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#### China’s Latin American influence is increasing – trends prove

Martinez 13 (Guillermo I. Martinez, Columnist Sun Sentinel, “America losing influence throughout Latin America,” http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2013-05-23/news/fl-gmcol-oped0523-20130523\_1\_drug-cartels-latin-america-pri)

Finally, China has helped change the equation. After the fall of the Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall, for several years the United States was the only super power. When American presidents spoke, the world listened. Now China offers both a challenge to the United States, as a second super power, and has become an alternative economic trading partner for countries throughout the world. Still, it is inconceivable that American media and officials pay so little attention to the region. Maybe those around President Obama have not told him that Iran has close ties with Argentina, Cuba and Venezuela. Certainly the administration must know Cuba and Venezuela are so close that many critics of President Nicolás Maduro are now saying Cubans are helping to keep him in power. They talk, only part in jest, that there is a new country in the region called Cubazuela – the alliance between Cuba's Raúl Castro and Maduro's supporters is so close. It is true all have heard the main culprit of the drug trade in the world is American and European consumption. Yet the United States has waged war on the producers and importers, and not on the consumers at home. Seldom has Latin America been further from American influence. Many of the leftists' presidents in the region consider the United States their enemy. Others maintain cordial, or even friendly relations with Washington, but are quick to negotiate economic deals with China. The task is not easy, granted. Yet it would help if the United States and the Obama Administration articulated a policy for its neighbors in Latin America. They should not be a second thought in America foreign policy. The region deserves better. So does the United States. This country needs to improve those ties or continue to lose status as a premier world power.

#### Increase in US influence in Latin America directly trades off with Chinese influence

Ellis 12

Dr. R. Evan Ellis is a professor of national security studies, modeling, gaming, and simulation with the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, with a research focus on Latin America’s relationships with external actors, including China, Russia, and Iran. holds a Ph.D. in political science with a specialization in comparative politics. May 2012- The Inter-American Dialogue - “The United States, ¶ Latin America and China: ¶ A “Triangular Relationship”?” http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD8661\_China\_Triangular0424v2e-may.pdf

At the political level, US engagement with Latin American ¶ countries has impacted the ability of the PRC to develop ¶ military and other ties in the region. Although journalistic ¶ and academic accounts often suggest that the 19th century ¶ Monroe Doctrine continues to be pursued by contemporary ¶ US policymakers, with a presumed desire to “keep China out” ¶ of the region,26 official US policy has repeatedly met Chinese ¶ initiatives in the hemisphere with a cautiously welcoming tone.27 Nonetheless, Latin America’s own leadership has ¶ responded to Chinese initiatives with a view of how engagement with China could damage its relationship with the United ¶ States. Colombia’s close relationship with the United States, for ¶ example, made the military leadership of the country reluctant ¶ to procure major military items from the PRC.28¶ The same logic has also applied to countries such as ¶ Venezuela, Ecuador and Bolivia, for whom embracing the ¶ PRC politically and economically signaled displeasure with ¶ the United States. The degree to which a “bad” relationship ¶ with the United States has propelled a “positive” relationship with China has increasingly gone beyond symbolism. The desire of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez to ¶ diversify away from Venezuelan dependence on the United ¶ States as the nation’s primary oil export market, for example, opened the door for massive loan-backed Chinese ¶ construction projects, the purchase of Chinese commercial goods and greatly expanded participation by Chinese ¶ oil companies.29 US refusal to sell F-16 fighter aircraft and ¶ components to Venezuela in 2006 prompted Venezuela to ¶ engage with China, and other countries, to procure military ¶ hardware. Similarly, Bolivia purchased Chinese K-8s after ¶ the United States blocked it from acquiring a comparable ¶ aircraft from the Czech Republic.30

#### Chinese influence is key to Chinese growth

Armony 12(Ariel Armony is Weeks Professor in Latin American Studies, Professor of International Studies and Director of the Center for Latin American Studies (CLAS) at the University of Miami. Spring 2012 “What Is China to Latin America”, http://lacc.fiu.edu/hemisphere/hemisphere\_vol\_21.pdf nkj) Note—Please excuse the capitalization issues—the article wouldn’t copy right

What is China to Latin America? Among other things, China represents a market, a partner and a competitor. China’s need for primary commodities to feed its manufacturing growth and unprecedented urbanization entails a vast demand for everything from soybeans to copper as well as higher prices for such commodities in the international market. Latin American exports to China have skyrocketed in response to this demand in the last decade. High commodity prices and ample revenues are helping to sustain economic growth and strengthen fiscal accounts in several countries. As mentioned above, however, Chinese demand mainly benefits commodity producers in South American countries such as Brazil, Chile, Argentina and Peru. The smaller countries of Central America and the Caribbean cannot benefit from trade with China unless they find a niche market (such as Costa Rican coffee). The reliance on primary commodities also entails the risk of resource dependency for exporting nations. This pattern of trade has clear limitations for long-term development. Among other limitations, it is not a big job creator and it does not contribute by itself (that is, without state intervention) to alleviate poverty and inequality. In brief, China is a market for Latin America, and one with great potential, but a shift from “fairy tale” to realism will have to occur if the region wants sustained benefits in the long run. Is China a partner for Latin America? China has the potential to collaborate with Latin American countries in a number of ways: in the realms of technology, infrastructure, poverty reduction and educational programs; as a source of foreign investment and aid; and as an ally on the diplomatic front. as Juan Gabriel tokatlian has argued, for example, China’s model of international diplomacy entails some attractive notions for Latin America: multilateral politics, noninterference in domestic affairs, sovereign integrity, horizontal collaboration between “equals” and pragmatism. a concrete potential for partnership exists in this realm. China conceives of its national security as a three-pronged approach: “national sovereignty” (territorial integrity and national reunification), “comprehensive security” (preservation of its political and economic system and cultural heritage), and “security in the global system” (terms of insertion in the international system). to guarantee terms of insertion that could satisfy the Chinese leadership’s demand for “equality, fairness, and justice,”

#### That solves global economic collapse and nuclear lashout

Buzan and Foot 04 **–** professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science; professor of International Relations at St. Anthony College, (Barry and Rosemary, “Does China Matter? A Reassessment: Essays in Memory of Gerald Segal”, ed., Questia, p. 145-147, USC Libraries)//JK

China, East Asia and the world The underlying argument in this section is that there is a strong link between the global standing of a major power and the way that power relates to the other states in its home region. As a general rule, the status of great power, and more so superpower, requires not only that the state concerned be able and willing to project its political influence beyond its immediate region, but that it also be able in some sense to manage, and perhaps lead, its region (Buzan and Wæver, 2003). The U.S. clearly does this in North America, and more arguably for the Western hemisphere as a whole, and the EU does it in Europe. The Soviet Union did it from 1945 to 1989, and the possible inability of Russia to do it (and its desperation to do so) explain the current question marks around its status. India's failure to do it is a big part of what denies it the great-power recognition it craves. During the Cold War, and up to a point still, Japan could exploit its political geography to detach itself from much of Asian politics, and float free as a kind of economic great power. China does not have that kind of geopolitical option. Like Russia and India, it cannot escape regional politics. China's global standing thus depends crucially on what kind of relationship it has with its neighbours. If China is able to reassert some form of hegemony over twenty-first century Asia - getting most or all of its neighbours to bandwagon with it - then its global standing will be hugely enhanced. But if China inspires fear in its neighbours - causing them to balance against it - then like India, and possibly Russia, it will be locked into its region, and its global standing will be diminished. Since the U.S. is strongly present in Asia, its influence also plays into this equation. Indeed, if China is at odds with its neighbours then its position will be worse than that of Russia and India. In their immediate regions, those two have only to deal with powers much smaller than themselves. In China's region there are several very substantial powers whose antagonism would be a real burden. The importance of regional relations for a major power's global standing is easily shown by two extreme scenarios for China's future. In the first, China's development provides it with the strength and the identity to become the central hub of Asia, in the process largely displacing the U.S.. It projects an acceptable political and economic image, and its neighbours bandwagon with it out of some combination of fear, prudence, admiration and hope for economic advantage. Its economy becomes the regional locomotive, and in political and military terms it is acknowledged as primus inter pares by Japan, Korea and the ASEAN states. Japan takes up a similar subordinate relationship with China to that it now has with the U.S., and China is able to use the regional institutions created by ASEAN rather as the U.S. uses the Organization of American States. If the other Asian states fear to antagonize China, and don't balance against it, then China is both free to play a larger global role, and is insulated against pressure from the West. And if China succeeds in positioning itself at the centre of an Asian economy, then it can claim 'locomotive' status along with the U.S. and the EU in the global economy. In the second scenario, China inspires fear in its neighbours. Japan's alliance with the U.S. deepens, and India, Southeast Asia, Japan and possibly Russia coordinate their defences against China, probably with U.S. support. Under the first set of conditions, China acquires a stable regional base which gives it both the status and the capability to play seriously on the global political stage. Under the second set of conditions, China may still be the biggest power in East Asia, but its ability to play on the global stage would be seriously curtailed. The task for this section is thus to examine the social and material forces in play and ask how they might support or block a move in either of these directions. Is it likely that China will acquire hegemony in East Asia, or is its rise to power more likely to produce U.S.-backed regional balancing against it? I will examine the factors playing into this question on three levels: China's capabilities and the trajectory of its internal development; China's relations with its Asian neighbours; and its relationships with the U.S. and the other great powers. China's capabilities and the trajectory of its internal development Debates about China's capability and prospects for development can be placed within a matrix formed by two variables: • Does China get stronger (because its economic development continues successfully) or weaker (because its development runs into obstacles, or triggers socio-political instability)? • Does China become a malign, aggressive, threatening force in international society (because it becomes hypernationalist or fascist), or does it become more benign and cooperative (because economic development brings internal democratization and liberalization)? If China's development falters and it becomes weak, then it will neither dominate its region nor project itself on to the global stage. Whether it is then politically benign or malign will be a much less pressing issue in terms of how others respond to it in the traditional politico-military security domain. What could happen in this scenario is that a breakdown in the socio-political order, perhaps triggered by economic or environmental troubles, might well trigger large-scale migrations, political fragmentations, or wider economic crises that would pose serious threats to China's neighbours. A major political collapse in China could also pose threats at the global level, via the scenario of a failed nuclear weapon state. But, if China becomes strong, then the malign or benign question matters a great deal. The benign and malign options could be alternative paths, or could occur in sequence, with a malign phase giving way to a benign one, as happened with Germany and Japan during their comparable phases of industrialization. The likelihood of just such a sequence was what underpinned Gerry's concern to promote constrainment.

### 2

#### Oil prices high after Federal Reserve announcement - above $100 and predictive

**Witkowski et al 9/18** MarketWatch news editors in San Francisco (Wallace and Myra Saefong, Sept. 18, 2013 <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/oil-rises-after-supply-data-before-fed-decision-2013-09-18> “Oil tops $108 on U.S. crude supply drop, Fed”)

SAN FRANCISCO (MarketWatch) — Oil futures rallied on Wednesday after U.S. government data revealed a big weekly drop in crude supplies and the Federal Reserve maintained the pace of its bond purchases.¶ October crude oil [CLV3](http://www.marketwatch.com/investing/future/CLV3) -0.66% rose $2.65, or 2.5%, to settle at $108.07 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. Prices, which [fell 1.1%](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/oil-extends-losses-ahead-of-inventory-data-2013-09-17) in the previous session, traded at $105.73 before the government’s supply data and at $107.02 before the Fed announcement.¶ The U.S. Energy Information Administration Wednesday said crude stockpiles for the week ended Sept. 13 fell 4.4 million barrels. Analysts polled by Platts expected a decline of 1.5 million barrels.¶ Then, the Fed surprised investors and said[it would not taper its](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/in-surprise-fed-decides-not-to-taper-2013-09-18) $85-billion-a-month in bond purchases for now, with [Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke](http://blogs.marketwatch.com/capitolreport/2013/09/18/live-blog-and-video-of-fed-taper-decision-and-bernanke-press-conference/) saying that economic data since June did not support a reduction in buys.¶ “The decision by the Fed not to taper has immediately manifested itself in further gains for oil today — after a rally was kick-started by a bullish inventory report — as a weaker dollar and ongoing stimulus is viewed as supportive for oil prices,” said Matt Smith, commodity analyst at Schneider Electric, in emailed comments.¶ The EIA data came in contrast to a much smaller-than-expected crude supply decline reported by the American Petroleum Institute late Tuesday. The API reported a roughly 252,000-barrel fall. The EIA said gasoline supplies fell 1.6 million barrels, while distillate stockpiles were down 1.1 million barrels. Gasoline stockpiles were expected to be unchanged, while forecasts called for an increase of 1 million barrels for distillates.¶ On Nymex, October gasoline [RBV3](http://www.marketwatch.com/investing/future/RBV3) -0.22% rose 8 cents, or 3%, to settle at $2.74 a gallon, and October heating oil was up 4 cents, or 1.4%, at $3.04 a gallon.¶ November Brent crude [UK:LCOX3](http://www.marketwatch.com/investing/future/LCOX3?countrycode=UK) +0.39% , the European benchmark, gained $2.41, or 2.2%, to $110.60 a barrel, following a 1.7% drop Tuesday on ICE Futures.¶ Commerzbank said Brent oil would see some support from Libyan outages and the lingering possibility of a U.S. attack on Syrian government targets.¶ “The still numerous supply outages and the residual risk of a renewed escalation of the Syrian crisis are likely to preclude any sharper fall in prices, so we do not envisage any prolonged price slide

#### Development of a new effective technology causes a broad US shift away from oil – that crushes global oil producers’ economies

**Miller 10**—assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma (Gregory D., April 2010, © Center for Strategic and International Studies, *The Washington Quarterly* 33:2, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence,” http://www.twq.com/10april/docs/10apr\_Miller.pdf, RBatra)

The United States only gets about 15 percent of its oil from the Middle East. Nearly 22 percent of all OPEC oil, however, is sold to the United States.26 The United States is the world’s largest consumer of oil (more than 25 percent), and a reduction in U.S. demand will have a dramatic effect on the price of oil and on the world’s oil-exporting states. The real effects of a drop in U.S. consumption are difficult to predict and may depend on how the United States reduces its demand. If it does so simply through conservation, then the gradual decline in demand will likely have minimal effects on oil exporters. On the other hand, a drastic drop in demand, such as that associated with the development of a new technology, will have significant economic repercussions for a number of countries, even those that do not sell much oil to the United States.

#### It also leads to OPEC flooding the market –turns case

**Energy Tech Stocks 8**—**quoting Dr.** **Marcel, Ph.D. in IR** and Senior Research Fellow at the Chatham House(“Petro-politics Expert Marcel: Saudis Have Oil But Not Enough; OPEC May Flood Market To Hurt New Techs,” 27 January 2008, <http://energytechstocks.com.previewmysite.com/wp/?cat=15&paged=2>, AMiles)

Saudi Arabia still has a lot of oil; nevertheless, the world doesn’t have enough to meet forecasted demand of roughly 115 million barrels a day by 2030, a more than 30% increase over today’s 87 million barrel daily consumption. Shorter term, should OPEC members feel threatened by new alternative energy technologies, they very well may flood the market, temporarily driving crude prices down in order to make the new technologies appear financially unattractive. That’s the analysis of Valerie Marcel, a Dubai-based petro-politics expert and the author of “Oil Titans: National Oil Companies in the Middle East.” During a lengthy conversation, Marcel, who is an associate fellow at UK-based Chatham House, one of Europe’s leading foreign policy think-tanks, told EnergyTechStocks.com that she wasn’t optimistic that oil shortages can be avoided, despite growing recognition of the problem in major oil-consuming nations. Marcel further said that the Saudi national oil company – Saudi Aramco – appears worried about fuel cell vehicles and other attempts by the world to wean itself off oil, and that should it and other OPEC members feel threatened, they would “play hardball,” flooding the market in an attempt to derail the new technologies. Marcel said that after 36 separate interviews with oil company officials, she believes Saudi Arabia probably has about **75 years of reserves remaining** at current production rates, and that the Kingdom is capable of raising daily production from around nine million barrels a day currently to a sustained 12.5 million per day, which is its plan. At the same time, Marcel said she understands why, given the Kingdom’s self-imposed secrecy surrounding its oil industry, the world keeps asking, “Why should we trust them?”

