Brazil imposed import quotas on Mexican manufactured vehicles in an attempt to contain the bilateral trade deficit. Making the relation with Mexico more solid is very attractive for Brazil which has seen its economy stall with an annual growth of 1% in 2012, despite all the stimuli, and a deteriorating relation with Argentina, that has become the main market for Brazilian manufacturing. Brazil is trying to tone down its protectionism with Mexico and last September in private talks the Rousseff administration said it was willing to discuss an expansion of the auto quotas. But there are also practical reasons since the cap was unable to contain the trade deficit with Mexico, which in the first ten months of this year has soared to 1.8bn dollars, particularly attracted by the high selling Mexican Ford Fusion of which President Rousseff has one. The Brazilian auto industry is complaining that in the first seven months of the year the full twelve months Mexican quota has been used up but cars keep coming in despite a 35% tariff. However despite Brazilian optimism things could not be that easy since the Mexican business community is distrustful of Brazil following what happened with the car agreement and also believe it is a “country with a far too closed market”. “I believe it makes sense to have certain scepticism” said trade consultant Luis de la Calle who was one of the negotiators of the free trade treaty with the US and Canada. “The good chemistry is positive because without it you can’t advance but at the end of the day it all comes down to each country’s interests, and what is best both for Brazil and Mexico is a far more open trade relation”. The president of Mexican businesspeople in Brazil, Eduardo Ragasol said that the Peña Nieto/Rousseff relation is full of good signals, such as the approval in record time of the new Mexican woman ambassador in Brazil. “But it’s too early to know when all this will materialize in concrete investments”. Mexican corporations have been far more aggressive: millions of Brazilians use Claro cellular phones and watch television on the NET cable system from Mexican tycoon Carlos Slim; they have breakfast with Bimbo toasts and have soft drinks bottled by Femsa, all Mexican businesses. Brazilians on the other hand have been rather shy but could see a turning point in 2015 when Braskem begins to build a huge petro-chemical complex in Veracruz, with an investment of 3.5 billion dollars. But for bilateral trade to keep advancing with a quality leap, some kind of agreement is needed according to analysts. Given the complexity of the relation cooperation between Petrobras and Pemex could be a starting point. In one of his latest statements Peña Nieto advanced he wants Pemex to work with strategic associations that includes the private sector following on the experience collected by Petrobras in Brazil.

The Counterplan is necessary to both build U.S.-Brazil relations and build the foundation for effective cooperation

Einaudi, Brazil Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2011

[March 2011, Luigi R., Member of the Advisory Council of the Brazil Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Distinguished Visiting Fellow in the Center for Strategic Research, Institute for National Strategic Studies, at the National Defense University, “Brazil and the United States: The Need for Strategic Engagement,” <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20266%20Einaudi.pdf>] Idriss

Whether Brazil’s future policies will, like those of the United States, reflect greater caution and sensitivity to third party interests remains an open question. But there can be no question that Brazil’s global activism is here to stay. “The days when domestic weaknesses [an acumulo de vulnerabilidades] limited our scope of action abroad have been left behind,” stated Antonio de Aguiar Patriota in his first speech as the new Foreign Minister under President Rousseff on January 2, 2011.33 Brazilians cannot underestimate what is left to be done domestically, he argued, but they now expect “to engage on all major international debates.” The United States and Brazil, concludes one American observer, seem destined to keep bumping into each other all over the world.34 The key requirement for both countries is therefore to give strategic shape and rationality to these otherwise random interactions. Prospects and Policy Recommendations The United States has a basic national security interest in Brazil’s continuing democratic and marketoriented success, which improves its will and capacity to help address pressing global problems. We are in a rapidly changing period of international relations, in which a high premium is put on skilled and effective diplomacy in order to provide a measure of management to situations that could spin out of control. We are still haunted by nuclear weapons. In these circumstances, Brazil plays an important role. It is in the U.S. interest to find as many ways as possible not only to cooperate with Brazil, but also to engage with Brasilia as a regional and global partner in the maintenance of peace and prosperity. A prerequisite for improved mutual engagement will be changes in perspective on both sides. Mutually beneficial engagement requires the United States to welcome Brazil’s emergence as a global power. Brazil is more than a tropical China35; it is culturally and politically close to the United States and Europe. Brazil, in turn, needs to realize that the United States accepts its rise. Brazil also needs to recognize that the United States still matters greatly to Brasilia and that more can be achieved working with Washington than against it. The United States and Brazil have vast overlapping interests, but a formal strategic partnership is probably out of the question for both countries. In the United States, Brazil must compete for policy attention with China, India, Russia, Japan, Mexico, and several European countries. It poses no security threat to the United States. Moreover, despite Brazil’s importance in multilateral organizations, particularly the UN, Brazil can be of limited practical assistance at best to the United States in its two current wars. Brazil’s interests, in turn, may be fairly said to include the need to distinguish itself from the United States. Diplomatically, this means neither country can expect automatic agreement from the other. Interests differ and it may be politically necessary to highlight differences even when interests are similar. But both countries should make every effort to develop a habit of “permanent consultation” in an effort to coordinate policies, work pragmatically together where interests are common, and reduce surprises even while recognizing that specific interests and policies often may differ. A first operational step, therefore, is for both countries to hold regular policy-level consultations, increase exchanges of information, and coordinate carefully on multilateral matters. This is much easier said than done. The list of global issues on which Brazil is becoming a major player includes conflict resolution, all aspects of energy, including nuclear matters, all types of trade, the environment, space, and the development of international law, including law of the seas and nonproliferation. To share information and ensure effective consultation on so many functional issues will require finding ways to lessen the geographic stovepiping natural to bureaucracy. The U.S. Department of State, for example, has historically organized itself into geographical bureaus responsible for relations with countries in particular regions, leaving functional issues to offices organized globally. This organization hampers the exchange of information and consultation with countries such as Brazil, whose reach and policies go beyond their particular geographic region. One result is that multilateral affairs are still often an isolated afterthought in the U.S. Government. Are there things the United States and Brazil could do, whether bilaterally or in the World Trade Organization, that would offset some of the negative effects of the China trade on manufacturing in both their countries?36 Just posing the question reveals the complexity of the task.
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Bilateralism is used to create asymmetrical power relations that lock in neoliberalism

Phillips 5 Sheffield political economy professor, 2005

(Nicola, “U.S. Power and the Politics of Economic Governance in the Americas”, Latin American Politics and Society, 47.4, December, Wiley)