#### That crushes prices

**Mohamedi 3** (Fareed , Chief economist at PFC Energy. “Add Added In the Wake of War: Geo–strategy, Terrorism, Oil and Domestic Politics,” Spring 2003, Middle East Policy, 10.1, Ebsco)

A more aggressive strategy - and actually a better strategy for the Saudis in many ways over the longer term and for OPEC - would be to crash oil prices and not agree to accommodate Iraq. To do what they did in '99 and inadvertently discovered had some advantages: push the burden onto non-OPEC producers - the high-cost producers - and over time induce a decline in non-OPEC production, and then come back and take that share of demand for themselves. That would require a fairly low oil price, $14-$15 a barrel. You may ask, how can the oil producers' economies take that? They can barely take it at $30 a barrel. If you look at the macroeconomic situation in some of the Gulf countries - Saudi Arabia and Iran, even Algeria - they have accumulated a lot of assets and paid down a lot of their debt. Financially, they're doing a lot better than they were just a few years ago. To a certain extent, they have the war chest to do this if they have the will and the guts. In sharp contrast, this would be disastrous for Indonesia, Russia, Venezuela and Nigeria. None of these countries can take that type of low oil price for a period of 18 months to two years.

#### Low prices collapse the Russian economy and undermine the regime

**Kramer 12** – New York Times writer and editor (ANDREW E. “Higher Oil Prices to Pay for Campaign Promises” New York Times March 16, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/17/business/global/vladimir-putins-big-promises-need-fueling-by-high-oil-prices.html?\_r=2?pagewanted=print Putin Needs ajones)

MOSCOW — In American presidential politics, high oil prices are a problem. For Vladimir V. Putin’s new presidential term in Russia, they will be a necessity — crucial to fulfilling his campaign promises to lift government spending by billions of dollars a year. But doing that without busting the Kremlin’s budget would require oil to reach and sustain a price it has never yet achieved — $150 a barrel, according to one estimate by Citigroup. No wonder economists who specialize in Russia are skeptical. (On Friday, Russia’s Ural Blend export-grade oil was trading at $120 on the global spot market.) “It’s very hard to overestimate how vulnerable the Russian economy is to external pressures” from the oil price, Sergei Guriev, the rector of the New Economic School in Moscow, said in a telephone interview. “That vulnerability is huge, which is why Russia must be very vigilant. The spending is a risk.” The promised spending is also ambitious. Mr. Putin has laid out a program of raising wages for doctors and teachers, padding retirement checks for everyone and refurbishing Russia’s military arsenal. The oil-lubricated offerings would even include a population premium: expanding the popular “baby bonus” payments the Russian government provides to mothers, to include a third child. The payment, of up to $8,300 for housing or baby-related expenses, now comes as an incentive only with each of the first two children. The additional cost of the expanded baby benefits alone will total $4.6 billion a year, according to an estimate by the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. Most of Mr. Putin’s spending promises came at least partly in response to the street demonstrations by young and middle-class protesters in Moscow and other big cities challenging his authority in the weeks leading up to the March 4 election. His apparent aim was to shore up support from the rest of Russia: poorer and rural parts of the country, and from state workers and the elderly. The repercussions of his campaign promises, and an earlier commitment on military spending, could be felt for years to come, giving price swings in oil a bigger role than ever on the Russian economy. Taxes on oil and natural gas sales provide half of Russia’s government revenue. Each increase in the Russian budget equivalent to 1 percent of the gross domestic product requires a rise in the price of oil of about $10 a barrel on global markets — which is how Citigroup arrived at the $150-a-barrel figure for meeting the new obligations Mr. Putin has taken on. Analysts worry that, even if the government can fulfill its promises, too little will remain for a sovereign wealth fund that is intended as a shock absorber for the Russian economy and the ruble exchange rate during an oil price slump. Russia needed to use that buffer as recently as 2008, during the financial crisis. “The concern is simple,” Kingsmill Bond, the chief strategist at Citigroup in Russia, said in a telephone interview. “If the oil price that Russia requires to balance its budget is higher, the systemic risks that the market faces are also higher.” The bank estimated that Mr. Putin’s promises of higher wages and pensions, not counting the military outlays, add up to additional spending equal to 1.5 percent of Russia’s gross domestic product. That comes on top of an earlier pledge to spend an additional 3 percent of gross domestic product a year re-arming the military. In all, the new commitments would add up to about $98 billion a year, Citigroup estimates. The spillover from the Arab Spring and the specter of an Israeli attack on Iran’s nuclear development plants are propping up oil prices now. But over the long term, economic stagnation in Europe could help bring them down. Even before the election, Russia’s government spending was up, helping reinforce Mr. Putin’s message that he was the best candidate to deliver prosperity and stability. In January, the Russian military ministry, for example, doubled salaries in the nation’s million-person army. It was ostensibly a long-planned move. But coming just two months before the presidential vote, the political message was clear. Also smoothing the path for Mr. Putin’s victory was a national cap on utility rates that helped keep inflation at the lowest level in Russia’s post-Soviet history for January and February, at a 3.7 percent annual pace. “Putin made large spending commitments,” the Fitch rating agency said in a statement released the day after the election. “The current high price of oil cushions Russia’s public finances,” Fitch said. “But in the absence of fiscal tightening that significantly cuts the non-oil and gas fiscal deficit, a severe and sustained drop in the oil price would have a damaging impact on the Russian economy and public finances and would likely lead to a downgrade” of the nation’s credit rating. As Mr. Putin’s spending promises started to be introduced in January, Fitch altered Russia’s outlook to stable, from positive. Mr. Putin has defended the proposed spending as necessary and just, given the hardship of teachers and other public sector workers in the post-Soviet years. “A doctor, a teacher, a professor, these people should make enough money where they work so they don’t have to look for a side job,” Mr. Putin wrote in a manifesto published during the campaign. But in fact, the government will offset a portion of the pay raises, perhaps as much as one-third of their cost, by laying off some public sector workers and trimming some other public spending. That was the word from Lev I. Yakobson, the deputy rector of the Higher School of Economics, who helped draft the policy. That part of the plan, though, was never part of Mr. Putin’s stump speech.

#### Nuclear war

**Filger 9** –Sheldon Filger, columnist and founder of GlobalEconomicCrisis.com, May 10, 2009, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction,” online: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html

The Medvedev/Putin regime has initiated a host of policy responses to mitigate the impact of the Global Economic Crisis on the nation's fragile economy. Time will determine their long-term effectiveness; however, in the short-term some measures have proven more efficacious than others. A major goal of Moscow's economic technocrats has been to stabilize the country's banking system, and for the time being a degree of success has been achieved through government provision of liquidity to financial institutions. However, this complex geopolitical space that is Russia is now facing a vast array of complex challenges that other members of the G8 are spared, despite the destructive impact of the global synchronized recession facing all major industrialized countries.

In Russia, historically, **economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other** major **industrialized economies**. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash.

Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is **a geopolitical dimension** that **is even more relevant** then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability **to destroy the world** as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the **greatest national security threat** to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world.

During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

### 3

#### Obama has held off new sanctions on iran but needs PC to sustain Congressional support for ongoing negotiation commitments

Parsi 11 – 20 – 13 (Trita Parsi is founder and president of the National Iranian American Council and an expert on US-Iranian relations, “Negotiations with Iran show promise, but true test comes later,” <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2013/11/iran-us-negotiationsgenevanuclearprogram.html>, CMR)

However, it is also clear that the real hurdles to an enduring deal will not be encountered now, but after the first agreement has been concluded. This is partly because Washington's ability to give concessions has not been truly tested yet. The **misinformation spread by** Israeli cabinet ministers and **opponents of** President Barack **Obama in** the U.S. **Congress notwithstanding, most of concessions in the first phase of the deal currently being negotiated in Geneva will be provided by Tehran**. **In return, the U**nited **S**tates and European Union **are offering** very **little**. **The sanctions relief is minimal and carefully avoids congressional approval**. **Obama has spent** a lot of political capital in the past two weeks simply **to convince Congress not to adopt new sanctions**. If a deal is reached this week in Geneva, **Obama will be faced with** **the** much taller order **of getting Congress to actually roll back existing sanctions**.

#### That’s key to preventing talks failure

Mousavian 10/18, Seyed Hossein “The road to finalizing a nuclear deal with Iran”, 2013 <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2013/10/18/iran-nuclear-talksgenevauraniumenrichment.html>, CMR

These ongoing talks have the potential to become a historic moment for the U.S., Iran and the international community. However, to ensure their progress, President Obama must do two things. First, he must resist pressure from hawkish members of Congress, Israel and lobbying groups such as the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs and United Against Nuclear Iran. And second, he must include significant sanctions relief in the final agreement with Iran. While Iran and the international community are ready for a final deal, the question remains whether Obama has the will to buck the hawkish pro-Israel lobby and the political capital to end sanctions.

#### Plan kills pc

Shear, 13

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

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

#### Negotiations failure turns multilat and causes global nuclear war

Press TV 11/13 Cites Jeff Steinberg, a Senior Editor at the Executive Intelligence Review, “Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail”, <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/>, CMR

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

### 4

#### The United States federal government should extend a tax credit of 39 cents for every dollar invested by business, non-governmental organizations, and individuals that increase renewable [non-hydrocarbon] energy integration with the United Mexican States

#### Tax credits solves the case – avoid corruption and bureaucracy – aff fails – waste

Werker, 7

(Professor-Harvard Business School, 10/20, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/20/opinion/20werker.html)

While foreign aid works in some situations, it is beset by two huge problems. First, there is never enough money to go around. Last year, the United States provided $23 billion of development aid to foreign countries. This was more than any other donor, but it still resulted in very little for the billion people who live on less than one dollar per day. The second problem is that the money that does get distributed doesn't always reach the people who need it. As Jeffrey Sachs has noted, of every dollar given to Africa, only 44 cents is actually directed toward economic development. The rest goes to debt service, consultants and humanitarian emergencies. And after those expenses are subtracted, the money that remains is further reduced by mismanagement and corruption. A solution to both problems would be to give tax credits to American companies that invest in qualified developing countries. A similar program that focuses on domestic poverty has been a resounding success. In 2000, Congress created $6 billion of tax credits for businesses that invest in poor communities within the United States. The theory was that the cycles of poverty and joblessness in poor communities could be ended only by the development of local businesses, not by an aid check. Seven years later, so many businesses want to invest in poor areas that only a quarter of the companies that applied for tax credits in 2006 received them. Using the domestic program as a template, Congress should provide a 39-cent tax credit for every dollar of American investment in developing countries. If General Electric were to build a $100 million factory in Madagascar, its tax bill would be reduced by $39 million. The lost revenue to government coffers would be offset by reducing direct foreign aid by the same amount. The power of substituting tax credits for lump sums of cash is that while the latter would bring at most $39 million to Madagascar, the former results in a $100 million investment. For the exact same cost to the federal government, Madagascar receives far more resources. And by leveraging its foreign aid dollars, the United States is better off too, for reasons ranging from the creation of new markets to alleviating conditions that may aid terrorist recruitment. Using tax credits instead of traditional foreign aid also means that the money will be spent more prudently. Because for-profit companies are focused on the bottom line, these companies will by nature be more protective than government agencies of the money they invest in developing countries. Developing countries themselves clamor for more foreign investment as a way to generate real economic development. They set up export promotion agencies and offer their own tax breaks to foreign companies. With $100 million in foreign investment from American companies, government officials in Madagascar could spend their time tackling other domestic problems. Moving from inefficient direct aid to investment tax credits could lead to a fivefold increase in the capital that is deployed in developing countries. Of the $23 billion the United States currently spends on foreign aid, less than half reaches the ground. Providing $23 billion in tax credits, on the other hand, would lead to $59 billion of investment, if the domestic formula is applied abroad. Of course, the private sector is not always efficient, and not all of the money allocated to foreign aid should be converted to tax credits. But by involving the private sector, the United States could significantly increase the amount of money we spend in poor countries, without using any more taxpayer dollars. A program of tax credits for private investment in developing countries could be structured to reinforce goals other than economic growth. The tax credits could be awarded to countries that embrace ''green'' development or good governance, providing an extra incentive for countries to achieve these goals. Eligibility could be restricted to new investment that generates jobs and transfers know-how to the poorest countries that do not compete directly with American workers.

#### Leakage means they only solve half the aff

Desai, 10

(Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Wolfensohn Center for Development at the Brookings Institution, and Associate Professor of International Development in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, 42 N.Y.U. J. Int'l L. & Pol. 1111, Summer)

Official aid is perceived to have low transaction costs because it operates at large scale. But official aid travels a long route, with costs at each stage. The first stage is the cost of tax collection when money is transferred from individuals to the treasury. In this stage, costs consist of the direct administrative costs of tax collection as well as deadweight losses from taxation. These costs can be substantial. n24 In the second stage, official donor agencies transfer funds to recipient country governments to support specific development projects and programs. The administrative costs of these agencies have averaged between 4 to 5 percent, according to statistics reported by the OECD Development Assistance Committee. n25 The third stage involves costs associated with transferring the money from the recipient government to final beneficiaries through project implementation. Administrative costs of the project, corruption, and other leakages mean that only about half the funds actually reach their stated end purpose. n26 [\*1127] In all, transaction costs on official aid could amount to 60 percent or more. Private aid, particularly internet-based, offers a more direct connection between donors and recipients and potentially reduces transaction costs. At both GlobalGiving or Kiva, the flow of funds route is short: money goes from an individual to the online platform, where it is pooled and transferred to a financial or project intermediary in a recipient country, which then disburses to the final beneficiaries. The long route of passing through government bureaucracies is avoided.

#### Lack of risk-taking turns solvency

Natsios, 10

(Prof of Diplomacy and Government-Georgetown and former administrator of USAID, *Center for Global Development, “*The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development”, July)

The Counter-bureaucracy

One of the little understood, but most powerful and disruptive tensions in established aid agencies lies in the clash between the compliance side of aid programs and the technical, program side. The essential balance between these two tensions in development programs— accountability and control versus good development practice—has now been skewed to such a degree in the U.S. aid system (and in the World Bank as well) that the imbalance threatens program integrity. The regulatory pressures in Washington created a force of auditors, accountants, lawyers, and procurement and contracts officers whose job it is to make sure the aid program is managed: (1) in accordance with federal law and regulation―principally the 450-page Foreign Assistance Act, a volume of OMB management circulars, and the 1977 pages of Federal Acquisition Regulations; (2) to produce rapid, measureable program success tracked through quantitative performance indicators usually based on U.S. domestic models of program management or of private industry; and (3) to follow good federal management and accounting practices as demanded by law and regulation. The compliance officers often clash with the technical program specialists over attempts to measure and account for everything and avoid risk. These technical program specialists are experts in the major sector disciplines of development: international health, agriculture, economic (both macro and micro) growth, humanitarian relief, environment, infrastructure, and education. Undertaking development work in poor countries with weak institutions involves a high degree of uncertainty and risk, and aid agencies are under constant scrutiny by policy makers and bureaucratic regulatory bodies to design systems and measures to reduce that risk. In practice, this means compromising good development practices such as local ownership, a focus on institution building, decentralized decisionmaking and long-term program planning horizons to assure sustainability in order to reduce risk, improve efficiency (at least as it is defined by federal administrative practice), and ensure proper recordkeeping and documentation for every transaction. Slowly, almost imperceptibly, over several decades, the compliance side of U.S. government aid programs has grown at the expense of the technical, program side. This has happened as a result of four factors. First, the size of the career USAID staff has declined over three decades, stabilizing after 9/11 (and only beginning to rise slowly again in 2005), even as spending more than doubled since 9/11. Second, is the emergence of what Georgetown professor, William Gormley, has called the ―counter-bureaucracy—a set of U.S. government agencies charged with command and control of the federal bureaucracy through a set of budgeting, oversight, accountability, and measurement systems that have grown over several decades to a massive degree, with extraordinary layer upon layer of procedural and compliance requirements. Third, the counter-bureaucracy has become infected with a very bad case of Obsessive Measurement Disorder (OMD), an intellectual dysfunction rooted in the notion that counting everything in government programs (or private industry and increasingly some foundations) will produce better policy choices and improved management. Fourth, demands of the oversight committees of Congress for ever more information, more control systems, and more reports have diverted professional USAID (and now MCC) staff from program work to data collection and reporting requirements. The counter-bureaucracy ignores a central principle of development theory—that those development programs that are most precisely and easily measured are the least transformational, and those programs that are most transformational are the least measurable. This brings us to a central question: what is it that USAID does in its programs that is considered transformational? USAID‘s humanitarian and development work may be broadly broken into three categories: (1) the delivery of goods and services (e.g., distributing of food aid and humanitarian assistance after a disaster, doing immunizations, distributing bed nets to control malaria, building of schools and roads), often through USAID partner contractors, universities, and nongovernmental organizations, (2) the building of local self-sustaining institutions—government, private sector, and nonprofit—through the training of staff, construction of business systems, and development of regular organizational procedures and institutional cultures, and (3) policy dialogue and reform, which means an ongoing discussion and debate about reform and policy changes, between development professionals in USAID missions, in the field, and with cabinet ministers, heads of state, local NGOs and civil society leaders, parliamentarians, and business leaders. The first of these missions―service delivery―includes outcomes that can be counted and seen and that are under the control of the USAID program implementers, while the latter two missions often are neither easily measured nor very visible, and require a long time horizon to achieve success; more important, they require the cooperation and consent of the power structure and leadership in the developing countries, which makes their outcomes more problematic and unpredictable. (A USAID-funded NGO can do a mass immunization of children successfully, but providing funding, training, and equipment to a local health ministry to do the same thing will usually have a more problematic outcome). For that reason, those latter two functions are increasingly underfunded and neglected, yet they are the most important in the long run, as they are more transformational and more central to what development—and state building—is all about. The counter-bureaucracy, dominated by civil servants trained in schools of public administration and business management, employs the measurements and program standards of U.S. domestic government agencies, foundations, and private industry and misapplies them to development programs in poor countries. Nothing could be further from good development theory and practice. When the Federal Highway Administration funds and oversees a highway building project, it uses the managerial standards of domestic transportation departments to judge whether the project was managed properly. When GM or Ford builds a car, it uses assembly-line processes developed over the past century. The purpose of these efforts is the building of a highway or assembly of a car. Development, on the other hand, is at its root an effort to build or strengthen institutions (public, private profit-making, and nonprofit civil society) in poor and fragile states, with the ultimate goal of developing a capable state, market economy, and civil society that can manage public services, design good policies, create jobs, and protect human rights and the rule of law on a reliable, sustainable basis after the aid program is over and funding ends. All construction or service delivery projects should be subordinate to the larger institution-building task. The counter-bureaucracy, with its elaborate control mechanisms, misunderstands this central development doctrine and thus misapplies a domestic management lens to aid programs by turning the means into an end. The demands of the counter-bureaucracy are now so intrusive that they have distorted, misdirected, and disfigured USAID‘s development practice to such a degree that it is compromising U.S. national security objectives and challenging established principles of good development practice. This regulatory apparatus has created an incentive structure that has led to an emphasis on process over program substance and, in so doing, has produced a perverse bureaucratic result; as the career staff has declined in size absolutely and proportionately to the size of the aid budget, the compliance side of aid has taken over management and decision making at the agency. When the agency does not comply with the commands of the counter- bureaucracy, it faces stiff penalties, but there is no legal or regulatory consequence if agency staff do not regularly interact with government officials, civil society organizations, and the business people in developing countries about political, economic, and social policy reform— i.e., the central practices of development work. The newest addition to the counter-bureaucracy—the State Department‘s Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance—is making matters worse, creating an even more dysfunctional set of incentives that are compromising the integrity of aid programs by the demand for metrics for every program and through the laborious and time-consuming annual process of each USAID mission writing an Annual Operating Plan. The question remains whether under sustained pressure from the counter-bureaucracy and the Congress, USAID is now spending as much money on oversight and control as on implementation of the aid program itself. What is more, the staff time needed to comply with all of these paperwork requirements has crowded out any remaining available time for the actual implementation of programs in the field offices. A point can be reached when compliance becomes counterproductive. I believe we are well past that point. What happened, why it happened, and how it happened is a disturbing, but also fascinating, story of good intentions—accountability and transparency—gone bad. The consequences of these counter-bureaucratic trends explain a great deal about why USAID business systems are designed as they are. But, before we get to the story of compliance and bureaucracy ―gone bad, we need a framework for our analysis. The source for that framework comes from the work of political scientist and scholar on public administration practice in U.S. state and national governments—and my former professor—James Q. Wilson.

#### Top down planning and politicization turn solvency – we control empirics

Coyne 5/21 Associate Director of the F. A. Hayek Program for Advanced Study in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics at the Mercatus Center F.A. Harper Professor of Economics at the Mercatus Center Professor of Economics at George Mason University (Christopher, “Why Government Aid Programs Aren’t the Best Way to End Poverty”, Mercatus Center, George Mason University, May 21, 2013, <http://mercatus.org/expert_commentary/why-government-aid-programs-aren-t-best-way-end-poverty>)

Based on the high standards of living enjoyed by their citizens, you might think that the governments of First World countries know how to create development. They don’t. Development isn’t created by anyone, not least well-intentioned politicians or development “experts”. The process of improving well-being only takes place in an environment that encourages constant innovation and experimentation. Unfortunately, the state-led aid industry not only neglects the realities of development, but often takes actions that actively undermine it. For First World countries, development does not mean allowing other societies to go through the same messy process they did themselves. It entails top-down planning and grandiose promises that – this time – their plans will end poverty and suffering for good. Just consider the $9bn (£5.9bn) pledged to Haiti following its 2010 earthquake. Only a small portion was delivered, and even that has proven ineffective. Haiti’s President Michel Martelly recently concluded that aid “isn’t showing results”. There are two reasons why state-provided aid cannot create society-wide prosperity. First, policymakers do not have access to the knowledge needed to allocate scarce resources to their best uses. In his critique of socialism in the 1930s and 1940s, Nobel Laureate Friedrich Hayek made this exact point, noting that even the most qualified and benevolent planners lack the knowledge to produce even the most basic items in a cost-effective manner. Investor Thomas Thwaites recently embarked on a fascinating endeavour, the Toaster Project, which illustrates Hayek’s point. Thwaites tried to build a simple toaster from scratch. He quickly found the task was overly complex, involving hundreds of parts and materials from many locations. After much travel and effort to extract and process these materials, he constructed his (extremely ugly) toaster. Upon being plugged into an electric socket, it burned out within seconds. Thwaites realised that “the scale of industry involved in making a toaster is ridiculous, but at the same time the chain of discoveries and small technological developments that occurred along the way make it entirely reasonable.” No central planner determined the process, yet toasters are readily available. This is economic development. The perverse incentives associated with aid are a second reason governments can’t create development. These exist both within the recipient and donor governments. For recipients, aid creates the incentive for already dysfunctional governments to remain ineffective. A cross-country study by Stephen Knack of the World Bank found that foreign assistance undermines the quality of political institutions in recipient countries through weakened accountability of political actors, more corruption, greater chances of conflict, and a weakening of the incentive to reform inefficient institutions and policies. For donors, government agencies tend to focus on spending money as quickly as possible on observable outputs to signal their importance and the need for more money. In the absence of clear lines of accountability, money is often wasted. Consider that a recent report by the Special Inspector General for the Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) identified $8bn in funds that were either wasted or unaccounted for. When people are not held responsible for their actions, they tend to act carelessly. Aid efforts are plagued by similar issues. Economic freedom, which requires general protections of person and property, avoids both of these problems. It does not fall prey to the knowledge problem that Hayek warned of because it recognises that attempting to micromanage economic outcomes is doomed to fail. Likewise, it avoids creating perverse incentives because it limits direct political interventions into voluntary interaction between people. What can be done? Instead of looking to fix other societies, developed nations should focus on their own policies towards people living elsewhere. As the Toaster Project illustrates, increasing the extent of the market is the best means of delivering more and cheaper goods and services. If the desired end is to help the worst off, this provides a benchmark for judging policies: does it contribute to increasing the extent of the voluntary market? If the answer is “yes”, those policies will be most effective at improving living standards and removing suffering.

### Mexico

#### Renewables cooperation high and resilient

Wood 10 – PhD in Political Studies @ Queen’s, Professor @ ITAM in Mexico City (Duncan, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, [http://www.statealliancepartnership.org/resources\_files/USMexico\_Cooperation\_Renewable\_Energies.pdf)//BB](http://www.statealliancepartnership.org/resources_files/USMexico_Cooperation_Renewable_Energies.pdf)/BB)

The history of cooperation between Mexico and the United States in renewable energy is surprisingly long and multi-faceted and it has been a vital, albeit unheralded, dimension to bilateral relations and a significant boost to rural and later national development for over 18 years. Cooperation in some areas goes back even further than that, with geothermal energy collaboration extending back to the 1970s. Although it is now seen as crucial in the context of efforts to mitigate climate change, renewable energy in Mexico has and always has been seen as a development tool, helping to bring energy and employment to marginalized areas that are not connected to the national electricity grid.¶ Beginning in the 1990s, USAID has invested in long term programs seeking to increase opportunities for renewable energy in Mexico, focusing mainly on small projects in rural areas but also increasingly on projects that a having a far-reaching impact on Mexico's energy profile. The investments made by the US government in mapping Mexico's wind energy resources in Oaxaca and other parts of the country have helped to develop a new source of energy for the national grid and for private consumption, and a new source of employment, investment, technical expertise and economic growth.

Coop has been and still is high and successful – that’s cx

#### Economic ties are high and resilient

Wilson 11 – MA in International Affairs @ American U, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs (Christopher, “Working Together,” Mexico Institute @ Woodrow Institute, Scholar)//BB

The economic ties between the United States and Mexico are reinforced by a large web of social networks. Thirty-two million U.S. residents, or one in ten, are of Mexican origin, including roughly 12 million people born in Mexico.10 Perhaps a million Americans live in Mexico, almost a fifth of all Americans who live abroad.11 Close to 15,000 Mexicans are pursuing college degrees in the United States, and 13 million Mexicans visit the U.S. in 2010.12 As the top tourist destination for U.S. travelers, an even larger 19 million U.S. residents visit Mexico each year.13 Just as social networks often facilitate the creation of commercial relationships within the United States, the depth and intensity of bilateral social integration spurs the development of economic links between the U.S. and Mexico. Import and export relationships, production sharing arrangements, and investment opportunities are all made easier by the relatively high level of understanding derived from the geographic and cultural proximity of United States and Mexico.

#### Our ev is predictive, relations are high now, and issues are compartmentalized – NGO’s fill in

Selee and Diaz-Cayeros 13 (Andrew and Alberto) “The Dynamics of US Mexico Relations” Mexico and the United States: the politics of partnership. 2013. Book

Yet positive factors favor prospects for more effective partnership and are likely to drive cooperation over time. First among these is the genuine interdependence of interests that underlies integration between the two countries. Everyday issues that need to be resolved – from the GM bailout to drug trafficking to natural disasters and water shortages at the border – create a dynamic of constant engagement around highly concrete topics that policymakers on the two sides of the border need to address. Moreover, the growing complexity of the relationship means that even when disputes arise among the two countries’ political leaders, progress continues along a number of other areas, driven by federal agencies, state, and local governments, and nongovernmental actors. Increasingly, interactions between the two countries take place simultaneously along a wide number of different points of engagement, which are largely independent of each other and have their own particular dynamics. Progress on one does not necessarily augur progress on another; nor does failure in one area lead to failure in another. Nonetheless, progress in depending engagement between the two countries will constantly be challenged by the persistent asymmetries that condition the relationship. The different in geopolitical realities of the two countries, the continuing inequality in average income between them and the dissimilar capacities of the two states are likely to continue to limit some efforts at greater cooperation. Recent tendencies have softened the impact of some of these asymmetries. Democratization in Mexico has made the political systems of the two countries more similar. Increased economic and social exchanges have built ties that mitigate some of the most visible asymmetries and forced the two countries to seek solutions to shared problems. Public opinion studies show how far the two countries have gone in recognizing their mutual interest in working together despite their differences, with ordinary citizens generally far ahead of political elites. Over the long term, interdependence will force the two countries closer and complexity will allow the relationship to lay down even deeper roots along multiple points of engagement. However, asymmetry will continue to create frictions and provide a brake on progress in cooperation. The relationship between the United States and Mexico will continuously deepen, but will be a process fraught with tension. The countries have ceased to be distant neighbors but as yet they remain far away from being strategic partners whose relationship is guided by a common vision of mutually beneficial shared outcomes.

#### Alt causes – poverty, Merida, and NAFTA

Hakim et al 2/1 – (Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and Laura Carlsen, director of the Americas program at the Center for International Policy, Latin America Advisor, February 1, 2013 “Have Prospects for U.S.-Mexican Relations Improved?” <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3222>) DF

A: Laura Carlsen, director of the Americas program at the Center for International Policy: "All major issues at stake in U.S.-Mexico relations-immigration--labor, security, trade, environment, climate, human rights--will experience a turning point over the coming years. Immigration reform, likely to be accomplished, will improve relations depending on its final form; legal status would enfranchise U.S. Latinos, deepening democracy, and allow for travel. This will reunite families and increase citizen diplomacy between the two nations--both big pluses for the U.S.-Mexico relationship. Other changes will be mixed. Blind cooperation in the failed drug war through more Mérida Initiative funding will improve military/intelligence cooperation while propelling violence as it has for the past five years and adding to deteriorating human security conditions, militarization and corruption. Unfortunately, signs point to continuation without a comprehensive evaluation of the damage done to date--John Kerry reiterated support for the Bush-era plan in confirmation hearings and Medina-Mora's appointment sends a sign to Washington that the Peña Nieto government will accept the U.S. security aid strategy, since Medina-Mora was a point man for the drug war as attorney general in the first years of the Calderón government. Citizen calls for an end to support for Mexico's drug war will increase, but will face strong pushback from defense industry lobbies in Congress. As NAFTA reaches the 20-year mark, controversy surrounding outsourcing, jobs and union rights in the context of high U.S. unemployment will resurge--it will be interesting to see who Obama replaces Ron Kirk with as U.S. trade representative after Kirk took up the Republican banner of free-trade agreements. In Mexico, NAFTA evaluations cannot ignore the additional creation of millions of poor people, plunging real wages, the hugely skewed distribution of wealth and the environmental and social conflicts provoked by investment in extractive industries. The tension between corporate-led trade/investment promotion and the negative impact on workers will increase."

#### Alt cause – border security

Brzezinski 12 – former National Security Adviser (Zbigniew, “Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power”, 2012, pp. ??)

A more coercive US attitude and policy toward Mexican immigrants would heighten Mexican resentment, adversely affecting the overall US-Mexico partnership.After 9/11, the issue of border security has come to be seen as essential to homeland security; the spector of an Islamic terrorist crossing the border from Mexico enhanced popular cries to seal off the border completely. America’s decision to construct a wall/fence itself from Mexico as a mechanism to support border security has already stimulated anti-American sentiments. It evokes negative images of Israel’s construction of a “security barrier” in the West Bank or of the Berlin Wall. An internationally declining America is likely to become even more disturbed by the insecurity of its porous border with Mexico and the resulting immigration, inspiring a continuation of similar policies and creating a downward spiral for relations between the two neighbors.