What explains this prioritization of bilateral negotiations? In the regional context, bilateralism represents, in essence, a political response by the US. government to the political difficulties encountered in realizing its particular vision of the FTAA and the regional economic governance agenda. As it became clear that U.S. preferences regarding the shape of an FTAA were unlikely to prosper in hemispheric negotiations, bilateralism became the strategy of choice for the pursuit of US. trade and economic policy priorities. In other words, the logic propelling a more robust pursuit of bilateral than of hemispheric arrangements rests on the apparently greater utility of bilateralism in serving key U.S. nego- tiating priorities; that is, of obtaining access to services markets in the region in exchange for concessions on market access for a range of goods, but equally the exclusion of significant concessions on agricul- tural liberalization or modification of domestic legislation on trade reme- dies. Crucially also, bilateralism offered a way of reviving the principle of WTO-plus in new trade agreements following the collapse of this aspiration as the foundation for an FTAA. Without exception, the bilat- eral agreements that trade officials in Washington refer to as “state of the art” trade deals conform with a WTO-plus template. Notably, however, the terms of WTO-plus are the same as those that prevailed in the FTAA negotiations; that is, WTO-plus does not universally apply to the vari- ous areas of negotiation and, as in the hemispheric negotiations, does not encompass agreements on trade remedies, agricultural subsidies, or various strategic and politically sensitive sectors. Yet the pursuit of bilateral agreements is also useful as a mechanism for increasing the incentives for other partners (notably Brazil) to engage in similar negotiations, or else for increasing their interest in the success of the FTAA negotiations and thus encouraging a softening of negotiating positions. The “incentive” has been invoked consistently by US. trade officials in the FTAA process. In an article published in 2002, Zoellick stated, “we want to negotiate with all the democracies of the Americas through the FTAA, but we are also prepared to move step bystep toward free trade if others turn back or simply are not ready” (Zoel- lick 2002). Similar pressures in the multilateral arena were brought to bear following the collapse of the WTO talks in Cancdn in late 2003, when Zoellick declared his determination not to entertain or wait for the “won’t do” countries in the multilateral system and to undermine the emerging Brazil-led G-20+ coalition of developing countries (Zoellick 2003b). The echoes of U.S. tactics in dealing with opposition among members of the U.N. Security Council to the invasion of Iraq around the same time are hard to miss, leading one observer pithily to cast Zoellick as a “Donald Rumsfeld of trade policy” (Bhagwati 2004, 52). The early defection from this grouping of such countries as Colombia, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Peru was directly a consequence of U.S. trade officials’ rebukes and warnings that trade agreements with the United States could be threatened by participation in the G20+ This form of “divide and rule” strategy in multilateral trade politics was also apparent earlier in the FTAA negotiations. In the process of presenting opening offers in the various negotiating groups in early 2003, the USTR chose to differentiate between the various subregional groupings in the Americas in a manner that explicitly disadvantaged Mercosur. It put forward four different sets of offers, in contrast with the single sets of offers put forward by all the other participants, ostensibly in recognition of the particular needs of smaller and poorer economies in the FTAA process. Even if this were the case, the opportunity thereby presented to put further pressure on the less-accommodating countries in the south of the region-particularly Brazil-would have gone neither unappreciated nor, indeed, lamented by U.S. trade officials. It is thus through the progressive prioritization of bilateral negotia- tions, mirrored in and reinforced by U.S. strategies outside the Ameri- cas, that US. influence over the architecture of the region has been most easily asserted. Indeed, the bilateralist emphasis facilitates the construc- tion of precisely the hub-and-spoke regional arrangements and the extension of NAFTA that the United States initially envisaged and desired in the FTAA context. Yet bilateralism has also come to be favored by a number of other governments in the region as the best means of pursuing their strategic priorities in trade negotiations, given the height of the hurdles facing the successful agreement of a comprehensive FTAA.

Neolibralism causes extinction through environmental destruction, space weaponization and nuclearwar – focus on short-term wealth and attempts to maintain superiority

Marko 2003—(“ Anarchism and Human Survival: Russell's Problem”, Indymedia UK,

<http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html> SW)