#### No risk of a failed state – empirics and media alarmism

Morton 11– associate professor of political economy and fellow of the Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice at the University of Nottingham (Adam David, “Failed-State Status and the War on Drugs in Mexico”, Winter/Spring 2011, Global Dialogue V. 13, No. 1; <http://www.worlddialogue.org/content.php?id=502)//Beddow>

It is this caricature of Mexico, based on the abstraction of “failed-state” discourse from the historical development of the state, and from the political economy and geopolitical dynamics structuring its post-colonial forms, that has to be rejected. It is a type of analysis that is being increasingly disseminated, as in works such as George Grayson’s Mexico: Narco-Violence and a Failed State? (Transaction Publishers, 2009). Government actions both reflect and bolster the notion that the Mexican state is radically weak: the United States, in agreement with Mexico’s National Security Council, flies unarmed drones across Mexico to gather intelligence on drug traffickers.23 As the Mexican historian Enrique Krauze has remarked of the creeping misconception that Mexico is on the verge of becoming a failed state, “let’s leave caricatures where they belong, in the hands of cartoonists”, and certainly not at the forefront of state policymaking or strategic thought linked to the academy.24 The Transformation of State Space in Mexico Rather than assume that the territorial jurisdiction of state space is rooted within clear and immobile boundaries, a more fruitful alternative approach is to begin by recognising divergent spatial sites of power constituting state forms. States are not simply fixed and unchanging entities but experience continual shifts in the geographical restructuring of space. A simple review of the modern history of state formation in Mexico would highlight the changing configurations of capital and state territorial organisation, whether through the Mexican War of Independence (1810–21) against the Spanish colonial government, the US annexation of Mexican territory and war in 1846–8, the occupation of the port of Veracruz by Spanish, British, and French forces in 1861, the installation by the French of Emperor Maximillian in 1863, or the occupation by US troops of Veracruz in 1914 during the Mexican Revolution of 1910–20. Focusing on the social content of a statement attributed to the Mexican leader Porfirio Díaz, “Poor Mexico, so far from God and so close to the United States”, might enable one to begin thinking more productively about the reconfiguration of state space through differential local, national, regional, as well as geopolitical vectors. In sum, one needs to be more acutely aware of the spatiality of state power and how state space is not only historically variable but also socially produced through a matrix of power relations. This point is somewhat lost on President Felipe Calderón when he exclaims, To say that Mexico is a failed state is absolutely false. I have not lost any part, any single point, of the Mexican territory. Colombia lost [territory] during several decades ... and even today huge parts of its territory [are] in the hands of the criminals, or the guerrillas, or some combination of drug traffickers and guerrillas. But in Mexico, all the territory is in the hands of the Mexican authorities.25

**Econ resilient—empirics**

**Zakaria, 9**—, PhD in pol sci Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, The Secrets of Stability, 12 December 2009, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/articles/articles.html, AMiles)

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world,was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s.  Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression."  Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets.  Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization.  One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaringdebt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.  A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstablecountries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but itdoes reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"  This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakesonce this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies.  It's true that the massive stateinterventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit.  Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think.

**No impact to collapse—liberalism**

**Zakaria, 9**—, PhD in pol sci Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, The Secrets of Stability, 12 December 2009, http://www.fareedzakaria.com/articles/articles.html, AMiles)

The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.  The first is the spread of great-power peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the world's major powers have not competed with each other in geomilitary terms. There have been some political tensions, but measured by historical standards the globe today is stunningly free of friction between the mightiest nations. This lack of conflict is extremely rare in history. You would have to go back at least 175 years, if not 400, to find any prolonged period like the one we are living in. The number of people who have died as a result of wars, civil conflicts, and terrorism over the last 30 years has declined sharply (despite what you might think on the basis of overhyped fears about terrorism). And no wonder—three decades ago, the Soviet Union was still funding militias, governments, and guerrillas in dozens of countries around the world. And the United States was backing the other side in every one of those places. That clash of superpower proxies caused enormous bloodshed and instability: recall that 3 million people died in Indochina alone during the 1970s. Nothing like that is happening today.  Peace is like oxygen, Harvard's Joseph Nye has written. When you don't have it, it's all you can think about, but when you do, you don't appreciate your good fortune. Peace allows for the possibility of a stable economic life and trade. The peace that flowed from the end of the Cold Warhad a much larger effect because it was accompanied by the discrediting of socialism. The world was left with a sole superpower but also a single workable economic model—capitalism—albeit with many variants from Sweden to Hong Kong.  This consensus enabled the expansion of the global economy; in fact, it created for the first time a single world economy in which almost all countries across the globe were participants. That means everyone is invested in the same system. Today, whilethe nations of Eastern Europe might face an economic crisis, no one is suggesting that they abandon free-market capitalism and return to communism. In fact, around the world you see the opposite: even in the midst of this downturn, there have been few successful electoral appeals for a turn to socialism or a rejection of the current framework of political economy. Center-right parties have instead prospered in recent elections throughout the West.  The second force for stability is the victory—after a decades-long struggle—over the cancer of inflation. Thirty-five years ago, much of the world was plagued by high inflation, with deep social and political consequences. Severe inflation can be far more disruptive than a recession, because while recessions rob you of better jobs and wages that you might have had in the future, inflation robs you of what you have now by destroying your savings. In many countries in the 1970s, hyperinflation led to the destruction of the middle class, which was the background condition for many of the political dramas of the era—coups in Latin America, the suspension of democracy in India, the overthrow of the shah in Iran. But then in 1979, the tide began to turn when Paul Volcker took over the U.S. Federal Reserve and waged war against inflation. Over two decades, central banks managed to decisively beat down the beast. At this point, only one country in the world suffers from hyperinflation: Zimbabwe. Low inflation allows people, businesses, and governments to plan for the future, a key precondition for stability.  Political and economic stability have each reinforced the other. And the third force that has underpinned the resilience of the global system is technological connectivity.Globalization has always existed in a sense in the modern world, but until recently its contours were mostly limited to trade: countries made goods and sold them abroad. Today the information revolution has created a much more deeply connected global system. Managers in Arkansas can work with suppliers in Beijing on a real-time basis. The production of almost every complex manufactured product now involves input from a dozen countries in a tight global supply chain. And the consequences of connectivity go well beyond economics. Women in rural India have learned through satellite television about the independence of women in more modern countries. Citizens in Iran have used cell phones and the Internet to connect to their well-wishers beyond their borders. Globalization today is fundamentally about knowledge being dispersed across our world.  This diffusion of knowledge may actually be the most important reason for the stability of the current system. The majority of the world's nations have learned some basic lessons about political well-being and wealth creation. They have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by peace, low inflation, and technology to plug in to the global system. And they have seen the indisputable results. Despite all the turmoil of the past year, it's important to remember that more people have been lifted out of poverty over the last two decades than in the preceding 10. Clear-thinking citizens around the world are determined not to lose these gains by falling for some ideological chimera, or searching for a worker's utopia. They are even cautious about the appeals of hypernationalism and war. Most have been there, done that. And they know the price.

**No impact to heg**

**Threat exaggeration**

**Maher 11—**PhD candidate in Political Science @ Brown

Richard, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States Will Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, 11/12/2011 Orbis, ScienceDirect

At the same time, preeminence creates burdens and facilitates imprudent behavior. Indeed, because of America’s unique political ideology, which sees its own domestic values and ideals as universal, and the relative openness of the foreign policymaking process, the United States is particularly susceptible to both the temptations and burdens of preponderance. For decades, perhaps since its very founding, the United States has viewed what is good for itself as good for the world. During its period of preeminence, the United States has both tried to maintain its position at the top and to transform world politics in fundamental ways, combining elements of realpolitik and liberal universalism (democratic government, free trade, basic human rights). At times, these desires have conflicted with each other but they also capture the enduring tensions of America’s role in the world. The absence of constraints and America’s overestimation of its own ability to shape outcomes has served to weaken its overall position. And because foreign policy is not the reserved and exclusive domain of the president—who presumably calculates strategy according to the pursuit of the state’s enduring national interests—the policymaking process is open to special interests and outside influences and, thus, susceptible to the cultivation of misperceptions, miscalculations, and misunderstandings. Five features in particular, each a consequence of how America has used its power in the unipolar era, have worked to diminish America’s long-term material and strategic position. Overextension. During its period of preeminence, the United States has found it difficult to stand aloof from threats (real or imagined) to its security, interests, and values. Most states are concerned with what happens in their immediate neighborhoods. The United States has interests that span virtually the entire globe, from its own Western Hemisphere, to Europe, the Middle East, Persian Gulf, South Asia, and East Asia. As its preeminence enters its third decade, the United States continues to define its interests in increasingly expansive terms. This has been facilitated by the massive forward presence of the American military, even when excluding the tens of thousands of troops stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. The U.S. military has permanent bases in over 30 countries and maintains a troop presence in dozens more.13 There are two logics that lead a preeminent state to overextend, and these logics of overextension lead to goals and policies that exceed even the considerable capabilities of a superpower. First, by definition, preeminent states face few external constraints. Unlike in bipolar or multipolar systems, there are no other states that can serve to reliably check or counterbalance the power and influence of a single hegemon. This gives preeminent states a staggering freedom of action and provides a tempting opportunity to shape world politics in fundamental ways. Rather than pursuing its own narrow interests, preeminence provides an opportunity to mix ideology, values, and normative beliefs with foreign policy. The United States has been susceptible to this temptation, going to great lengths to slay dragons abroad, and even to remake whole societies in its own (liberal democratic) image.14 The costs and risks of taking such bold action or pursuing transformative foreign policies often seem manageable or even remote. We know from both theory and history that external powers can impose important checks on calculated risk-taking and serve as a moderating influence. The bipolar system of the Cold War forced policymakers in both the United States and the Soviet Union to exercise extreme caution and prudence. One wrong move could have led to a crisis that quickly spiraled out of policymakers’ control. Second, preeminent states have a strong incentive to seek to maintain their preeminence in the international system. Being number one has clear strategic, political, and psychological benefits. Preeminent states may, therefore, **overestimate** the intensity and immediacy of **threats**, or to fundamentally redefine what constitutes an acceptable level of threat to live with.

**Over-stretch and free riding**

**Maher 11—**PhD candidate in Political Science @ Brown

Richard, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States Will Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, 11/12/2011 Orbis, ScienceDirect

To protect itself from emerging or even future threats, preeminent states may be more likely to take unilateral action, particularly compared to when power is distributed more evenly in the international system. Preeminence has not only made it possible for the United States to overestimate its power, but also to overestimate the degree to which other states and societies see American power as legitimate and even as worthy of emulation. There is almost a belief in historical determinism, or the feeling that one was destined to stand atop world politics as a colossus, and this preeminence gives one a special prerogative for one’s role and purpose in world politics. The security doctrine that the George W. Bush administration adopted took an aggressive approach to maintaining American preeminence and eliminating threats to American security, including waging preventive war. The invasion of Iraq, based on claims that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and had ties to al Qaeda, both of which turned out to be false, produced huge costs for the United States—in political, material, and human terms. After seven years of war, tens of thousands of American military personnel remain in Iraq. Estimates of its long-term cost are in the trillions of dollars.15 At the same time, the United States has fought a parallel conflict in Afghanistan. While the Obama administration looks to dramatically reduce the American military presence in Iraq, President Obama has committed tens of thousands of additional U.S. troops to Afghanistan. Distraction. Preeminent states have a tendency to seek to shape world politics in fundamental ways, which can lead to conflicting priorities and unnecessary diversions. As resources, attention, and prestige are devoted to one issue or set of issues, others are necessarily disregarded or given reduced importance. There are always trade-offs and opportunity costs in international politics, even for a state as powerful as the United States. Most states are required to define their priorities in highly specific terms. Because the preeminent state has such a large stake in world politics, it feels the need to be vigilant against any changes that could impact its short-, medium-, or longterm interests. The result is taking on commitments on an expansive number of issues all over the globe. The United States has been very active in its ambition to shape the postCold War world. It has expanded NATO to Russia’s doorstep; waged war in Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; sought to export its own democratic principles and institutions around the world; assembled an international coalition against transnational terrorism; imposed sanctions on North Korea and Iran for their nuclear programs; undertaken ‘‘nation building’’ in Iraq and Afghanistan; announced plans for a missile defense system to be stationed in Poland and the Czech Republic; and, with the United Kingdom, led the response to the recent global financial and economic crisis. By being so involved in so many parts of the world, there often emerges ambiguity over priorities. The United States defines its interests and obligations in global terms, and defending all of them simultaneously is **beyond the pale** even for a superpower like the United States. Issues that may have received benign neglect during the Cold War, for example, when U.S. attention and resources were almost exclusively devoted to its strategic competition with the Soviet Union, are now viewed as central to U.S. interests. Bearing Disproportionate Costs of Maintaining the Status Quo. As the preeminent power, the United States has the largest stake in maintaining the status quo. The world the United States took the lead in creating—one based on open markets and free trade, democratic norms and institutions, private property rights and the rule of law—has created enormous benefits for the United States. This is true both in terms of reaching unprecedented levels of domestic prosperity and in institutionalizing U.S. preferences, norms, and values globally. But at the same time, this system has proven costly to maintain. Smaller, less powerful states have a strong incentive to free ride, meaning that preeminent states bear a disproportionate share of the costs of maintaining the basic rules and institutions that give world politics order, stability, and predictability. While this might be frustrating to U.S. policymakers, it is perfectly understandable. Other countries know that the United States will continue to provide these goods out of its own self-interest, so there is little incentive for these other states to contribute significant resources to help maintain these public goods.16 The U.S. Navy patrols the oceans keeping vital sea lanes open. During financial crises around the globe—such as in Asia in 1997-1998, Mexico in 1994, or the global financial and economic crisis that began in October 2008— the U.S. Treasury rather than the IMF takes the lead in setting out and implementing a plan to stabilize global financial markets. The United States has spent massive amounts on defense in part to prevent great power war. The United States, therefore, provides an indisputable collective good—a world, particularly compared to past eras, that is marked by order, stability, and predictability. A number of countries—in Europe, the Middle East, and East Asia—continue to rely on the American security guarantee for their own security. Rather than devoting more resources to defense, they are able to finance generous social welfare programs. To maintain these commitments, the United States has accumulated staggering budget deficits and national debt. As the sole superpower, the United States bears an additional though different kind of weight. From the Israeli-Palestinian dispute to the India Pakistan rivalry over Kashmir, the United States is expected to assert leadership to bring these disagreements to a peaceful resolution. The United States puts its reputation on the line, and as years and decades pass without lasting settlements, U.S. prestige and influence is further eroded. The **only way** to get other states to contribute more to the provision of public goods is if the United States dramatically **decreases its share**. At the same time, the United States would have to give other states an expanded role and greater responsibility given the proportionate increase in paying for public goods. This is a political decision for the United States—maintain predominant control over the provision of collective goods or reduce its burden but lose influence in how these public goods are used. Creation of Feelings of Enmity and Anti-Americanism. It is not necessary that everyone admire the United States or accept its ideals, values, and goals. Indeed, such dramatic imbalances of power that characterize world politics today almost always produce in others feelings of mistrust, resentment, and outright hostility. At the same time, it is easier for the United States to realize its own goals and values when these are shared by others, and are viewed as legitimate and in the common interest.

**Anti-Americanism**

**Maher 11—**PhD candidate in Political Science @ Brown

Richard, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States Will Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, 11/12/2011 Orbis, ScienceDirect

As a result of both its vast power but also some of the decisions it has made, particularly over the past eight years, feelings of resentment and hostility toward the United States have grown, and perceptions of the legitimacy of its role and place in the world have correspondingly declined. Multiple factors give rise toanti-American sentiment, and anti-Americanism takes different shapes and forms.17 It emerges partly as a response to the vast disparity in power the United States enjoys over other states. Taking satisfaction in themissteps and indiscretions of the imposing Gulliver is a natural reaction. In societies that globalization (which in many parts of the world is interpreted as equivalent to Americanization) has largely passed over, resentment and alienation are felt when comparing one’s own impoverished, ill-governed, unstable society with the wealth, stability, and influence enjoyed by the United States.18 Anti-Americanism also emerges as a consequence of specific American actions and certain values and principles to which the United States ascribes. Opinion polls showed that a dramatic rise in anti-American sentiment followed the perceived unilateral decision to invade Iraq (under pretences that failed to convince much of the rest of the world) and to depose Saddam Hussein and his government and replace itwith a governmentmuchmore friendly to the United States. To many, this appeared as an arrogant and completely unilateral decision by a single state to decide for itselfwhen—and under what conditions—military force could be used. A number of other policy decisions by not just the George W. Bush but also the Clinton and Obama administrations have provoked feelings of anti-American sentiment. However, it seemed that a large portion of theworld had a particular animus for GeorgeW. Bush and a number of policy decisions of his administration, from voiding the U.S. signature on the International Criminal Court (ICC), resisting a global climate change treaty, detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib in Iraq and at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, and what many viewed as a simplistic worldview that declared a ‘‘war’’ on terrorism and the division of theworld between goodand evil.Withpopulations around theworld mobilized and politicized to a degree never before seen—let alone barely contemplated—such feelings of anti-American sentiment makes it more difficult for the United States to convince other governments that the U.S.’ own preferences and priorities are legitimate and worthy of emulation. Decreased Allied Dependence. It is counterintuitive to think that America’s unprecedented power decreases its allies’ dependence on it. During the Cold War, for example, America’s allies were highly dependent on the United States for their own security. The security relationship that the United States had with Western Europe and Japan allowed these societies to rebuild and reach a stunning level of economic prosperity in the decades following World War II. Now that the United States is the sole superpower and the threat posed by the Soviet Union no longer exists, these countries have charted more autonomous courses in foreign and security policy.

**Multipolarity solves**

**Maher 11—**PhD candidate in Political Science @ Brown

Richard, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States Will Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, 11/12/2011 Orbis, ScienceDirect

A reversion to a bipolar or multipolar system could change that, making these allies more dependent on the United States for their security. Russia’s reemergence could unnerve America’s European allies, just as China’s continued ascent could provoke unease in Japan. Either possibility would disrupt the equilibrium in Europe and East Asia that the United States has cultivated over the past several decades. New geopolitical rivalries could serve to create incentives for America’s allies to reduce the disagreements they have with Washington and to reinforce their security relationships with the United States.

Heg is inevitable

Maher 11 – Richard Maher, Ph.D. in Political Science from Brown University, Winter 2011, “The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World,” Orbis, Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 53-68

The United States will continue to be the ‘‘default power’’ (to use Josef Joffe’s term) in the near future.20 No other country will be able to duplicate the overall reach and influence of the United States—in terms of economic, political, and military power—for at least several decades. It is not clear, moreover, how many peoplewouldwant to live in aworlddominated byChina, India,Russia, or even Europe. The United States retains a number of tremendous advantages compared to possible strategic competitors: its demographics; advanced technology; raw materials; research universities and laboratories; continued dominance in global mass culture, and labor market flexibility.

Even with decline, their internal link can’t affect the structural reasons why heg solves war

### Warming

#### Emissions cuts fail – CO2 saturation

Dickinson 9 (Pete, Global warming: Is it too late?, 26 August 2009, http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article19.php?id=1142, AMiles)

Note – paper cited is by Susan Solomon - atmospheric chemist working for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - Gian-Kasper Plattnerb- Group, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, UCLA - Reto Knuttic - Institute for Atmopsheric and Climate Science, PhD

New research is claiming that concentrations of carbon dioxide (the main greenhouse gas, CO2) will remain high for at least 1,000 years, even if greenhouse gases are eliminated in the next few decades. The climate scientists who produced this work assert that the effects of global warming, such as high sea levels and reduced rainfall in certain areas, will also persist over this time scale. (The findings are in a paper published in February in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences by researchers from the USA, Switzerland and France, www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0812721106 ) Most previous estimates of the longevity of global warming effects, after greenhouse gases were removed, have ranged from a few decades to a century, so this new analysis could represent a development with very serious implications, including political ones. For example, those campaigning for action on climate change could be disheartened and climate sceptics could opportunistically say that nothing should be done because it is now too late. The authors of the paper make various estimates of CO2 concentrations based on the year emissions are cut, assumed to be from 2015 to 2050. They make optimistic assumptions, for instance, that emissions are cut at a stroke rather than gradually, and that their annual rate of growth before cut-off is 2%, not the 3% plus witnessed from 2000-05. They then estimate what the effects would be on surface warming, sea level rise and rainfall over a 1,000-year period using the latest climate models. The results of the melting of the polar ice caps are not included in the calculations of sea levels, only the expansion of the water in the oceans caused by the surface temperature increase so, as the authors point out, the actual new sea level will be much higher. The best-case results for surface warming, where action is taken in 2015 to eliminate emissions, show that over 1,000 years the temperature rises from 1.3 to 1.0 degree centigrade above pre-industrial levels. The worst case, where action is delayed to 2050, predicts surface temperatures will increase from just under to just over four degrees by 2320 and then remain approximately constant for the rest of the millennium. High levels of CO2 persist in the atmosphere because, over long timescales, reduction of the gas is dependent on the ability of the oceans to absorb it, but there are limits to this due to the physics and chemistry of deep-ocean mixing. On the other hand, the amount of heat in the atmosphere that can be absorbed by the sea, the key way surface temperatures are decreased, is limited by the same scientific laws. As a result, carbon concentrations cannot fall enough to force temperatures down while there is simultaneously reduced cooling due to limited heat loss to the oceans.

**Climate impacts are overyhyped, nothing will happen for 300 years and even then it won’t be that bad, tech solves in the meantime**

**Lomborg 8** – Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15,http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange

These **alarmist predictions are** becoming **quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities**, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver **Tickell**, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This **is** simply silly**.** His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, **Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential** (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But **he is wrong**. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, **the IPCC predicts that,** by the end of the century, **sea levels will rise 18**-59 **centimetres – Tickell is** simply exaggerating by a factor ofup to400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. **Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature**, say, **six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting tech**nology such as solar panels **will not have become economically competitive**). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But **to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan**. **This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading,** mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. **Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times** beyond wrong and misleading, **and**, of course, **made with** no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, **there will**, of course, also **be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; ag**ricultural **yields will** decline in the tropics, but **increase in the temperate zones**, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. **The** bottom line is that **benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs** (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). **Global warming will continue to be a net benefit** until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. **This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it** will not be a challenge to **our** civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

**No warming**

**Beisner 10**—former associate professor of interdisciplinary studies in economics, government, and public policy, Covenant. PhD, University of St. Andrews, (Calvin, Forget Global Warming Mini Ice Age May Be on Its Way, 12 January 2010, http://www.rightsidenews.com/201001128144/energy-and-environment/forget-global-warming-mini-ice-age-may-be-on-its-way.html, AMiles)

Note – graph omitted

The UK's MailOnline did just that this week under the headline The mini ice age starts here. Lead paragraph? "The bitter winter afflicting much of the Northern Hemisphere is only the start of a global trend towards cooler weather that is likely to last for 20 or 30 years, say some of the world's most eminent climate scientists." Right. MailOnline reporter David Rose doesn't call them "the world's leading climate skeptics." He calls them "some of the world's most eminent climate scientists"--and he goes on to cite "Mojib Latif, a leading member of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)," "Anastasios Tsonis, head of the University of Wisconsin Atmospheric Sciences Group," and "William Gray, emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Colorado State University." Contrary to fears of inexorably diminishing Arctic sea ice, Rose cites the U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center as reporting that "Arctic summer sea ice has increased by 409,000 square miles, or 26 per cent, since 2007." Though snow's been unusual for most of the southern half of the United Kingdom in recent decades, the Mail published the accompanying satellite photo of Great Britain during the recent cold snap. The island is essentially all covered with snow. Rose reported record lows as far south as Cuba--something I can attest to, living near Miami in south Florida, where we experienced sub-freezing weather over the weekend. He quoted Tsonis as saying that last week 56% of the United States was covered by snow--something that hasn't happened in several decades. And the "'Arctic oscillation'--a weather pattern that sees the development of huge 'blocking' areas of high pressure in northern latitudes, driving polar winds far to the south . . . is at its strongest for at least 60 years. As a result, the jetstream--the high-altitude wind that circles the globe from west to east and normally pushes a series of wet but mild Atlantic lows across Britain--is currently running not over the English Channel but the Strait of Gibraltar." Consequently, most of the Northern Hemisphere is much colder this winter than it's been in decades--and the Southern Hemisphere is cooler, too. According to Rose, Latif, Tsonis, and other scientists attribute the cold shift primarily to a shift in the world's dominant ocean circulations--the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation--from a warm phase to a cool phase, something that happens about every 20 to 30 years. "The scientists' predictions also undermine the standard climate computer models, which assert that the warming of the Earth since 1900 has been driven solely by man-made greenhouse gas emissions and will continue as long as carbon dioxide levels rise. They say that their research shows that much of the warming was caused by oceanic cycles when they were in a 'warm mode' as opposed to the present 'cold mode'." That's a point made by Dr. Roy W. Spencer in the science chapter of the Cornwall Alliance's new document A Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science, and Economics of Global Warming and illustrated in the graph below. "A significant share of the warming we saw from 1980 to 2000 and at earlier periods in the 20th Century was due to these cycles," said Latif, "perhaps as much as 50 per cent. They have now gone into reverse, so winters like this one will become much more likely. Summers will also probably be cooler, and all this may well last two decades or longer. The extreme retreats that we have seen in glaciers and sea ice will come to a halt. For the time being, global warming has paused, and there may well be some cooling." Tsonis also believes that the ocean current cycles dominated global climate change in the 20th century, including the post-1970s, the period many point to as driven by human greenhouse gas emissions, but he doesn't venture to attribute specific percentages to the natural and human causes. "I do not believe in catastrophe theories," Rose quoted him as saying. "Man-made warming is balanced by the natural cycles, and I do not trust the computer models which state that if CO2 reaches a particular level then temperatures and sea levels will rise by a given amount. These models cannot be trusted to predict the weather for a week, yet they are running them to give readings for 100 years." Gray went farther: "Most of the rise in temperature from the Seventies to the Nineties was natural. Very little was down to CO2--in my view, as little as five to ten per cent." Gray, Tsonis, and Latif all agreed that the findings about the ocean currents undermined the credibility of the computer climate models on which the IPCC and other alarmists rely.

**Warming inevitable**

**Dickinson 9** (Pete, Global warming: Is it too late?, 26 August 2009, http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article19.php?id=1142, AMiles)

Note – paper cited is by Susan Solomon - atmospheric chemist working for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - Gian-Kasper Plattnerb- Group, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, UCLA - Reto Knuttic - Institute for Atmopsheric and Climate Science, PhD

New research is claiming that concentrations of carbon dioxide (the main greenhouse gas, CO2) will remain high for at least 1,000 years, even if greenhouse gases are eliminated in the next few decades. The climate scientists who produced this work assert that the effects of global warming, such as high sea levels and reduced rainfall in certain areas, will also persist over this time scale. (The findings are in a paper published in February in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences by researchers from the USA, Switzerland and France, www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.0812721106 ) Most previous estimates of the longevity of global warming effects, after greenhouse gases were removed, have ranged from a few decades to a century, so this new analysis could represent a development with very serious implications, including political ones. For example, those campaigning for action on climate change could be disheartened and climate sceptics could opportunistically say that nothing should be done because it is now too late. The authors of the paper make various estimates of CO2 concentrations based on the year emissions are cut, assumed to be from 2015 to 2050. They make optimistic assumptions, for instance, that emissions are cut at a stroke rather than gradually, and that their annual rate of growth before cut-off is 2%, not the 3% plus witnessed from 2000-05. They then estimate what the effects would be on surface warming, sea level rise and rainfall over a 1,000-year period using the latest climate models. The results of the melting of the polar ice caps are not included in the calculations of sea levels, only the expansion of the water in the oceans caused by the surface temperature increase so, as the authors point out, the actual new sea level will be much higher. The best-case results for surface warming, where action is taken in 2015 to eliminate emissions, show that over 1,000 years the temperature rises from 1.3 to 1.0 degree centigrade above pre-industrial levels. The worst case, where action is delayed to 2050, predicts surface temperatures will increase from just under to just over four degrees by 2320 and then remain approximately constant for the rest of the millennium. High levels of CO2 persist in the atmosphere because, over long timescales, reduction of the gas is dependent on the ability of the oceans to absorb it, but there are limits to this due to the physics and chemistry of deep-ocean mixing. On the other hand, the amount of heat in the atmosphere that can be absorbed by the sea, the key way surface temperatures are decreased, is limited by the same scientific laws. As a result, carbon concentrations cannot fall enough to force temperatures down while there is simultaneously reduced cooling due to limited heat loss to the oceans.

No impact to warming

Lomborg 8—Director - Copenhagen Consensus Center Adjunct prof, Copenhagen Business School. (Björn, Warming warnings get overheated, 15 August 2008, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange, AMiles)

Much of the global warming debate is perhaps best described as a constant outbidding by frantic campaigners, producing a barrage of ever-more scary scenarios in an attempt to get the public to accept their civilisation-changing proposals. Unfortunately, the general public – while concerned about the environment – is distinctly unwilling to support questionable solutions with costs running into tens of trillions of pounds. Predictably, this makes the campaigners reach for even more outlandish scares. These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren't for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a "catastrophe" and the beginning of the "extinction" of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners' scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland's ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world's coastal infrastructure and much of the world's farmland – "undoubtedly" causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years' time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell's claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

**US can’t solve warming**

**Sensenbrenner 9** – Congressman and ranking minority member of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming (James, 4/3, Technology Is the Answer to Climate Change, WSJ, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123871985916184973.html#mod=loomia?loomia\_si=t0:a16:g2:r3:c0.191864:b23626456, AG)

The U.S. cannot reduce the growth of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere without the developing nations cutting their emissions as well. A 2007 study by the Battelle Memorial Institute found that if China, India and the other developing countries keep growing at current rates, they will emit nearly three times as much carbon dioxide as will the developed countries by the end of this century. But will China and India join in the effort to reduce CO2 emissions? During December's U.N. climate-change conference in Poznan, Poland, I asked delegates from both of these nations if they would agree to cut their emissions. Both said, unequivocally, "no." The Poznan conference wasn't my first experience with the developing world's refusal to sign up for the West's global-warming agenda. I led the congressional delegation to the infamous Kyoto, Japan, negotiations in 1997, and the story then was the same as now. Without China and India, there can be no deal. It's understandable why the developing nations are reluctant to cut emissions -- it means higher energy costs and reduced growth. China and India are more concerned with growing their economy, expanding access to electricity, and reducing poverty. I don't blame them.

**Alt causes**

**Ecobridge 7** (http://www.ecobridge.org/content/g\_cse.htm, AG)

While carbon dioxide is the principal greenhouse gas, methane is second most important. According to the IPCC, Methane is more than 20 times as effective as CO2 at trapping heat in the atmosphere. US Emissions Inventory 2004 Levels of atmospheric methane have risen 145% in the last 100 years. [18] Methane is derived from sources such as rice paddies, bovine flatulence, bacteria in bogs and fossil fuel production. Most of the world’s rice, and all of the rice in the United States, is grown on flooded fields. When fields are flooded, anaerobic conditions develop and the organic matter in the soil decomposes, releasing CH4 to the atmosphere, primarily through the rice plants. US Emissions Inventory 2004 Water Vapor in the Atmosphere Increasing Water vapor is the most prevalent and most poweful greenhouse gas on the planet, but its increasing presence is the result of warming caused by carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases. (See NOAA's National Climate Data Center (NCDC) FAQ page) Water vapor holds onto two-thirds of the heat trapped by all the greenhouse gases.[129] As the Earth heats up relative humidity is able to increase, allowing the planet's atmosphere to hold more water vapor, causing even more warming, thus a positive feedback scenario. Because the air is warmer, the relative humidity can be higher (in essence, the air is able to 'hold' more water when its warmer), leading to more water vapor in the atmosphere, says the NCDC. There is much scientific uncertainty as to the degree this feedback loop causes increased warming, inasmuch as the water vapor also causes increased cloud formation, which in turn reflects heat back out into space. Nitrous oxide Another greenhouse gas is Nitrous oxide (N2O), a colourless, non-flammable gas with a sweetish odour, commonly known as "laughing gas", and sometimes used as an anaesthetic. Nitrous oxide is naturally produced by oceans and rainforests. Man-made sources of nitrous oxide include nylon and nitric acid production, the use of fertilisers in agriculture, cars with catalytic converters and the burning of organic matter. Nitrous oxide is broken down in the atmosphere by chemical reactions that involve sunlight. Deforestation After carbon emissions caused by humans, deforestation is the second principle cause of atmospheric carbn dioxide. (NASA Web Site) Deforestation is responsible for 20-25% of all carbon emissions entering the atmosphere, by the burning and cutting of about 34 million acres of trees each year. We are losing millions of acres of rainforests each year, the equivalent in area to the size of Italy. [22] The destroying of tropical forests alone is throwing hundreds of millions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere each year. We are also losing temperate forests. The temperate forests of the world account for an absorption rate of 2 billion tons of carbon annually. [3] In the temperate forests of Siberia alone, the earth is losing 10 million acres per year.