Bertrand Russell throughout his long career as a public intellectual and political activist had reason to reflect on the follies of humanity and the real threats to human survival, threats which are self induced. Much speculation and movie making is devoted toward such survival threatening events as asteroid strikes and mantle head plumes. What is totally ignored is the threat to human survival posed by our own institutions. We can notch another one for the propaganda model; it is to be expected that our pathological institutions would not dwell on their inherent pathology. We can expect nothing less of the corporate media. I shall argue that we face what I refer to as "Russell's problem": are Homo sapiens an intelligent maladaptive organism doomed to self extinction? There exists good reason to suppose that a maladaptive, intelligent, organism would indeed cause its own extinction simply because of the destructive potential of intelligence. This is one of the farces of many science fiction stories, such as Star Trek, which posit the existence of hideous innately war like but highly intelligent species. This is not a productive mix; surely any advanced species, in order to reach such heights as inter-galactic travel, would need to be a species that places a premium on cooperation and solidarity. An avaricious intelligent species would only over time succeed in destroying itself and much of the ecological basis for the support of life long before it would be able to traverse wormholes. There exist three threats to survival namely nuclear war, ecological change and north-south conflict. All three I would argue can be traced to a single source that being the pathological nature of state capitalism. What is frightening is that eventual self induced extinction is a rational consequence of our system of world order much like the destruction of the system of world order prior to 1914 was a rational consequence of its internal nature. I shall focus in this essay on nuclear war, the most immediate threat. In doing so we will come to appreciate the nexus between this threat, globalisation and north-south conflict. Currently we are witnessing a major expansion in the US global military system. One facet of this expansion is the globalisation of US nuclear war planning known as "adaptive planning". The idea here is that the US would be able to execute a nuclear strike against any target on Earth at very short notice. For strategic planners the world's population is what they refer to as a "target rich environment". The Clinton era commander of US nuclear forces, Admiral Mies, stated that nuclear ballistic missile submarines would be able to "move undetected to any launch point" threatening "any spot on Earth". What lies at the heart of such a policy is the desire to maintain global strategic superiority what is known as "full spectrum dominance" previously referred to as "escalation dominance". Full spectrum dominance means that the US would be able to wage and win any type of war ranging from a small scale contingency to general nuclear war. Strategic nuclear superiority is to be used to threaten other states so that they toe the party line. The Bush administration's Nuclear Posture Review stipulated that nuclear weapons are needed in case of "surprising military developments" not necessarily limited to chemical or biological weapons. The Clinton administration was more explicit stating in its 2001 Pentagon report to Congress that US nuclear forces are to "hedge against defeat of conventional forces in defense of vital interests". The passage makes clear that this statement is not limited to chemical or biological weapons. We have just seen in Iraq what is meant by the phrase "defense of vital interests". Washington is asserting that if any nation were to have the temerity to successfully defend itself against US invasion, armed with conventional weapons only, then instant annihilation awaits. "What we say goes" or you go is the message being conveyed. Hitler no doubt would have had a similar conception of "deterrence". It should be stressed that this is a message offered to the whole world after all it is now a target rich environment. During the cold war the US twice contemplated using nuclear weapons in such a fashion both in Vietnam, the first at Dien Bien Phu and during Nixon administration planning for "operation duck hook". In both cases the main impediments to US action were the notion that nuclear weapons were not politically "useable" in such a context and because of the Soviet deterrent. The Soviet deterrent is no more and the US currently is hotly pursuing the development of nuclear weapons that its designers believe will be "useable" what the Clinton administration referred to as low yield earth penetrating nuclear weapons and what the Bush administration refers to as the Rapid Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Such strategic reforms are meant to make nuclear war a more viable policy option, on the basis that lower yields will not immediately kill as many innocent people as higher yield weapons. This is known as the lowering of the threshold of nuclear war. The development of the RNEP draws us closer to the prospect of nuclear war, including accidental nuclear war, because lower yields will lower the barrier between conventional and nuclear war. There will exist no real escalatory firewall between these two forms of warfare which means that in any conventional crisis involving nuclear powers, there will exist a strong incentive to strike first. A relationship very similar to the interaction between the mobilisation schedules of the great powers prior to 1914. There exist strong parallels between US nuclear planning and the German Imperial Staffs Schlieffen plan. Lowering the threshold of nuclear war will also enhance pressures for global nuclear proliferation. If the US is making its arsenal more useable by working towards achieving a first strike capability, then others such as Russia and China must react in order to ensure the viability of their deterrents. Moreover, the potential third world targets of US attack would also have greater incentive to ensure that they also have a nuclear deterrent. It is also understood that the development of these nuclear weapons may require the resumption of nuclear testing, a key reason for the Administration's lack of readiness to abide by the CTBT treaty, which is meant to ban nuclear testing. The CTBT is a key feature of contemporary global nuclear non proliferation regimes for the US signed the CTBT in order to extend the nuclear non proliferation treaty (NPT) indefinitely. Abandoning the CTBT treaty, in order to develop a new generation of more "useable" nuclear weapons that will lower the threshold of nuclear war, will place the NPT regime under further strain and greatly increase the chances of further nuclear proliferation. There exists a "deadly connection" between global weapons of mass destruction proliferation and US foreign policy. One may well ask what has all this to do with state capitalism? Consider the thinking behind the militarisation of space, outlined for us by Space Command; historically military forces have evolved to protect national interests and investments  both military and economic. During the rise of sea commerce, nations built navies to protect and enhance their commercial interests. During the westward expansion of the continental United States, military outposts and the cavalry emerged to protect our wagon trains, settlements and roads. The document goes on, the emergence of space power follows both of these models. Moreover, the globalization of the world economy will continue, with a widening between haves and have nots. The demands of unilateral strategic superiority, long standing US policy known as "escalation" or "full spectrum" dominance, compel Washington to pursue space control". This means that, according to a report written under the chairmanship of Donald Rumsfeld, "in the coming period the US will conduct operations to, from, in and through space" which includes "power projection in, from and through space". Toward this end, Washington has resisted efforts in the UN to create an arms control regime for space. As a result there will inevitably arise an arms race in space. The importance of this simply cannot be over-emphasised. Throughout the nuclear age there have been a number of close calls, due to both human and technical error, that almost lead to a full scale nuclear exchange between Washington and Moscow. These glitches in command and control systems were ultimately benign because both sides had early warning satellites placed in specialised orbits which could be relied upon to provide real time imagery of nuclear missile launch sites. However the militarisation of space now means that these satellites will become open game; the benign environment in space will disappear if the militarisation of space continues. Thus if the US were to "conduct operations to, from in and through space" it will do see remotely. Technical failure may result in the system attacking Russian early warning satellites. Without question this would be perceived by the Russian's as the first shot in a US nuclear first strike. Consider for instance a curious event that occurred in 1995. A NASA research rocket, part of a study of the northern lights, was fired over Norway. The rocket was perceived by the Russian early warning system as the spear of a US first strike. The Russian system then began a countdown to full scale nuclear response; it takes only a single rocket to achieve this effect because it was no doubt perceived by Russian planners that this single rocket was meant to disable their command and control system as a result of electromagnetic pulse effects. To prevent the loss of all nuclear forces in a subsequent follow on strike the Russian's would need to launch a full scale response as soon as possible. Because the US itself has a hair trigger launch on warning posture a Russian attack would be followed by a full scale US attack; the US has a number of "reserve options" in its war plans, thus such an accidental launch could trigger a global chain of nuclear release around the globe. Calamity was averted in 1995 because Russia's early warning satellites would have demonstrated that there was no launch of US nuclear forces. If these satellites were to be taken out then this ultimate guarantee disappears; the Russian ground based radar system has a number of key holes that prevent it from warning of an attack through two key corridors, one from the Atlantic the other from the Pacific. In the future if an event such as 1995 were to occur in space the Russians no longer would have the level of comfort provided by its space based assets. The militarisation of space greatly increases the chances of a full scale accidental nuclear war. The militarisation of space is intimately linked with US strategic nuclear forces, for the previous command covering space, known as Space Command, has merged with the command responsible for nuclear forces, Strategic Command. Upon merger, the commander of Strategic Command stated, "United States Strategic Command provides a single war fighting combatant command with a global perspective, focused on exploiting the strong and growing synergy between the domain of space and strategic capabilities." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff added, "this new command is going to have all the responsibilities of its predecessors, but an entirely new mission focus, greatly expanded forces and you might even say several infinite areas of responsibility." In other words, we are witnessing the integration of strategic conventional, nuclear and space planning into the command responsible for overseeing US nuclear forces. In turn these forces become an ordinary facet of US strategic planning, severing the break between conventional and nuclear war. The link between the increase in threats to survival and state capitalism (as well as globalisation) was provided for us by the old Space Command as noted above. We may justly also conclude that US nuclear weapons provide a shield, or shadow, enabling the deployment of offensive military firepower in what Kennedy era commander General Maxwell Taylor referred to as the key theatre of war, namely "under-developed areas". This shield was made effective by "escalation dominance", as noted above, now known as "full spectrum dominance". It is this facet of US strategic policy that compels Washington place such a premium on nuclear superiority and nuclear war fighting. The link between US nuclear strategy and the global political economy is intimate. US nuclear weapons, both during and after the cold war, have acted as the ultimate guarantors of US policy, which is concerned with managing the world capitalist system in the interests of dominant domestic elites. Nuclear weapons provide the umbrella of power under which the system is able to function in much the same way that Karl Polanyi in his classic work, The Great Transformation, argued that the balance of power functioned in the service of the world capitalist system in the 19th century. The great restoration of the world capitalist system, under the rubric of liberal internationalism, and the onset of the nuclear age in the wake of the second world war, are not merely coincidental. To understand the contours of contemporary world order is to appreciate the deep nexus between the two. Military superiority is necessary because of threats to "stability". It