**Long timeframe means intervening actors and tech solve**

**Michaels 7** – Cato senior fellow. PhD in climatology. Former Research Professor of Environmental Sciences from the University of Virginia. (Patrick, 2/2, Live with Climate Change, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=7502, AG)

Consequently, the best policy is to live with some modest climate change now and encourage economic development, which will generate the capital necessary for investment in the more efficient technologies of the future. Fortunately, we have more time than the alarmists suggest. The warming path of the planet falls at the lowest end of today's U.N. projections. In aggregate, our computer models tell us that once warming is established, it tends to take place at a constant, not an increasing, rate. Reassuringly, the rate has been remarkably constant, at 0.324 degrees F per decade, since warming began around 1975. The notion that we must do "something in 10 years," repeated by a small but vocal band of extremists, enjoys virtually no support in the truly peer reviewed scientific literature. Rather than burning our capital now for no environmental gain (did someone say "ethanol?"), let's encourage economic development so people can invest and profit in our more efficient future. People who invested in automobile companies that developed hybrid technology have been rewarded handsomely in the past few years, and there's no reason to think environmental speculators won't be rewarded in the future, too.

**No brink—hundreds of species have gone extinct by now and they don’t stop all species loss**

**Species loss alt causes**

**EDF 7** (Environmental Defense Fund, The Importance of Wildlife and the Diversity of Life, http://www.edf.org/page.cfm?tagID=445, AG)

The major cause of species loss in the U.S. and worldwide is the loss and degradation of habitat. As forests, wetlands, prairies, coastal estuaries and other habitats are converted to residential, commercial or agricultural use and other types of development, wild plants and animals vanish. In addition, many areas known as "hotspots" for their unusually rich biodiversity, such as Florida and Southern California, also have rapidly expanding human populations, which accelerates the loss of biodiversity. In the U.S. non-native species are the second largest cause of species loss. Hundreds of Hawaii's unique wildlife and plants are being driven to extinction by non-native plants and animals. Other factors are pollution, disease, over-fishing and over-hunting.

**No extinction**

**Easterbrook** **3—**senior fellow at the New Republic(“We're All Gonna Die!”, http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

**Environment resilient—adaptation checks**

**Doremus 2k** – Law Professor, California (Holly, 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, AG)

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 [\*47] One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse. n217

**Tech solves—their evidence is media alarmism—the environment is improving**

**Stossel**, **7** Journalist, winner of the Peabody Award, anchors ABC News, [John, “Environmental Alarmists Have It Backwards”, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/04/how\_about\_economic\_progress\_da.html]

Watching the media coverage, you'd think that the earth was in imminent danger -- that human life itself was on the verge of extinction. Technology is fingered as the perp. Nothing could be further from the truth. John Semmens of Arizona's Laissez Faire Institute points out that Earth Day misses an important point. In the April issue of The Freeman magazine, Semmens says the environmental movement overlooks how hospitable the earth has become -- thanks to technology. "The environmental alarmists have it backwards. If anything imperils the earth it is ignorant obstruction of science and progress. ... That technology provides the best option for serving human wants and conserving the environment should be evident in the progress made in environmental improvement in the United States. Virtually every measure shows that pollution is headed downward and that nature is making a comeback." (Carbon dioxide excepted, if it is really a pollutant.) Semmens describes his visit to historic Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, an area "lush with trees and greenery." It wasn't always that way. In 1775, the land was cleared so it could be farmed. Today, technology makes farmers so efficient that only a fraction of the land is needed to produce much more food. As a result, "Massachusetts farmland has been allowed to revert back to forest." Human ingenuity and technology not only raised living standards, but also restored environmental amenities. How about a day to celebrate that? Yet, Semmens writes, the environmental movement is skeptical about technology and is attracted to three dubious principles: sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and stakeholder participation. The point of sustainable development, Semmens says, "is to minimize the use of nonrenewable natural resources so there will be more left for future generations." Sounds sensible -- who is for "unsustainable" development? But as the great economist Julian Simon often pointed out, resources are manmade, not natural. Jed Clampett cheered when he found oil on his land because it made him rich enough to move to Beverly Hills. But his great-grandfather would have cursed the disgusting black gunk because Canadian geologist Abraham Gesner hadn't yet discovered that kerosene could be distilled from it. President Bush chides us for our "addiction to oil." But under current conditions, using oil makes perfect sense. Someday, if we let the free market operate, someone will find an energy source that works better than oil. Then richer future generations won't need oil. So why deprive ourselves and make ourselves poorer with needless regulation now? Anyway, it's not as if we're running out of oil. That's one of the myths I expose in my new book, "Myths, Lies and Downright Stupidity". If the price of a barrel of oil stays high, entrepreneurs will find better ways to suck oil out of the ground. At $50 a barrel, it's even profitable to recover oil that's stuck in the tar sands in Alberta, Canada. Those tar sands alone contain enough oil to meet our needs for a hundred years. The precautionary principle, popular in Europe, is the idea that no new thing should be permitted until it has been proved harmless. Sounds good, except as Ron Bailey of Reason writes, it basically means, "Don't ever do anything for the first time." Stakeholder participation means that busybodies would be permitted to intrude on private transactions. Semmens's example is DDT, which for years would have saved children from deadly malaria, except that "'stakeholders' from the environmental quarter have prevailed on governments to ban the trade in this product." The first victims of these principles are the poor. We rich Westerners can withstand a lot of policy foolishness. But people in the developing world live on the edge, so anything that retards economic progress -- including measures to arrest global warming -- will bring incredible hardship to the most vulnerable on the planet. If we care about human life, we should celebrate Economic Progress Day.

# 2NC

## CP

### 2NC – Overview

#### CP solves the case and the net benefit is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

#### Frame the debate through a lens of sufficiency – we don’t have to solve the aff, just the status quo – if they don’t read comparative ev about the CP, reject solvency deficits.

#### Only evaluate quantifiable solvency deficits – I can’t win CP solvency over arbitrary gut feeling.

#### Private aid solves best – tax credits quintuple investment – federal bureaucracy and corruption turns solvency – I’ll go through each internal link:

[insert that stuff here]

### 2NC – Authors indict

#### Their government key arguments are full of institutional bias

Parajuli, 10

(Columnist-The Concord Review, 7/8, http://archives.myrepublica.com/portal/index.php?action=news\_details&news\_id=20776)

This brings us to another argument – that the aid agency has become self-perpetuating and thus is at loggerheads with its explicit aims. Dambisa Moyo argues in her book “Dead Aid” that aid has become a self-perpetuating industry. She argues that “some people actually have a vested interest to see the continual cycle of (Nepal) in despair so that they can justify their existence.” Miller-Adams (1999) argue, noting that organizations strive to ensure organizational survival and better their bargaining power with others through steady growth, of the World Bank’s continued moves to increase its branches even in areas where other development banks are present. This despite the potential for duplication of duties and conflict in those regions. This sort of overlap just highlights at the macro level the perpetuation tendencies within aid organizations where livelihood and careers are now planned specifically for the sector and many have a vested interest in seeing it continue. If we are to agree that at some stage we want to see a world that does not need aid, we have to set timelines. President Obama by setting a clear deadline for troop withdrawal from Africa has made it clear to President Hamid Karzai that he needs to get his act together because US involvement is not a blank check. So, are there any alternatives? Can aid be replaced by investment that is responsible to a bottom line and does not crowd out the private sector. Justin Muzinich and Eric Werker (the latter an assistant professor at Harvard Business School) have a suggestion. The US Congress, they say, should provide a 39-cent tax credit for every dollar of American investment in developing countries. If Company X were to build a $100 million factory in Nepal, its tax bill would be reduced by $39 million. Because for-profit companies are focused on the bottom line, they will be more protective than government agencies of the money they invest in developing countries.

### 2NC – Implementation framing

#### If we win the thesis of any solvency turn, vote neg on presumption – empirical implementation questions are a prior question

Bicchi 10

(London School of Economics IR Professor, "Dilemmas of implementation: EU democracy assistance in the Mediterranean," Democratization, Volume 17, Issue 5, October)

There is a broad literature addressing the margins of discretion that public officials have when implementing decisions. The study of implementation is fundamentally a study of change, i.e. of the change that takes place after the adoption of formal decisions and as action progresses. Implementation has been conceptualized in many different ways, but at its core implementation research assumes that, contrary to the classic Weberian model of bureaucracy, the policy-making process continues during the implementation stage in ways that were generally not foreseen or intended at its beginning.10

The main argument of this article is that policy analysis and implementation research specifically contribute to the understanding of EU democracy assistance (and more generally of EU foreign policy) in a variety of ways. First, they suggest distinguishing between stages of the policy cycle. Despite criticisms, the policy cycle retains some heuristic utility if only as an organizing principle for analysis, as it highlights the difference between decision-making, implementation and evaluation.11 This distinction is very useful to counter the current trend towards assessing the impact of democracy assistance without taking into account whether it has actually been implemented. Implementation cannot be assumed; in fact, **it is extremely rare for decisions to include automatic implementation.** If there is complete **'policy evaporation' during the implementation stage** and rhetoric fails to turn into reality, **then it makes little sense to evaluate the potential impact of the policy**.

#### Their flawed assumptions mean they have zero predictive ability – dropping one solvency takeout is a neg ballot

Steele 92 David, author and founder of the Libertarian Alliance, *From Marx to Mises*, p 374-5

Does this lead us to embrace the extremely anti-Misesian contention that 'the realism of the assumptions doesn't matter'? 'Unrealistic assumptions' is a euphemism for false assumptions. If 'the assumptions' are part of the theory, then false assumptions mean that the theory is false. The claim, then, is that it doesn't matter whether the theory is false. The claim is usually followed up with the assertion that 'what really matters is whether the theory predicts well'. But if the assumptions are part of the theory, then the theory predicts its own assumptions, and is immediately refuted if one of its assumptions is shown to be false. There can be no worse predictive performance for any theory than for it to be found to require a false assumption: the theory is immediately a failure, as far as prediction goes. We can instead say that 'the assumptions' are not part of the theory, but then it is not clear that the theory needs the 'assumptions'. If the assumptions are expository mnemonics not implied by the theory, or metaphysical views that people who hold the theory find congenial, then there is no reason why they need to be true.

### 2NC – AT: Perm do both

#### Perm fails – links to the net benefit but federal spending creates an uncertain regulatory environment so they can’t capture the benefits of the CP.

#### It doesn’t solve our turns:

#### 1) Crowdout – disincentivizes private aid

Desai, 10

(Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Wolfensohn Center for Development at the Brookings Institution, and Associate Professor of International Development in the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, http://www.redlandsfortnightly.org/papers/baldwin02.htm, ak.)

The public economics literature suggests that collective action problems may block private giving for worthy causes because each individual, behaving rationally, tries to free-ride on others’ generosity. Governments can overcome the collective action problem by taxing everyone and providing grants to the causes to which individuals would want to give. One common empirical approach is to test whether individual donations are smaller in areas where government grants are larger. Such crowding-out would be evidence of collective action problems at work. A review of the literature by Bekkers and Wiepking (2007) ﬁnds evidence that crowding-out in domestic charities is signiﬁcant. Their summary mostly looks at cross-section studies. Garrett and Rhine (2007) analyze time-series for 1965-2003 and reach the same conclusion. In the long run, cointegration tests show that increased government spending crowds out charitable giving, especially in the education sector. In the short run, however, the effects are weaker and not signiﬁcant. The authors suggest that it may take time for individuals to get full information on what the government is doing. Andreoni and Payne (2008) also conﬁrm the crowding-out effect in a large sample of charities. They demonstrate that crowding out occurs through two channels: classic crowding out (where donors feel less willing to give) and fund-raising crowding out (where grant receiving organizations reduce their activity to collect donations). Their evidence suggests that fundraising crowding out accounts for 68 percent of the observed crowding-out effect

#### 2) Destroys private cred

Crimm, 5

(Law Prof-St. John’s, Democratization, Global Grant-Making, and the Internal Revenue Code Lobbying Restrictions, 79 Tul. L. Rev. 587)

Despite the many uncertainties, after further input and deliberation, we should cautiously experiment at least temporarily, perhaps five years, with either a substantial reformation of the tax lobbying restrictions or their elimination. Because there are governmental controls and guidelines intended to prevent funds from intentionally or inadvertently being channeled to terrorist causes, there appears to be little risk in such an experiment. n329 Regardless of the course selected, any outcome from alteration of the tax constraints must ensure the accountability and transparency of our public charities and private foundations in their foreign aid endeavors. These philanthropies must be entitled to utilize resources for the purposes discussed in this Article as their best business judgments dictate. In this process, their attention must focus on the many possible domestic and foreign dangers and interests. But, whether or not fully aligned with our government's particular political agenda, the philanthropic institutions must maintain their independence from all governments to ensure their legitimacy. Additionally, it is important for the sake of democracy that our philanthropies should be able to support foreign NGOs whose interests represent those of their constituents but might not coincide entirely with U.S. values or concerns. Foreign countries must be encouraged to mold their own democratic laws and governmental policies, and, through the democratization process, the natural outcome should at least produce a country whose values are neither repugnant to, nor intolerant of, U.S. values.

#### 3) Perm causes backlash – only independent private action solves

Jenkins, 7

(Law Prof-The Ohio State University & Former COO and General Counsel of the Goldman Sachs Foundation, “Soft Power, Strategic Security, and International Philanthropy, 85 N.C.L. Rev. 773)

[\*826] One of the key strengths of nonprofit institutions and a source of their effectiveness stems from their independence. Because they are neither government nor business, nonprofit organizations occupy a unique space between the public and private sectors, unfettered from both the constraints of the political system faced by government and those of market ownership faced by corporations. n221 Although the sector's activities may generate advantageous and even important byproducts for government or business, n222 and some charitable organizations frequently work directly with government or business, nonprofits remain independent and apart from their public and corporate sector brethren. Even the nomenclature encapsulates this fundamental feature, as the term "nongovernmental organization," emphasizing such organizations' unique role apart from government, has gained global acceptance. n223 Because of this independence, international funders are able to use their position to bring diverse coalitions together: foreign governments, the private sector, other funders, and citizen stakeholders who are normally excluded from decisionmaking processes. n224 Since U.S. security interests are linked to the development of civil societies and stable states abroad, policies exact security costs when they undermine - even marginally - the unique contributions that American nonprofits make in advancing overseas development. The Guidelines are contributing to the erosion of the vital independence and separateness from government that has been a hallmark of the nonprofit sector.

There are three principal problems with these efforts to conscript funders into carrying out these investigatory functions: (1) the process does not provide the transparency and fairness that typically accompanies government processes; (2) nonprofit organizations, especially smaller organizations, are not equipped to effectively carry out investigatory functions; and (3) the process diminishes the credibility of nonprofits operating abroad. The role thrust upon nonprofits by the Treasury ATF Guidelines is not comparable to those instances in which private entities choose to conduct certain functions traditionally associated with the state; n225 here nonprofits are coerced into the role without corresponding benefit to themselves or society.

As previously noted, most nonprofit entities feel compelled to follow the Guidelines because of the catastrophic effects of having their assets frozen if the government were to deem the organization uncooperative. n226 This enlistment of private citizens (i.e., charitable organizations) to gather information - essentially to undertake an investigatory function - represents a partial shifting of traditional governmental functions and responsibilities. Significantly, the supplemental data that the Treasury ATF Guidelines ask nonprofits to collect are not necessary or helpful to improve the quality of grantmaking. n227 In practice, most funders find that they can gather enough information about the potential grantee, its leadership, its track record, and its uses of funds without the additional steps and information outlined in the Guidelines. As such, the information gathering in accordance with the Treasury ATF Guidelines appears to be for investigatory purposes on behalf of the government with the burdens and expenses placed on the nonprofit sector. Moreover, since the prescribed efforts generate no additional benefit for the nonprofit sector and speculative benefit, at best, for society, the government has not adequately justified the coercion of charitable organizations. Such coercion is troubling: transferring a public function to NGOs leads to a less transparent process, both to the public as a whole and to the constituency under investigation, and as [\*828] a result potentially makes it more difficult to hold the government accountable. To the extent that potential grantee organizations investigated would like to challenge the results, criticize the manner of investigation, or even subject the process of the required investigation to public scrutiny or inquiry, the government has immunized itself from complaints regarding the ways such investigations are handled by shifting responsibilities to private charitable organizations doing work that more suitably falls under the government's direct purview. Assigning investigatory tasks to nonprofits is ill-conceived because nonprofits are not likely to be well-equipped or effective investigatory agents. The Guidelines place nonprofits in the position of carrying out functions beyond those usually required to ensure the efficacy of charitable uses of grant funds. The suggested "data mining" tasks from the Guidelines fall outside the usual due diligence measures and expertise of charitable organizations. n228 Such organizations cannot be viewed as agents of the U.S. government if they are to effectively carry out their work. Several international philanthropists have expressed concern that the information collection activities will undermine the reputation of nonprofit organizations "for impartiality and operational independence from governments," which is a significant source of organizational strength that permits nongovernmental organizations to operate effectively in disaster areas and places of armed conflict. n229 Extensive government entanglement in ways that undermine independence may blur the lines between legitimate NGOs and less-respected government-organized NGOs ("GONGOs"). n230

[\*829] The programmatic effectiveness of international funders depends, to a great extent, on relations with key stakeholders. Grantmakers often find that "stakeholder interactions improve the ability of foundations to achieve their missions in ways that help people and communities." n231 However, some recommendations of the Treasury ATF Guidelines seem to exacerbate tensions of cross-border philanthropy and underestimate the potentially delicate relationships at stake. For instance, the Guidelines direct grantors to generate lists containing background information (names, nicknames, nationality, citizenship, place and date of birth, residential information, etc.) on staff and board members at foreign recipient organizations. n232 Requesting the type of information recommended, however, could undermine relationships between grantors and prospective grantees. n233 In many parts of the world, "there appears to be a pervasive lack of trust and confidence in nonprofit organizations," n234 which may lead some U.S. grantmakers to be viewed with greater suspicion; these invasive inquiries can support the perception that the nonprofit is working on behalf of foreign or domestic governments. And these fears may actually be warranted. In fact, in some countries, seeking the background information suggested may be misinterpreted as "intelligence-gathering" efforts on behalf of hostile local government officials, and may actually place organization staff at risk. n235 In addition to harm by insurgents, many foreign nonprofit employees around the world fear physical abuse at the hands of their government if their affiliation with certain humanitarian or pro-democracy NGOs were made public. For instance, in recent congressional testimony, a senior U.S. State Department official acknowledged unjust government harassment, [\*830] beatings, and arrests of local NGO employees in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. n236

Further, because of the unequal power dynamics in the funding relationship and the perception of U.S. foundations as elitist, U.S. grantors have been seeking to develop symbiotic partnership relationships with their grant recipients. n237 When they follow these measures and request a written certification that the foreign organization does not deal with terrorists or "support terrorism," n238 grantmakers may jeopardize the working relationship with their new partners before it even begins. This issue is particularly sensitive in dealings in certain parts of the world, such as the Middle East. Moreover, obtaining certification regarding terrorist support is a futile exercise because it is unlikely to deter a nefarious grantee seeking to dupe a U.S. charitable organization into donating funds that can be diverted to support terrorism.

Insofar as regulatory reforms interfere with grantor-grantee relationships between U.S. funders and foreign recipient organizations, charitable effectiveness may be undermined, thus lessening the ability of nonprofit organizations to contribute to America's soft power. Global nonprofits draw strength and influence from their ability to "represent[] broad public interests beyond the purview of individual states." n239 The credibility and trustworthiness that nonprofits bring to communities are just as important, perhaps even more important, to the long-term success of funded projects as their funds and resources. n240 Much of that virtue is a function of their independence from national governments. If they become an extension of government or even perceived as such, nonprofits forsake the high middle ground between the public and private spheres. n241 Paradoxically, much of the benefit that nonprofits confer on government through the enhancement of soft power is dependent on the theoretical and actual separation between private nonprofit associations and official government entities. Security interests, it would appear, are thus tied into the effectiveness and the independence of charitable organizations.

## Relations

### 2NC – Relations high/resilient

#### Relations with Mexico high and resilient:

#### a) Economic cooperation– migration, export-import relationships, FDI, and production sharing solve – that’s Wilson.

#### b) Compartmentalization –police symmetry ensure drug coop even if there are tensions elsewhere.

#### c) Framing – our ev’s predictive and empirical – no spillover between climate coop and fighting instability – that’s Selee.

#### Multiple reasons relations are inevitable:

#### 1) NAFTA bloc – prefer concrete policies over fearmongering

Shifter 13 (Michael, Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue, “A More Ambitious Agenda” February 2013 <http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD9042_USMexicoReportEnglishFinal.pdf\\CLans>)

Mexico and the United States have forged one of the strongest and most productive relationships in the world. No two countries anywhere engage so intensely on a daily basis, cooperate across such a wide and varied spectrum of issues, and affect the economy and society of the other so profoundly. No two sovereign nations are more demographically and economically integrated. With annual cross-border commerce of some $500 billion, Mexico is now the United States’ second largest trading partner. Some analysts project that it will overtake Canada for the No. 1 position within the decade. Sales to Mexico make up twothirds of all US exports to Latin America. Mexico, in turn, sends 80 percent of its exports to the United States and purchases nearly 60 percent of its imports from its northern neighbor. Substantial investment, too, flows in both directions. US investments in Mexico have averaged $12 billion annually for the past dozen years, amounting to more than half of all foreign investment in the country, according to the US State Department. In addition, families in the United States send more than $20 billion in remittances to Mexico each year. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which joined the economies of Mexico, the United States, and Canada in 1994, is today the world’s largest economic bloc, exceeding, albeit by a small margin, the total output of the 27-member European Union. Demography also matters. Some 33 million US residents are of Mexican origin. They make up more than 10 percent of the US population, nearly two-thirds of all Latinos, and around 7 percent of American voters. While US political debates tend to spotlight unauthorized immigration, 80 percent of Mexicans in the United States are legal residents. Still, illegal immigration may be the single most troubling issue in US-Mexico relations, although changing migration patterns and the growing influence of Latino voters may offer solutions going forward. Security has become an area of intense cooperation as Mexico grapples with an ongoing wave of brutal crime and violence. The United States and Mexico may not always agree on policy or strategy, but the extensive collaboration among their police and security agencies is unprecedented. Indeed, the bilateral agenda has seen cooperation flourish on almost every issue, with more opportunities emerging as mutual interests deepen. Mexico and the United States are consistently finding new ways to complement and reinforce one another in the global marketplace and on matters of regional and international importance. Both governments have made clear a commitment to consolidate and enhance this cooperation to fully leverage their inevitable and accelerating economic and demographic integration. In many ways, the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico is complicated and conditioned by the long and the bloody war on drugs. It's difficult to say exactly how many people have been killed in that war, but Mexican media have estimated that around 70,000 people have died since 2006; many thousands more have been disappeared. The United States has been closely involved, providing money, technology and intelligence to the Mexican government.

#### 2) Politics and the TPP

Hakim et al 2/1 – (Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and Laura Carlsen, director of the Americas program at the Center for International Policy, Latin America Advisor, February 1, 2013 “Have Prospects for U.S.-Mexican Relations Improved?” <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3222>) DF

Q: Eduardo Medina-Mora formally presented his credentials to U.S. President Barack Obama on Jan. 14, succeeding Arturo Sarukhán as Mexico's ambassador to Washington. This year also marks the first time in 12 years that both countries are experiencing a change in administrations at the same time. With a new administration in Mexico sworn in last month and a renewed mandate for Obama this year, have the prospects for U.S.-Mexico relations improved? What is on the horizon for U.S.-Mexican relations, and how might they change from recent years? Which bilateral issues are most likely to be addressed? Where do trade ties stand? A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Last year's concurrent elections in Mexico and the United States produced new opportunities for upgrading the two countries' already robust economic partnership and resolving longstanding bilateral tensions. The decisive impact of the Latino vote on Obama's re-election dramatically increased the prospects for an immigration reform that would make U.S. laws more humane and boost the U.S. and Mexican economies. No policy change would do more to increase goodwill between the two nations. Mexico's economy has shown remarkable vigor in the past three years, and the future could be even brighter. President Peña Nieto is committed to far-reaching economic reforms, including the opening of Mexico's languishing energy sector to private participation. Although it still faces some formidable opposition, energy reform has been gaining political support across the spectrum. Plans include freeing Mexico's national oil company from suffocating constitutional constraints and allowing exploitation of Mexico's immense shale gas reserves. This would be a game-changer for both nations--giving Mexico access to the capital and technology it requires to remain a major oil exporter and setting the stage for a North American energy market. The U.S. and Mexico, along with Canada, are participating in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) negotiations. If successful, the TPP would transform NAFTA into an even stronger trade and investment regime, with common rules of origin and far greater reach. The U.S. and Mexico also have the opportunity to initiate a significant bilateral discussion about alternative crime and drug control policies, including a hard look at legalization measures. It has been decades since even modest headway was made on any of these issues. But the shifting political climate in both countries has paved the way for change. It is now up to the two presidents to take advantage of it."

#### 3) FDI proves – interdependence prevents tensions

Wilson 11 – MA in International Affairs @ American U, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs

(Christopher, “Working Together,” Mexico Institute @ Woodrow Institute, Scholar)//BB

In addition to trade, both Mexicans and Americans have significant foreign investment in each other’s country in a diverse range of industries. Bilateral foreign investment offers benefits to both parties, generating jobs and supporting industries in the host country while generating profits for foreign companies and investors. It is often a pillar of production sharing arrangements. Since 1993, U.S. investment in Mexico and Mexican investment in the United States have skyrocketed to more than six times their 1993 level. While U.S. foreign direct investment, at $90 billion in 2010, is still much larger than investment in the opposite direction, Mexican FDI in the United States, at $12.6 billion, is significant and growing quickly.14 Mexican companies are now industry leaders in at least four areas of the U.S. market: cement, breads and baked goods, tortillas, and milk and dairy products. There are also significant Mexican investments in U.S. media, mining, beverages, retail stores, and other areas of the economy. Consumers may be surprised to learn that brands they are familiar with, like Entenmanns, Sara Lee, Thomas English Muffins, Boboli Pizza Crust, Borden Milk, Weight Watchers Yogurt, Mission Tortillas, Ready-Mix Cement, Tracfone cell phones, Saks Fifth Avenue stores, and even the New York Times, are supported by Mexican investment—as are the U.S. jobs those companies provide.15 Indeed, all but the last two are wholly owned by Mexican companies.16

#### 4) North American Leaders’ Summit

Villarreal 12 – (M. Angeles, Specialist in International Trade and Finance, August 9, 2012 “U.S.-Mexico Economic Relations: Trends, Issues, and Implications” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32934.pdf>) DF

Regulatory Cooperation

The United States, Mexico, and Canada have made efforts since 2005 to increase cooperation on security and economic issues through various endeavors, most notably by participating in trilateral summits known as the North American Leaders Summits. The most recent Summit was hosted by President Barack Obama on April 2, 2012, in Washington, DC, at the White House, where he met with Mexican President Felipe Calderón and Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper to discuss the economic well-being, safety, and security of the United States, Mexico, and Canada. After the meeting, the three leaders issued a joint statement in which they renewed their commitment to North American cooperation in the following key areas of interest: protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPR); enhancement of collective energy security, including the safe and efficient exploration and exploitation of resources; advancement of the goals of the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas and enhancement of electricity interconnection in the Americas; support of efforts to advance a lasting global solution to the challenge of climate changes; and the recognition of the importance of adopting the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime, including Canada’s commitment to ratifying the Convention and Mexico’s necessary preparations for signing it. In addition, the leaders announced the North American Plan for Animal and Pandemic Influenza (NAPAPI) to strengthen North America’s response to future animal and pandemic influenza events. In the area of strengthening security in the Americas and concerns about transnational organized crime, the three governments agreed to launch in 2012 a consolidated Central America Integration System-North America Security Dialogue to deepen regional security coordination and cooperation.

### 2NC – Alt causes

#### Alt causes to relations:

#### a) Border security – ignites political tensions over immigration reform.

#### b) Merida cooperation – drug policies and border violence hinder coop – viewed as US imperialism – that’s Brezinski and Hakim.

#### c) Framing – if the 1AR drops a single alt cause, they can’t solve for broader relations – proves issues are compartmentalized.

#### And broad disputes are inevitable:

#### 1) NSA spying – spills over to all Latin American relations

Reuters 9/3 (Reuters, via NDTV, September 3, 2013, “United States allegedly spied on presidents of Brazil, Mexico, says report,” <http://www.ndtv.com/article/world/united-states-allegedly-spied-on-presidents-of-brazil-mexico-says-report-413421?curl=1378272765>, alp)

Sao Paulo: The US National Security Agency spied on the communications of the presidents of Brazil and Mexico, a Brazilian news programme reported, a revelation that could strain US relations with the two biggest countries in Latin America. The report by Globo's news programme "Fantastico" yesterday was based on documents that journalist Glenn Greenwald obtained from former NSA contractor Edward Snowden. Greenwald, who lives in Rio de Janeiro, was listed as a co-contributor to the report. "Fantastico" showed what it said was an NSA document dated June 2012 displaying passages of written messages sent by Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto, who was still a candidate at that time. In the messages, Pena Nieto discussed who he was considering naming as his ministers once elected. A separate document displayed communication patterns between Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff and her top advisers, "Fantastico" said, although no specific written passages were included in the report. Both documents were part of an NSA case study showing how data could be "intelligently" filtered, Fantastico said. Justice Minister Jose Eduardo Cardozo told O Globo newspaper that the contents of the documents, if confirmed, "should be considered very serious and constitute a clear violation of Brazilian sovereignty." "This (spying) hits not only Brazil, but the sovereignty of several countries that could have been violated in a way totally contrary to what international law establishes," Cardozo said. Cardozo traveled last week to Washington and met with US Vice President Joseph Biden and other officials, seeking more details on a previous, seemingly less serious set of disclosures by Snowden regarding US spying in Brazil. Rousseff is scheduled to make a formal state visit in October to meet US President Barack Obama in Washington, a trip intended to illustrate the warming in Brazil-US relations since she took office in 2011. A spokesman for Rousseff would not comment on the new spying allegations. Officials at Mexico's presidential palace did not immediately respond to a request for comment. Snowden, an American who worked as a contractor for the NSA before leaking the documents, currently lives in asylum in Russia. "Fantastico" said it contacted Snowden via Internet chat, and that Snowden said he could not comment on the content of the report because of his asylum agreement with Russian authorities.

#### 2) Broken immigration policy – securitized framing means relations won’t be implemented effectively

Barry 13 (Tom Barry, senior policy analyst at the Center for International Policy, where he directs the TransBorder project, “Changing Perspectives on US-Mexico Relations” May 7, 2013 <http://truth-out.org/news/item/16221-changing-perspectives-on-us-mexico-relations\\CLans>)

The near-fortification of the border during the Bush and Obama administrations has greatly stymied regional trade and the once-vibrant crossborder culture. In highly urbanized areas such as the El Paso-Juárez metroplex, some level of border fencing makes for good neighborly relations, but the 3,169-kilometer border the “secure border fence” is not only a multibillion waste of scarce U.S. revenues, it’s also a shameful monument to U.S. xenophobia and political opportunism. President Obama should shed the “border security” framing of U.S.-Mexico border policy adopted by the Bush administration and tell President Peña Nieto and the U.S. public that Mexico and Mexicans present no security risk to the borderlands or the U.S. homeland. Terrorism is a palpable threat to U.S. public safety and national security, but this threat is best met by better U.S. intelligence about potential foreign and domestic terrorists and by a common regional security perimeter—not by continuing or increasing military-like measures of border control including drones and militarized border patrols. It is not common knowledge that Mexico is the United States’ third largest trading partner, behind Canada and China. Every day, at least a billion dollars of goods flows across the border. Yet, Mexico is frequently negatively caricaturized, primarily with images of migrants illegally crossing the border into the U.S. and stealing U.S. jobs. Instead of viewing Mexico as a valuable partner that can benefit the U.S. in many facets, it is perceived as a liability, a region that cultivates corruption and violence and is the root of the current U.S. immigration ‘problem’ that has spurred controversial rogue measures like Arizona’s SB 1070.