is to be expected that a system of world order constructed for the benefit of an elite core of corporate interests in the US will not go down well with the world's population, especially in key regions singled out for capital extraction such as the Middle East and Latin America. Planners recognise that the pursuit of capital globalisation and the consequent widening of the gap between rich and poor would be opposed by the globe's population. Absolute strategic superiority is meant to keep the world's population quite and obedient out of sheer terror, as Bush administration aligned neo-conservative thinkers have argued it is better that Washington be feared rather than loved. As they have asserted, after world war two US hegemony had to be "obtained", now it must be "maintained" (Robert Kagan and William Kristol). It is only natural that this "maintenance operation" should be a militaristic one given that the US has a comparative advantage in the use of force; a nuclear global first strike capability would give Washington an absolute advantage. Should anyone get out of line, possibly threatening to spread the "virus" of popular social and economic development, force is to be used to restore "credibility" to beat down the threat of a better example. The US pursues a dangerous nuclear strategy because such a strategy in its terms is "credible". Anarchists are well aware of this important aspect of international relations given the events of the Spanish Civil War. Such a situation is no joke, for this was precisely the fear of Kennedy era planners that led to the Cuban Missile Crisis. Washington sought to return Cuba to the "Latin American mode" fearing that Cuba would set an example to the population of Latin America in independent social and economic planning conducted in the interests of the population rather than US capital. In response to the Castro takeover the US engaged in one of the most serious terrorist campaigns of recent times, meant as a prelude to invasion in order to ensure "regime change" thereby teaching the people of the region the lesson that "what we say goes". One of the key reasons why Khrushchev sought to place nuclear missiles in Cuba was to deter a US invasion and to achieve strategic parity with Washington. Throughout the Cuban Missile Crisis many potential flashpoints almost lead to a full-scale nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union and the US, how close we came to annihilation is only now being fully realised. These are not matters for idle speculation: destruction almost occurred in the past and may very well occur in the future; even cats have only nine lives. This is a matter of great contemporary significance because of the current geographical expansion of the US military system. One of the most significant results of the invasion of Afghanistan was the expansion of the US military system into Central Asia, including into some former Soviet republics. The Russians have traditionally considered this to be their version of the Western hemisphere. If a "great game" were to develop in the region between Russia and the US (perhaps also Pakistan, China and India all nuclear powers, Turkey which sits under US "extended deterrence" and Iran, a potential nuclear power) then such a "great game" may become a nuclearised great game. Indeed the standoff in Kashmir may have global consequences if a system of alliance politics were to develop in the region between the globe's nuclear powers, especially as the threshold of nuclear war is being lowered. In this sense Central Asia may develop into a global version of the link between the Balkans and central alliance systems prior to 1914. Of even greater concern is the further expansion of the US military system into the Middle East following the invasion of Iraq. Washington has already foreshadowed a desire to construct permanent military bases in Iraq in order to facilitate intervention into the region. Both Iran and Syria are potential targets of US attack. Iran may decide upon the nuclear option in order to deter the globes leading rogue state. This could be potentially explosive because it is well known that Israel posses a significant nuclear force. Israel has always feared that its paymaster would ultimately abandon it. In response Israel has reportedly developed a "samson option" nuclear targeting strategy. The idea is that Israel would target Russia with its nuclear weapons (Israel has developed delivery systems with an excessive range capability), which would lead to a full-scale nuclear exchange between Moscow and Washington. In essence Israel is saying: we should be allowed to continue repressing the Palestinians if not we have the "samson option". Furthermore, in order to facilitate intervention into these regions the US has began a programme to shift the basing of its military forces into "new Europe" that is Eastern Europe. Washington for instance pushed Romania into NATO for this very reason. Placing military forces in Eastern Europe no doubt would give the Russians some cause for concern. After Kosovo Russia conducted large-scale war games assuming an invasion through "new Europe". The game ended with the release of nuclear weapons. Indeed, expanding the US military system up to the border of Belarus may be dangerous for it is quite possible that Russia extends nuclear deterrence to Minsk; for instance Russia is building a new ground based strategic early warning radar in Belarus. This may all become a series problem in the future because of what the US Geological Survey refers to as "the big rollover": the time at which the world oil market changes from a buyers market into a sellers market (which may occur in the next 15-20 years). Washington has always regarded the oil resources of the Middle East as "the most stupendous material prize in world history" which is a key lever of US global dominance. The big rollover will ensure that Middle Eastern oil reserves will become an even more significant lever of world control placing greater premium on US control over the political development of the Arab world. In 1967, 1970 and 1973 strategic developments in the Middle East were overshadowed by nuclear weapons. In fact the events of 1970 and 1973 convinced many, such as Henry Kissinger, that the US needed to strive to retain nuclear superiority and reverse the condition of strategic parity with Moscow. This ultimately lead to the Carter-Reagan build-up of the late 1970s and early 1980s; a build-up which easily could have been disastrous. The militarisation of space, the development of so called "useable" nuclear weapons, the globalisation of the US nuclear planning system, the hair trigger alert status of the globe's nuclear forces and the expansion of the US military system into Central Asia and the Middle East possibly triggering a "great game" in these regions between nuclear powers, not to mention military expansion into "new Europe", all seriously increase the threats to our long term (indeed short term) survival. Washington's aggressive nuclear strategy is not only meant to deter democracy abroad; it is also meant to deter democracy at home. In 1956 the author of NSC 68 and one of the chief ideologues behind the Carter-Reagan nuclear build-up, Paul Nitze, made a distinction between what he referred to as "declaratory" nuclear weapons policy and "actual" nuclear weapons policy. For anybody interested in unravelling truth from fiction the distinction is critical. In Nitze's words, "the word 'policy' is used in two related but different senses. In one sense, the action sense, it refers to the general guidelines, which we believe should and will govern our actions in various contingencies. In the other sense, the declaratory sense, it refers to policy statements which have as their aim political and psychological effects". The most important target audience of declaratory policy is the American population, the so-called "internal deterrent". Consider for instance the key nuclear proliferation planning document of the cold war era, the Gilpatric report delivered to President Johnson. In it Gilpatric spelt out the threat that nuclear proliferation poses to US security: "as additional nations obtained nuclear weapons our diplomatic and military influence would wane, and strong pressures would arise to retreat to isolation to avoid the risk of involvement in nuclear war". So if it were seen by the population that the pursuit of foreign policy, conducted in the interests of domestic elites, would increase the threat of nuclear war then the internal deterrent may become dangerously aroused possibly calling off the show. In the strategic literature this is referred to as self-deterrence. In other words US non proliferation policy was meant to lock in US strategic dominance so that the domestic population would not become dangerously aroused whilst providing Washington the freedom of action necessary to brandish its nuclear superiority over others. This sentiment was reflected in the Bush administrations Nuclear Posture Review, nuclear capabilities also assure the US public that the United States will not be subject to coercion based on a false perception of U.S. weakness among potential adversaries. Many strategic thinkers have argued that the greatest threat to US hegemony or "unipolarity" is the internal "welfare role" and the populations lack of understanding for the burdens of Empire, in other words popular democracy. One of the reasons that the Reagan administration pursued "Star Wars" a programme to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" was to outflank the domestic and global peace movements that were gathering pace as a result of the administration's pursuit of potentially apocalyptic nuclear policies (the very same people have their fingers on the button again). It was well recognised that the Star Wars programme would have increased the chances of a nuclear exchange between Moscow and Washington, just as today the pursuit of short term interests is known to have potentially serious international consequences, such as increase in conflict and global weapons of mass destruction proliferation. The ruling class is well aware of the adverse impact the pursuit of its own sectional interests will have on international order. It pursues those interests with renewed zeal anyway. As far as the ruling class is concerned the greatest threat we face is not nuclear war, it is popular democracy. As Adam Smith observed of a previous mercantile system, applicable to today's system of state-corporate mercantilism, "it cannot be very difficult to determine who have been the contrivers of this whole mercantile system; not the consumers, we may believe, whose interest has been entirely neglected; but the producers, whose interest has been so carefully attended to; and among this latter class our merchants and manufacturers have been by far the principal architects." Policy Smith observed, "comes from an order of men, whose interest is never exactly the same with that of the public, who have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public, and who accordingly have, upon many occasions, both deceived and oppressed it." This raises an interesting issue, namely that the pursuit of Armageddon is quite rational. The dominant institutions of capitalism place a premium on short-term greed. Rational participatory planning incorporating long-term concerns such as human survival are of no interest to these pathological institutions. What matters is short-term profit maximisation. One can see this most clearly in the case of such externalities as ecological change where the desire to pursue short-term profit undermines the long-term viability of the system itself (also us as a species; indeed many have surmised that we are in the era of the sixth great extinction of life on Earth this time human induced). The fact that the institutional structures of society compel the ruling classes to pursue highly dangerous security policies that are another externality of the system of state capitalism compels the population to constrain and eventually overthrow these institutions because apocalypse is institutionally rational. This brings us back however to Russell's problem. How do we answer Russells problem? There are those who do believe it can be answered, in the affirmative that is. Really this is just about the entire intellectual class which spins tails about human nature, most especially what are referred to as evolutionary psychologists and realist international relations thinkers; their doctrines are essentially prophecies of doomsday. Russell himself stated, "I am no prophet. Mankind perhaps decided that it has existed long enough and its time has come to yield the place to the animals we have hitherto considered lower. This is the view of those who are called statesmen and realists. For those actually interested in human freedom and survival Russells problem is to be solved in the manner Bertrand Russell himself sought to solve it; not by lofty speculations and social theories but by political dissidence in all its manifestations. Chomsky has stated that the people of the third world rely on a thin margin of survival provided by turbulence and dissidence within the imperial states. In fact humanity relies on a thin margin of survival provided by turbulence and dissidence within the imperial states. The global justice movement has an awesome responsibility: human survival depends upon its success. The concerns expressed in this essay ought to occupy more of its time.

ALT: We need to take back politics – systems of politics are sustained only by our engagement with them – working w/in doesn’t solve

Meszaros 8 (Istvan, Chair of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time, p323-328)

The unreality of postulation the sustainable solution of the grave problems of our social order within the formal and legal framework and corresponding constraints of parliamentary politics arises from the fundamental misconception of the structural determinations of capital’s rule, as represented in all varieties that assert the dualism of civil society and the political state. The difficulty, insurmountable within the parliamentary framework is this that since capital is actually in control of all vital aspects of the social metabolism, it can afford to define the separately constituted sphere of political legitimation as a strictly formal and legal matter, thereby necessarily excluding the possibility of being legitimately challenged in its substantive sphere of socioeconomic reproductive operation. Directly or indirectly, capital controls everything, including the parliamentary legislative process, even in the latter is supposed to be fully independent from capital in many theories that fictitiously hypostatize the “democratic equality” of all political forces participating in the legislative process. TO envisage a very different relationship to the powers of decision making in our societies, now completely dominated by the forces of capital in every domain, it is necessary to radically challenge capital itself as the overall controller of social metabolic reproduction. What makes this problem worse for all those who are looking for significant change on the margins of the established political system is that the later can claim for itself genuine constitutional legitimacy in its present mode of functioning, based on the historically constituted inversion of the actual state of the material reproductive affairs. For inasmuch as the capital is not only the “personification of capital” but simultaneously functions also “as the personification of the social character of labor, of the total workshop as such,” the system can claim to represent the vitally necessary productive power of society vis-à-vis the individuals as the basis of their continued existence, incorporating the interest of all. In this way capital asserts itself not only as the de facto but also the de jure power of society, in its capacity as the objectively given necessary condition of societal reproduction, and thereby as the constitutional foundation to its own political order. The fact that the constitutional legitimacy of capital is historically founded on the ruthless expropriation of the conditions of social metabolic reproduction- the means and material of labor-from the producers, and therefore capital’s claimed “constitutionality” (like the origin of all constitutions) is unconstitutional, is an unpalatable truth which fades away in the mist of a remote past. The “social productive powers of labor, or productive power or social labor, first develop historically with the specifically capitalist mode of production, hence appear as something immanent in the capital-relation and inseparable from it. This is how capital’s mode of social metabolic reproduction becomes eternalized and legitimated as a lawfully unchallengeable system. Legitimate contest is admissible only in relation to some minor aspects of the unalterable overall structure. The real state of affairs on thee plane of socioeconomic reproduction-i.e., the actually exercised productive power of labor and its absolute necessity for securing capital’s own reproduction- disappears from sight. Partly because of the ignorance of the very far from legitimate historical origin of capital’s “primitive accumulation” and the concomitant, frequently violent, expropriation of property as the precondition of the system’s present mode of functioning; and partly because of the mystifying nature of the established productive and distributive relations. As Marx notes: The objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker; rather, he appears as subsumed under them. Capital employs Labor. Even this relation is in its simplicity is a personification of things and a reification of persons. None of this can be challenged and remedied within the framework of parliamentary political reform. It would be quite absurd to expect the abolition of the “personification of things and the reification of persons” by political decree, and just as absurd to expect the proclamation of such an intended reform within the framework of capital’s political institutions. For the capital system cannot function without the perverse overturning of the relationship between persons and things: capital’s alienated and reified powers dominate the masses of the people. Similarly it would be a miracle if the workers who confront capital in the labor process as “isolated workers” could reacquire mastery over the social productive powers of their labor by some political decree, or even by a whole series of parliamentary reforms enacted under capital’s order of social metabolic control. For in these matters there can be no way of avoiding the irreconcilable conflict over the material stakes of “either/or” Capital can neither abdicate its-usurped-social productive powers in favor of labor, nor can I share them with labor, thanks to some wishful but utterly fictitious “political compromise.” For they constitute the overall controlling power of societal reproduction in the form of “the rule of wealth over society.” Thus it is impossible to escape, in the domain of the fundamental social metabolism, the severe logic of either/or. For either wealth, in the shape of capital, continues to rule over human society, taking it to the brink of self-destruction, or the society of associated producers learns to rule over alienated and reified wealth, with productive powers arising from the self-determinated social labor of its individual-but not longer isolated-members. Capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence. It cannot possibly be politically constrained by parliament in its power of social metabolic control. This is why the only mode of political representation compatible with capital’s mode of functioning is one that effectively denies the possibility of contesting its material power. And precisely because capital is the extra-parliamentary force par excellence, it has nothing to fear from the reforms that can be enacted within its parliamentary political framework. Since the vital issue on which everything else hinges is that “the objective conditions of labor do not appear as subsumed under the worker” buy, on the contrary, “he appears as subsumed under them,” no meaningful change is feasible without addressing the issue both in a form of politics capable of matching capital’s extra-parliamentary powers and modes of action, and in the domain of material reproduction. Thus the only challenge that could affect the power of capital, in a sustainable manner, is one which would simultaneously aim at assuming the system’s key productive functions, and at acquiring control over the corresponding political decision making processes in all spheres, instead of being hopelessly constrained by the circular confinement of institutionally legitimated political action to parliamentary legislation. There is a great deal of critique of formerly leftwing political figures and of their now fully accommodating parties in the political debates of the last decades. However, what is problematic about such debates is that by overemphasizing the role of personal ambition and failure, they often continue to envisage remedying the situation with in the same political institutional framework that, in fact, greatly favors the criticized “personal betrayals” and the painful “party derailments.” Unfortunately, though the advocated and hoped for personal and government changes tend to reproduce the same deplorable results. All this could not be very surprising. The reason why the now established political institutions successfully resist significant change for the better is because they are themselves part of the problem and not of the solution. For in their immanent nature they are the embodiment of the underlying structural determinations and contradictions through which the modern capitalist state- with its ubiquitous network of bureaucratic constituents- has been articulated and stabilized in the course of the last four hundred years. Naturally, the state was formed not as a one-sided mechanical result but through its necessary reciprocal interrelationship to the material ground of capital’s historical unfolding, as not only being shaped by the latter but also actively shaping it as much as historically feasible under the prevailing- and precisely through the interrelationship also changing- circumstances. Given the insuperably centrifugal determination of capital’s productive microcosms, even at the level of the giant quasi-monopolistic transnational corporations, only the modern state could assume and fulfill the required function of being the overall command structure of the capital system. Inevitably, that meant the complete alienation of the power of overall decision making from the producers. Even the “particular personifications of capital” were strictly mandated to act in accord with the structural imperatives of their system. Indeed the modern state, as constituted on the material ground of the capital system, is the paradigm of alienation as regards the power of comprehensive decision making. It would be therefore extremely naïve to imagine that the capitalist state could willingly hand over the alienated power of systemic decision making to any rival actor who operates within the legislative framework of parliament. Thus, in order to envisage a meaningful and historically sustainable societal change, it is necessary to submit to a radical critique both the material reproductive and the political inter-determinations of the entire system, and not simply some of the contingent and limited political practices. The combined totality of the material reproductive determinations and the all-embracing political command structure of the state together constitutes the overpowering reality of the capital system. In this sense, in view of the unavoidable question arising from the challenge of systemic determinations, with regard to both socioeconomic reproduction and the state, the need for a comprehensive political transformation-in close conjunction to the meaningful exercise of society’s vital productive functions without which far-reaching and lasting political change is inconceivable-becomes inseparable from the problem characterized as the wither away of the state. Accordingly, in the historic task of accomplishing “the withering away of the state,” self-management through full participation, and the permanently sustainable overcoming of parliamentarism by a positive form of substantive decision-making are inseparable. This is a vital concern and not “romantic faithfulness to Marx’s unrealizable dream,” as some people try to discredit and dismiss it. In truth, the “withering away of the state” refers to nothing mysterious or remote but to a perfectly tangible process that must be initiated right in our own historical time. It means, in plain language, the progressive reacquisition of the alienated power of political decision making by the individuals in their enterprise of moving toward a genuine socialist society. Without the reacquisition of this power- to which not only the capitalist state but also the paralyzing inertia of the structurally well-entrenched material reproductive practices are fundamentally opposed- neither the new mode of political control of society as a whole by its individuals is conceivable, nor indeed the nonadversarial and thereby cohesive and plannable everyday operation of the particular productive and distributive units by the self-managing freely associated producers. Radically superseding adversariality, and thereby securing the material and political ground of globally viable planning- an absolute must for the very survival of humanity, not to mention the potentially enriched self realization- of its individual members- its synonymous with the withering away of the state as an ongoing historical enterprise.

Ag

Biofuels can’t solve and multiple structural barriers prevent their adoption and use – their authors have a financial incentive to skew the data

Kagan, 10 – reporter and researcher for Green Tech Media (Joshua, “Will the BP Gulf Tragedy Spur Faster Adoption of Biofuels?”, Green Tech Media, 6/21/2010, http://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/will-the-bp-gulf-tragedy-spur-faster-adoption-of-biofuels) // MS

Any conversation that highlights biofuels as a potential replacement for petroleum must be grounded in the specific generation of biofuels that one is discussing. While "advanced" biofuels will be discussed later in this piece, we need to first come to a recognition of the fact that first-generation biofuels like corn ethanol and biodiesel cannot ever possibly replace petroleum. Why? In 2010, the U.S. will utilize 30% of our corn crop to displace 6% of our gasoline consumption (see The True Cost of Corn Ethanol). Even if we utilized 100% of our corn crop for ethanol production, we would still only grow enough to offset a fraction of our gasoline needs. And this says nothing about our diesel or jet fuel consumption. Additionally, corn ethanol production is energy intensive. The processes of growing, harvesting, transporting, pre-treating, fermenting, and distilling it all require copious amounts of fresh water, nutrients, pesticides, and energy. There is no scientific consensus on whether more energy (and GHGs) goes into or comes out of the corn ethanol production process. Furthermore, ethanol cannot be used in blends above 10% without modification to one's engine and the fuel is largely incompatible with much of the trillions of dollars' worth of petroleum infrastructure currently in use in the U.S. Additionally, the U.S. will soon hit its "blend wall." The EPA has determined that only blends of 10% ethanol are safe in unmodified gasoline engines. That is, if there are 140 billion gallons of gasoline consumed in the U.S. market, only 14 billion gallons of ethanol can be blended. Yet, in 2010, more than 12 billion gallons will be produced. Under the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007, the U.S. is required to blend increasing amounts of corn ethanol into the gasoline supply, reaching a level of 15 billion gallons in 2015. Either the EPA will soon increase this blend limit (which will create a whole slew of other problems, like vehicle warranties being capped at 10% ethanol blends -- see Ethanol and the Looming Blend Wall), or the U.S. will have to figure out a way of quickly converting vehicles, pipelines, and service stations to accommodate "E85" blends of gasoline, an undertaking that could cost billions of dollars. While pro-ethanol lobbyist groups like the Renewable Fuels Association and Growth Energy (whose constituents are the recipients in more than $5 billion worth of direct corporate welfare annually) continue to espouse the merits of corn ethanol, I have yet to meet anyone without a financial stake in the industry who seriously believes that corn ethanol is a viable long-term solution. One danger that can occur with environmental catastrophes like the BP disaster is the emergence of a herd-like mentality: "We need alternatives now! Let's invest in biofuels by giving more money to the ethanol industry."

Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend.

Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

No shortages – food is abundant

Poole 6 (Holly Kavana, Institute for Food and Development Policy, “12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths)

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products.

Mexico

Mexico’s economy is resilient

IMF 12 (International Monetary Fund, “Mexico Banks Resilient, But Global Risks Need Care”, 3/30/12, http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2012/car033012a.htm)//WL

Mexico’s banking system is resilient and well capitalized, and stress tests indicate that it would be capable of sustaining significant shocks, the IMF said in its latest assessment of the country’s financial system. However, Mexico, the current president of the Group of Twenty (G-20) advanced and emerging economies, will need to be vigilant to risks from outside the country and should strengthen the institutional framework for its supervision of financial regulation by establishing a fixed term for the President of the Banking Commission, rebalancing its Board and promoting stronger legal safeguards for its personnel, the IMF said. “Our assessment of Mexico’s financial system is very positive,” said Fernando Montes-Negret, a senior financial expert in the IMF’s Monetary and Capital Markets Department and head of the team that conducted the assessment. Cross-border linkages“ The country has better tools for systemic crisis management and competent supervision. However, there have been episodes of distress in recent years and given Mexico’s significant linkages to the global economy and to Spanish banks, authorities need to monitor closely and respond quickly to emerging risks,” Montes-Negret said. The assessment was published on March 30.In the wake of the global economic crisis, the IMF has strengthened its surveillance of countries’ financial systems. Since 1999, the IMF has monitored countries’ financial sectors on a voluntary basis through a joint review process with the World Bank called the Financial Sector Assessment Program. Mexico is one of the major 25 financial sectors that must undergo a review of its financial health as part of the IMF’s economic surveillance and monitoring. The global economic crisis laid bare the devastating economic consequences a financial crisis in one country can have on the global economy. Countries with financial sectors that have the greatest impact on global financial stability are now required to undergo in-depth reviews of their financial health by the IMF every five years. In its assessment of the health of Mexico’s financial system, the IMF recommended the government enact a series of reforms as Latin America’s second largest economy continues to modernize.

No risk of drug instability- loss of cartel leadership

Reed 10/10/13- Mexico Security Analyst at Right Side News (Tristan, “Mexico's Drug War: Stability Ahead of Fourth Quarter Turmoil”, 10/10/13, http://www.rightsidenews.com/2013101033317/world/terrorism/mexicos-drug-war-stability-ahead-of-fourth-quarter-turmoil.html)//CW

While no criminal organization in Mexico suffered any substantial losses in capabilities or territory in the third quarter, the fourth quarter will likely see variations in this trend, particularly as cartels adjust to the arrest of Mario Ramirez Trevino. The Velazquez faction will become the widest-operating branch of the Gulf cartel and the most active challenger to Los Zetas for control of the northeast. As Stratfor noted during our first quarterly update, the Velazquez faction was formerly led by the now-captured Ivan "El Taliban" Velazquez Caballero, a former regional boss for Los Zetas, which split from Los Zetas around March 2012 and later returned to operating under the Gulf cartel name. The Velazquez faction continues to operate unhindered by the arrest of Ivan Velazquez on Sept. 26, 2012.¶ There are a variety of reasons for the relatively stable cartel dynamics in Mexico during the third quarter. For one, it has been less than three months since Miguel Trevino was detained by the Mexican navy and less than two since Mario Ramirez's detention. Miguel Trevino's brother, Omar Trevino, appears to have assumed leadership over Los Zetas, and -- notably -- there has been no significant challenge to his new role. Mario Ramirez's arrest will certainly alter the dynamic within the umbrella of the Gulf cartel, particularly as it relates to Gulf allies such as the Knights Templar and the Sinaloa Federation, and Gulf rivals, such as Los Zetas. Any changes related to dynamics within the Gulf cartel have yet to be reflected in open source reporting.¶ Also, the balkanization of Mexican organized crime has shifted the focus of all criminal organizations from planning new incursions to addressing existing challenges within their territory. The Sinaloa Federation continues to combat regional rivals in northwestern Mexico, including northern Sinaloa, southwestern Chihuahua, and northern Sonora state. Los Zetas continue their fight to regain complete control over much of Zacatecas state after Velazquez Caballero's split in 2012. Los Zetas also continued to engage in violent attacks against the Gulf cartel in the rest of northeastern Mexico and against the Knights Templar (and possibly Gulf cartel) in Tabasco state, although these offensives have not accomplished any real gains. The Cartel de Jalisco Nueva Generacion and the Knights Templar continued to focus on their traditional strongholds in southwestern Mexico, trading tit-for-tat incursions into one another's territories.¶ Moreover, many of the changes in cartel dynamics reported in the third quarter actually occurred during the first quarter. For example, Stratfor first identified the arrival of a new challenger to Los Zetas into Tabasco state operating under the name People United Against Crime (commonly referred to by its Spanish acronym, PUCD), but during the second and particularly third quarter it became apparent that People United Against Crime are really just pre-existing Zetas rivals operating under a new label (most likely the Knights Templar or its allies, the Velazquez faction of the Gulf cartel). And it came to light in the third quarter that Los Zetas have entered the Ciudad Juarez area in northern Chihuahua, though they actually began building their presence at least as far back as the first quarter.¶ In contrast to the minimal disruptions in the overall cartel landscape in Mexico in the past two quarters, the fourth quarter will likely see substantial changes. The Gulf cartel will likely feel the effects of Mario Ramirez's capture, which will shift the balance of power in Tamaulipas state and thus invite another offensive by Los Zetas or further control by Gulf allies, particularly the Knights Templar. Meanwhile, should Omar Trevino be capable of retaining the organization's ability to stage significant incursions into Sinaloa Federation territory, Los Zetas efforts in Ciudad Juarez could spark a new turf war in Chihuahua state.

Mexico says no to the plan- NSA probing

Press TV 10/31/13 (Press TV, “Mexico orders probe into US spying on its top officials”, 10/31/13, <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/10/23/330911/mexico-orders-probe-into-nsa-spying/>) //CW

Mexican interior minister has ordered a major probe into reports of US electronic spying on its current President Enrique Pena Nieto as well as his predecessor Felipe Calderon.¶ Miguel Angel Osorio Chong announced on Tuesday that he had instructed Mexico’s CISEN intelligence agency and federal police to conduct an "exhaustive" investigation into the spying operation and to determine whether any Mexican operatives were involved. ¶ The call for the high-level probe followed an official order by President Pena Nieto to conduct a major investigation on whether the US National Security Agency (NSA) hacked his emails while he was campaigning for presidential office in 2012. ¶ The NSA targeted his phone and the phones of nine of his close associates to build a map of their regular contacts. From then it closely monitored those individuals’ phones as well, intercepting 85,489 text messages, including those sent by Nieto, press reports say. ¶ President Nieto further added that Calderon, widely known for his cooperation with American officials, was also targeted by US eavesdropping efforts while in office. ¶ The Mexican Foreign Ministry, meanwhile, has further slammed the fresh evidence of US spying measures on the country’s officials. ¶ "The Mexican government strongly condemns the spying practice over communication tools and internet activity of the country’s state agencies and its citizens," the Foreign Ministry said in a statement.¶ It added that such cases were completely unacceptable, unlawful and contrary to international legislation. ¶ Earlier, Mexican press published facts that the NSA was using special software to spy in several Latin American countries. According to the media reports, these activities were aimed at collecting confidential data in military and energy fields, as well as intelligence on fighting narcotics trade. ¶ Moreover, a report by German news magazine Der Spiegel, mostly based on classified documents leaked by NSA whistleblower, Edward Snowden, indicated that US surveillance operations against the Latin American nation helped the Americans make several profitable investments in Mexican enterprises. ¶ The report cites a “top secret” NSA internal memo as stating that access to Calderon electronic exchanges gave the US spies "diplomatic, economic and leadership communications which continue to provide insight into Mexico's political system and internal stability."¶ Meanwhile, top officials in France have also demanded explanations from Washington on Monday following a recent report that its infamous NSA spy agency secretly recorded millions of phone calls made in the country. ¶ The development comes as French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius also reacted strongly on Monday to a report that US electronic spying operations monitored millions of calls made by French citizens. ¶ "I have immediately summoned the US ambassador," Fabius told reporters on Monday as he arrived for an EU foreign ministers summit, adding a meeting would take place "this morning" at the ministry in Paris. ¶ "This type of practice between partners, which violates privacy, is totally unacceptable and we must ensure very quick that it is not still continuing," Fabius added.

Climate Leadership

Pollution from INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES CAUSE A Decrease In Rainfall In Areas With Large Amounts of Precipitaion – this Produces a Natural Cooling Effect By Keeping Precipitation in the Air

Center for Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change in 2002

(staff, “Feedback Factors (Clouds) – Summary, August 7, 2002, pg. online @ <http://www.co2science.org/subject/f/summaries/feedbackcloud.htm> //wyo-ef)

Last of all, Rosenfeld (2000) used satellite data obtained from the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission to look for terrestrial analogues of the cloud trails that form in the wakes of ships at sea as a consequence of their emissions of particulates that redistribute cloud-water into larger numbers of smaller droplets that do not rain out of the atmosphere as readily as they would in the absence of this phenomenon. Visualizations produced from the mission data clearly revealed the existence of enhanced cloud trails downwind of urban and industrial complexes in Turkey, Canada and Australia, to which Rosenfeld gave the name pollution tracks in view of their similarity to ship tracks.  Rosenfeld also demonstrated that the clouds comprising these pollution tracks were composed of droplets of reduced size that did indeed suppress precipitation by inhibiting further coalescence and ice precipitation formation.  As Toon (2000) noted in a commentary on this study, these smaller droplets will not "rain out" as quickly and will therefore last longer and cover more of the earth, both of which effects tend to cool the globe.

AND, REMOVING AEROSOLS FROM THE ATMOSPHERE WOULD CAUSE A BURST OF WARMING – AEROSOLS ARE HOLDING BACK THE EFFECTS OF GREENHOUSE WARMING

NEW SCIENTIST IN ‘04

(Fred Pearce, nqa, New Scientist, “Harbingers of Doom?” 7/24/04, pg. Lexis //wyo-ef)

As well as pumping gases into the atmosphere, we are also filling it with huge volumes of microscopic particles, mostly from burning forests, crop waste and fossil fuels. Depending on their characteristics, these aerosols can scatter or absorb solar radiation and may influence the formation, colour and reflectivity of clouds. The precise nature of their involvement in global temperature has been hotly disputed for a decade. But most researchers now believe that

the dominant effect of these aerosols is to suppress warming by shading the planet. "We are dealing with a coiled spring, with temperatures being held back by aerosols," says Solomon. "If you shut off aerosols, temperatures would increase rapidly, but we don't yet know exactly how coiled the spring is." The best guess until recently was that this "parasol effect" was holding back a quarter of the warming so far, or about 0.2 degreesC. But critics say this calculation is little more than a guess. The first efforts at directly measuring the parasol effect suggest the spring may be much more tightly coiled. In an assessment last year, Nobel prize-winning atmospheric chemist Paul Crutzen argued that aerosols could be disguising between half and three-quarters of present warming . That suggests the coiled spring is already holding back warming of anything up to 2 degreesC. "The two major pollutants have been almost cancelling each other out," says Cox. This is doubly bad news. First because it shows that cleaning up aerosols would release a burst of warming. But secondly, it suggests that the climate system is much more sensitive to greenhouse gases than we thought. Crutzen's estimate would put the true warming effect of doubling CO2 at between 7 and 10 degreesC, which Murphy's graph predicts, albeit at a low probability.

Uniqueness overwhelms the link- warming isn’t the problem neolib is

Crist, 2k7 Eileen Crist, Associate Professor of Science and Technology Studies in the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies at Virginia Tech “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse” Telos 141 Winter 2007

Rather than focusing on global warming as a driver of more biodiversity losses, climate change can be considered as a mirror that reflects how wild nature’s ability to adapt to climate change has been seriously undermined. In other words, beyond escalating the destruction of nature, climate change is bringing into high relief the violence that has already been perpetrated. There is a point to looking through climate change rather than at it: the point is that climate change is not “the problem.” The problem is a sprawling civilization that is destroying the biosphere, and will continue to do so even after it (somehow or other) deals with a major glitch in the machine—the consequences of accumulating greenhouse gases.

The plan doesn't address consumption and produces – means they can’t solve and turns case

Byrne et al 9 - Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University of Delaware (John, “Relocating Energy in the Social Commons: Ideas for a Sustainable Energy Utility,” Sage, April 2009, http://bst.sagepub.com/content/29/2/81.full.pdf+html ) //JG

The threat of global warming has propelled renewable energy from policy Siberia to policy priority. Its impressive rise to prominence has been swift and, also, puzzling. While renewables lack the industrial heft of nuclear power, they nevertheless have left the engineering garage and are now courted in the boardrooms of big industry and big finance. Their recent success has been aptly described as a passage “from love-ins to logos” (Glover, 2006). Power and profit projections once reserved solely for the globally integrated fossil fuel system now extend to include renewable energy markets as well. Industry proponents and market analysts project billions of dollars in growth in the renewable energy market over the next decade. Wave, wind, solar, and hydropower are all considered essential technologies to address energy demand in a carbon-constrained world. Reminiscent of the institutional alliances that led to the creation of the industrial mega-energy systems that have dominated modernity, the call for public and private investment in renewable energy has the political ring and economic ka-ching normally reserved for the overlords of the modern energy scheme. The corporate renewable energy movement has studied the tactics of its competitors and adapted them to their needs. Appropriating the symbols of technology triumphalism of nuclear power (Byrne, Glover, & Alroe, 2006, p. 16-17), corporate renewable energy has launched a campaign for, fittingly, a “Manhattan Project” that can vault Big Wind and other renewables with extra-large size ambitions to a new level (Wilson, 2008). The new order is visualized with imagery suggesting the benign nature of giant wind turbines in pastoral settings. To secure the support of technologically minded moderns, these same turbines are applauded for their complexity and scale—far larger than the Statue of Liberty, built with the exotic chemistry of composites, and aerodynamically designed with highly sophisticated computer models, the technology readily earns hi-tech status (Parfit, 2005). Contesting the imagery is difficult. Big Wind resisters cite noise, bird mortality, and the industrialization of heretofore largely untrammeled land and seascapes in their arguments against Big Wind farms. But supporters counter with scientific evidence offered by experts ranging from ornithologists to acoustics specialists and underscore the larger threat of global warming in defense of these carbon-free alternatives. Importantly, the green energy case pits one set of environmental values against another, and depends on the priority of climate change to win out. But equally important, the environmental case for green energy fails to challenge the affluence-based development path secured by earlier energy systems. Rather than questioning the underlying premise of modern society to produce and consume without constraint, contemporary green energy advocates warmly embrace creating “bigger and more complex machines to spur and sate an endlessly increasing world energy demand” (Byrne & Toly, 2006, p. 3) Marketing slogans originally justifying fossil energy-based obesity can be revamped to suit the new green energy agenda: choosier mothers choose renewables and better living through green energy will motivate the postclimate change consumer to do the right thing. Yet the green energy agenda will not change the cause of the global warming threat (and so many other environmental harms), namely, unlimited consumption and production. In this sense, large renewable energy systems, touted as saviors of the planet, actually appear mainly to save modernity. A final problem specific to an extra-large green energy project is the distinctive environmental alienation it can produce. The march of commodification is spurred by the green titans as they seek to enter historic commons areas such as mountain passes, pasture lands, coastal areas, and the oceans, in order to collect renewable energy. Although it is not possible to formally privatize the wind or solar radiation (for example), the extensive technological lattices created to harvest renewable energy on a grand scale functionally preempt commons management of these resources.10 Previous efforts to harness the kinetic energy of flowing waters should have taught the designers of the mega-green energy program and their environmental allies that environmental and social effects will be massive and will preempt commons-based, society-nature relations. Instead of learning this lesson, the technophilic awe that inspired earlier energy obesity now emboldens efforts to tame the winds, waters, and sunlight—the final frontiers of he society-nature commons—all to serve the revised modern ideal of endless, but low- to no- carbon emitting, economic growth.

Multilateralism fails

Harvey, 4 – University Research Professor of International Relations, professor in the Department of Political Science, and the director of the Centre for Foreign Policy Studies at Dalhousie University (Frank, Smoke And Mirrors: Globalized Terrorism And The Illusion Of Multilateral Security, p. 43-45) // MS

The typical argument favouring multilateralism is a simple one, sum- marized by Ramesh Thakur: ‘Because the world is essentially anarchi- cal, it is fundamentally insecure, characterized by strategic uncertainty and complexity because of too many actors with multiple goals and interests and variable capabilities and convictions. Collective action embedded in international institutions that mirror mainly U.S. value preferences and interests enhances predictability, reduces uncertainty, and cuts the transaction costs of intemational action.’" With respect to peacekeeping, for example, Thakur argues that if ‘the UN helps to mute the costs and spread the risks of the terms of intemational engagement to maximise these benefits, the United States will need to instill in others, as well as itself embrace, the principle of multilateralism as a norm in its own right: states must do X because the United Nations has called for X, and good states do what the United Nations asks them to do.’l2 But there are several problems with Thakur's defence of collective action and associated policy recommendations, particularly in relation to multilateral approaches to security in a post-9/11 setting. First, and foremost, state leaders often refuse to do what the UN asks of them, are often more than prepared to have their publics suffer the consequences of whatever sanctions the UN can mount, and are rarely directly affected by the sanctions that are implemented – assuming the permanent members of the Security Council find it in their collective interest to implement a sanctions regime in the first place. The lessons from UN intervention and sanction efforts over the past decade are not at all encouraging in this regard. Second, many state and non-state actors fall outside the institutional constraints imposed on the system through global norms and regimes. As the capacity spreads for smaller and smaller groups to inflict increasingly devastating levels of damage on larger states, international institutions will lose the capacity to force or coerce compliance with international law. Consequently, leaders of major powers, such as the United States, will be compelled to respond to security threats through unilateral initiatives. This compulsion will force other powers to push that much harder to control American impulses by demanding that multilateral consensus remain the sole guarantor of legitimacy. These tensions will be exacerbated by the prevailing perception in the United States that these same multilateral institutions are constraining the power and capacity of the U.S. government to protect American citizens from emerging threats of terrorism and proliferation. Third, the collective-action argument put forward by Thai-cur typically (and erroneously) assumes that most states are governed by a similar set of political priorities, share common concerns about similar combinations of security threats, are stimulated into action (or inaction) by the same set of economic imperatives, are inspired by a common set of interests and overarching values (such as peace, security, stability), and are encouraged by their respective publics to meet their demands for a common set of public goods. But the differences, tensions, and overall level of competition among states in the system are far greater than proponents of multilateralism acknowledge. Some states are more threatened by terrorism and proliferation than others, have more substantial and direct economic interest in particular regions, are less interested in securing peace, and experience pressure from their respective publics to pursue very distinct foreign and security policies. Consequently, there is no guarantee that a collection of states will have the same motivation to change the status quo, or experience the same imperative to address the same security threats with the same level of resolve, commitment, or resources (relative to their size). In sum, multi- lateral organizations are less likely today to act with the same level of urgency to address security threats that Washington considers imperative. The costs of inaction (derived from exclusive reliance on multilateral consensus) are now perceived as being higher than the costs of unilateralism. Although similar threats may have guided collective action through multilateral alliances for much of the cold war, these imperatives were a product of a common Soviet threat. But threats today are many and varied, and few states share the same concerns or face the same obligations to respond. No case more clearly illustrates the growing divisions among former allies than the 2003 Iraq war. Fourth, decreasing transaction costs may be a valid argument in favour of multilateral cooperation in some cases (e. g., to facilitate post- conflict reconstruction, political reforms, democratization, elections run by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, food aid, water distribution, and the provision of medical supplies and facilities), but this is not true for all security challenges. In a post-9/11 environment, the transaction costs that are saved through joint efforts will always be compared with the costs of depending exclusively on collective-action mechanisms that ultimately may fail - multilateralism is not free of costs or risks. For example, one of the many important lessons of the 2003 Iraq war, at least for American officials, is that there are no collective-security guarantees any longer, even from traditional allies. The UN Security Council did not function as a separate entity committed to facilitating and coordinating diplomatic exchanges towards a common good. The UN functions in a highly competitive environment in which traditional power politics plays out. Proponents of multilateralism through the UNSC do not espouse that doctrine in the interest of global security; their efforts are typically designed to use the institution to limit the capacity of the U.S. to act unilaterally to protect American interests. That level of competition, itself driven by competing interpretations of interests, values, and threats, does not lend itself well to the kind of multilateralism its proponents aspire to achieve. Of course, if France shared the same concerns about terrorism, or if leaders in Paris were equally motivated to address the potential for WMD proliferation in and through Iraq, the transaction costs incurred by responding through the UN would be more acceptable. But as threat perceptions continue to diverge, the risks associated with waiting for multilateral consensus are simply too high. The complex nature of contemporary security threats virtually guarantees that similar conflicts will plague multilateral institutions in the future.

No US-Russia war- Russia is too weak to attack the US

Lieber, 07 – Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University (Robert J., "Persistent Primacy and the Future of the American Era", APSA Paper 2007, http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/2/1/1/0/5/pages211058/p211058-1.php)//VP

Constraints on the capacity of adversaries also needs to be taken into account. Russia under Putin has put pressure on its immediate neighbors and seeks to rebuild its armed forces, but Moscow’s ability to regain the superpower status of the former Soviet Union remains limited. The Russian armed forces are in woeful condition, the total population is half that of the USSR and declining by 700,000 per year, the economy is overwhelmingly dependent on revenues from oil and natural gas and thus vulnerable if world market prices soften, and the long term stability of its crony capitalism and increasingly authoritarian political system are uncertain. China, despite extraordinary economic growth and modernization, will continue to depend on rapid expansion of trade and the absorption of vast numbers of people moving from the countryside to the cities. It may well become a major military challenger of the United States, first regionally and even globally, but only over the long term.

No war or escalation- nuclear primacy prevents

Ross ‘5 (Robert S., Staff Writer for the National Interest, Fall, Assessing the China Threat. The National Interest. Lexis)

At the strategic level, after decades of research and testing, China is preparing to deploy solid-fuel ballistic missiles that can target U.S. allies in East Asia and may be nearing completion of an intercontinental ballistic missile that can target the continental United States. It is also making advances in development of its next-generation submarine-launched ballistic missiles. None of these developments should come as a surprise; U.S. intelligence has been following these programs since their inception. Moreover, these programs should not be considered a challenge to U.S. military superiority. Once these weapons are fully operational, perhaps by the end of the decade, China will have a more credible minimal second-strike capability. Despite recent Chinese bravado, not only is it hard to imagine a scenario in which China would use nuclear weapons in response to conventional hostilities, but U.S. retaliatory capabilities would make Chinese first-use suicidal. Continued modernization of its nuclear forces and massive quantitative superiority over China give the United States a far more robust deterrent posture vis-a -vis China than it ever possessed vis-a -vis the Soviet Union. Similarly, overwhelming U.S. nuclear superiority provides greater strategic security for our East Asian allies than U.S. nuclear capabilities ever provided for our European allies during the Cold War.