#### 3) Water conflict – treaty negotiation tanks relations

Stratfor 13 (Stratfor is a geopolitical intelligence firm that provides strategic analysis and forecasting to individuals and organizations around the world, “U.S., Mexico: The Decline of the Colorado River” May 13, 2013 <http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/us-mexico-decline-colorado-river#ixzz2TH6K2oMA\\CLans>)

Conflict over water can arise when there are competing interests for limited resources. This is seen throughout the world with rivers that traverse borders in places like Central Asia and North Africa. For the Colorado River, the U.S.-Mexico border is likely less relevant to the competition for the river’s resources than the artificial border drawn at Lees Ferry. Aside from growing populations, increased energy production from unconventional hydrocarbon sources in the Upper Basin has the potential to increase consumption. While this amount will likely be small compared to overall allocations, it emphasizes the value of water to the Upper Basin. Real or perceived threats to the Upper Basin’s surplus of water could be seen as threats to economic growth in the region. At the same time, further water shortages could limit the potential for economic growth in the Lower Basin — a situation that would only be exacerbated by growing populations. While necessary, conservation efforts and the search for alternative sources likely will not be able to make up for the predicted shortage. Amendments to the original treaty typically have been issued to address symptomatic problems. However, the core problem remains: More water is promised to river users than is available on average. While this problem has not come to a head yet, there may come a time when regional growth overtakes conservation efforts. It is then that renegotiation of the treaty with a more realistic view of the river’s volume will become necessary. Any renegotiation will be filled with conflict, but most of that likely will be contained in the United States.

#### 4) The plan makes it worse – shifts drug policy out of the spotlight which turns the advantage and makes it harder to overcome alt causes

CNN 5/2 (Catherine E. Schoichet, 5/2/13, “U.S., Mexican presidents push deeper economic ties; security issues still key”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/02/world/americas/mexico-obama-visit//lm>)

Two issues -- security and immigration -- often get too much attention when it comes to talking about the U.S.-Mexico relationship, U.S. President Barack Obama said Thursday. Now, Obama said, it's time to forge deeper economic connections to create more jobs and more trade on both sides of the border. "That's the focus of my visit," he told reporters after meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto in the country's capital. But even as Obama and Peña Nieto pushed to shift the tone more toward trade and economics, security issues loomed large over Thursday's meeting. Peña Nieto said his government remains committed to fighting organized crime, but that the United States and Mexico must "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect, to be more efficient in our security strategy that we are implementing in Mexico." Obama stressed that the countries will continue to cooperate closely on security, but he didn't specify how. "I agreed to continue our close cooperation on security, even as that nature of that close cooperation will evolve," he said. It's up to the Mexican people, Obama said, "to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States." In the meantime, he said, the United States remains committed to reducing the demand for drugs north of the border, and the southward flow of illegal guns and cash that help fuel violence. "I think it's natural that a new administration here in Mexico is looking carefully at how it's going to approach what is obviously a serious problem," Obama said, "and we are very much looking forward to cooperating in any ways that we can to battle organized crime." High-profile cartel takedowns were a hallmark of former President Felipe Calderon's tenure. Peña Nieto has vowed to take a different approach, focusing more on education problems and social inequality that he says fuel drug violence. The details of his policies are still coming into focus, and analysts say his government has deliberately tried to shift drug violence out of the spotlight. Before Obama's arrival, a spate of news reports this week on both sides of the border detailed changes in how Mexico cooperates with the United States. Under the new rules, all U.S. requests for collaboration with Mexican agencies will flow through a single office, Interior Minister Miguel Angel Osorio Chong told Mexico's state-run Notimex news agency. It is a drastic change from recent years, when U.S. agents enjoyed widespread access to their Mexican counterparts. Critics have expressed concerns that Peña Nieto's government will turn a blind eye to cartels or negotiate with them -- something he repeatedly denied on the campaign trail last year. On Tuesday -- two days before Obama's arrival -- his government arrested the father-in-law of Joaquin "El Chapo" Guzman, head of Mexico's Sinaloa cartel and one of the country's most-wanted drug lords. Speaking to reporters after his meeting with Obama on Thursday, Peña Nieto emphasized the importance of reducing violence, and also the importance of Mexico's relationship with the United States extending beyond the drug war. "We don't want to make this relationship targeted on one single issue," he said. "We want to place particular emphasis on the potential in the economic relationship between Mexico and the United States." To achieve that goal, Peña Nieto said, the presidents agreed to create a new high-level group to discuss economic and trade relations between the two nations. The group, which will include Cabinet ministers from both countries and U.S. Vice President Joe Biden, will have its first meeting this fall, Peña Nieto said. Imports and exports between the United States and Mexico totaled nearly $500 billion last year, and before Obama's arrival officials on both sides of the border said economic relations would be a focal point during the U.S. president's visit. "When the economy in Mexico has grown, and people have opportunity, a lot of our problems are solved, or we have the resources to solve them," Obama said Thursday. The emphasis on the economy Thursday was a significant shift, said Jason Marczak, director of policy at the Americas Society and Council of the Americas. "

### AT: Econ

**Economic collapse doesn’t cause war—that’s Zakaria—their evidence is just hype—no ongoing conflicts in the status quo were caused by the recession—cooperation, not conflict was actually the result and the liberal order is resilient**

**History proves**

**Ferguson 6**— Laurence A. Tisch prof of History at Harvard. William Ziegler of Business Administration at Harvard. MA and D.Phil from Glasgow and Oxford (Niall, “The Next War of the World,” September/October 2006, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html, AMiles)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

**Collapse saps resources from aggression**

**Nordstrum 2k** (D. Scott Bennett and Timothy Nordstrom, Department of Political Science Professors at Pennsylvania State, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No. 1, Feb., 2000, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/174621?seq=10>, ZBurdette)

In this analysis, we focus on using economic conditions to understand when rivalries are likely to escalate or end. Rivalries are an appropriate set of cases to use when examining substitutability both because leaders in rival states have clearly substitutable choices and because rivalries are a set of cases in which externalization is particularly plausible policy option. In particular, when confronted with domestic problems, leaders in a rivalry have the clear alternatives of escalating the conflict with the rival to divert attention or to work to settle the rivalry as a means of freeing up a substantial amount of resources that can be diverted toward solving internal problems. In the case of the diversion option, rivals provide logical, believable actors for leaders to target; the presence of a clear rival may offer unstable elites a particularly inviting target for hostile statements or actual conflict as necessary. The public and relevant elites already consider the rival a threat or else the rivalry would not have continued for an extended period; the presence of disputed issues also provides a casus belli with the rival that is always present. Rivals also may provide a target where the possible costs and risks of externalization are relatively controlled. If the goal is diversion, leaders will want to divert attention **without provoking an actual (and expensive) war**. Over the course of many confrontations, rival states may learn to anticipate response patterns, leading to **safer disputes** or at least to leaders believing that they can control the risks of conflict when they initiate a new confrontation. In sum, rivals provide good targets for domestically challenged political leaders. This leads to you first hypothesis, which is as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Poor economic conditions lead to diversionary actions against the rival.

Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that **end**s **a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy.** In a “guns versus butter” world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be the greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.

**Studies go neg**

**Miller 2k** – Professor of Management, Ottawa (Morris, Poverty As A Cause Of Wars?, http://www.pugwash.org/reports/pac/pac256/WG4draft1.htm, AG)

Thus, these armed conflicts can hardly be said to be caused by poverty as a principal factor when the greed and envy of leaders and their hegemonic ambitions provide sufficient cause. The poor would appear to be more the victims than the perpetrators of armed conflict. It might be alleged that some dramatic event or rapid sequence of those types of events that lead to the exacerbation of poverty might be the catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who might be tempted to seek a diversion by finding/fabricating an enemy and going to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since World War II they concluded that Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes. A more direct role was played by political variables such as ideological polarization, labor radicalism, guerilla insurgencies and an anti-Communist military... (In democratic states) such changes seldom lead to an outbreak of violence (while) in the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another.

**Recession won’t cause civil unrest**

**Durodie, security lecturer, 9**—Senior Lecturer in Risk and Corporate Security in the Resilience Centre of Cranfield University. Senior Fellow co-ordinating the Homeland Defence research programme in the Centre of Excellence for National Security of the S.Rajaratnam School of International Studies at the Nanyang Technological University. Associate Fellow of the International Security Programme at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House. PhD from the London School of Economics (Bill, Recession and unrest: Cauldron may not boil over, 28 May 2009, Straits Times, AMiles)

NO SOONER had the economic crisis emerged before security agencies began worrying about its implications for social stability. This tells us more about their crisis of confidence than inherent tendencies. The recession will not necessarily lead to social problems. It is striking how swiftly the world moved into recession and how unexpected this was. On June 20, 2007, the then British Chancellor of the Exchequer congratulated the City of London for creating “an era that history will record as the beginning of a new golden age for the City”. The US sub-prime mortgage crisis emerged a month later. By September, Britain’s Northern Rock Bank was seeking support from the Bank of England. But even at that stage, many considered the crisis to be specific rather than systemic. On Aug 13 last year, the Bank of England governor Mervyn King announced: “The central projection is one of a broadly flat output over the next year.” Events then accelerated from September last year, with the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers. Only one month later, a major British policing agency was asking: “How will crime against business and industry change in an economic downturn?” This suggests the discussion on the implications of the recession for social cohesion has been driven more by speculative concerns than evident trends. That is not surprising as the current period is marked more by elite insecurity than inherent social instability. Some commentators have suggested the recession may be a good thing. These romanticise a supposed spirit of community they believe will emerge from an enforced curb on consumption. One should be wary of talking up the crisis in this fashion, as the British shadow health secretary has discovered. He was chastised for suggesting the recession would be good for families since it would prevent people from buying cigarettes and alcohol. The masses may not be revolting, but they are not stupid either. They are quite capable of noting that a recession is nothing to celebrate. At the opposite end of the spectrum, some have worried that the crisis will lead to social unrest. These overestimate the inevitability of social instability and underestimate its requisite political drivers. Compared to previous recessions, the worldwide working class has never been so disconnected and disorganised. In the 1960s and 1970s, leaders across the globe faced the twin threats of the organised labour movement within their borders and the alternative of communism without. These elements disintegrated in the 1980s and 1990s, leaving behind an atomised and disillusioned workforce. Of course, atomisation breeds alienation with a concomitant and occasional lashing out against the system. But this is sporadic and exceptional, rather than generic and protracted. The concerns of the elites therefore have more to do with their sense of isolation and insecurity than any conscious or organised threat. Indeed, most world leaders do not even face a serious challenge from within their own ranks, let alone one from outside. The most vocal have been the disgruntled middle classes, and their supporters in the media. Of course, since the French revolution, it has been the historic role of the middle class to co-opt the lower orders in their struggles only to turn against them at the last moment. But the absence of any oppositional ideology today suggests this to be extremely unlikely. Crime, of course, is a separate matter from social unrest. One might expect social hardship to lead to some increase in particular types of criminality. Illegal immigration and insurance scams may also increase, as could covering up errors for fear of losing one’s job. But some crimes, such as metal theft in a period of diminishing demand, may decrease. The important thing to note is that these are individual responses rather than organised ones. It is the worrying about, and talking up of, the possibility of crime that may encourage it. Blaming bankers for causing all these problem is also unproductive. This ignores the responsibility of governments in encouraging their activities. Oddly, it may be the absence of resistance that has allowed political leaders to avoid the hard intellectual and managerial tasks required of them, such as allowing banks to fail and curbing spending. This suggests we face a political, as well as an economic crisis. It is clear that many have still to appreciate the true severity and longevity of the problems that confront them. Even when the recession recedes, deeper structural problems will still need to be addressed, as will the lack of the requisite leadership and vision to do this. The emphasis now on promoting “green” solutions reflects the low horizons that preceded the crisis. “Green” jobs are unlikely to be well-paid or productive. A campaign to encourage everybody to switch to energy-efficient light bulbs is not the same as investing in the research and production facilities required to develop and produce energy-efficient solutions. “Sustainable” growth is code for “low” or “no” growth. Finally, for all the talk of pump-priming, that is easier said than done in economies where state-spending already accounts for 40 per cent to 50 per cent of total expenditure. State cuts are more likely to be required. These are unlikely to be popular, but they may not be rejected either. Many of the measures introduced so far to address the crisis will simply convert the current private debt crisis into a future public one. What may be most important for the elites to do at this time would be to engage the public in an open dialogue as to what should come next. The crisis will not automatically lead to class conflict or social unrest, but neither will it be good for communities and the environment. A genuine engagement with the public about future possibilities may serve to offset the pain of the necessary cuts that lie ahead.

**Leaders don’t want to spend money on the military**

**Deudney, pol sci prof, 91** – Professor of PolSci, Johns Hopkins (Daniel, Environment and Security, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 47.3, proquest, AG)

In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modern era, "The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones." The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930s, increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem.

**And, decline causes cooperation not war**

**Aljazeera News 9** (US and China vow closer ties, AMiles)

China and the US have wrapped up two days of high-level strategic talks pledging closer cooperation on measures to revive the global economy and increased diplomatic efforts to rein in the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea. Following the talks in Washington officials from the two countries said they had agreed to maintain stimulus spending until recovery is secured and support free trade. A memorandum was also signed on measures to combat climate change and reduce carbon emissions, although it did not set any firm goals. Praising what she said was an "unprecedented" meeting Hillary Clinton, the US secretary of state, said the two countries had spoken candidly "about some of the world's most difficult challenges." The two days of talks, dubbed the "strategic and economic dialogue" brought together top level officials from the world's biggest developed and developing economies. Clinton said Chinese and US officials had agreed to push for global economic recovery, promote stability through six-party nuclear talks in northeast Asia and address ongoing security threats in central Asia and the Middle East. She added that China shared US worries over North Korean and Iranian nuclear programmes and both agreed that negotiations were the only way to deal with North Korea's recent missile and nuclear tests. While Clinton conceded that the talks had yet to yield concrete results, she said the laying of the groundwork "to create confidence and understanding is a very good investment". Economic revampOn the economic front Timothy Geithner, the US treasury secretary, said the two sides had agreed to step up efforts to reconfigure their economies so that China's growth is less reliant on exports and the US resumes saving and investment to stop the boom-and-bust cycle. "China will rebalance towards domestic demand-led growth," Geithner said, while the US had already learned the "importance of living within our means as a country and at a household level". "The most important thing we achieved today was to agree on this broad framework for policies and reform… to help lay the foundation for a more sustainable , more balanced global recovery." Praising China's restructuring efforts, Geithner said the moves would make "a huge contribution to more rapid, balanced, and sustained global growth".

## Warming

**No warming—that’s Beisner—there’s a trend to cooler weather now—new studies by climate experts prove that natural oceanic cycles are shifting back to cold mold mode—their evidence is based on false predictions**

\*\*Must read\*\*

**No runaway warming**

**McShane 8—**Owen, chairman of the policy panel of the New Zealand Climate Science Coalition and director of the Centre for Resource Management Studies, April 4, 2008

(Cites Roy Spencer, principal research scientist for U of Alabama in Huntsville and recipient of NASA's Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement, “Climate change confirmed but global warming is cancelled”, The National Business Review (New Zealand), Lexis)

Atmospheric scientists generally agree that as carbon dioxide levels increase there is a law of "diminishing returns" - or more properly "diminishing effects" - and that ongoing increases in CO2 concentration do not generate proportional increases in temperature. The common analogy is painting over window glass. The first layers of paint cut out lots of light but subsequent layers have diminishing impact. So, you might be asking, why the panic? Why does Al Gore talk about temperatures spiraling out of control, causing mass extinctions and catastrophic rises in sea-level, and all his other disastrous outcomes when there is no evidence to support it? The alarmists argue that increased CO2 leads to more water vapour - the main greenhouse gas - and this provides positive feedback and hence makes the overall climate highly sensitive to small increases in the concentration of CO2. Consequently, the IPCC argues that while carbon dioxide may well "run out of puff" the consequent evaporation of water vapour provides the positive feedback loop that will make anthropogenic global warming reach dangerous levels. This assumption that water vapour provides positive feedback lies behind the famous "tipping point," which nourishes Al Gore's dreams of destruction, and indeed all those calls for action now - "before it is too late!" But no climate models predict such a tipping point. However, while the absence of hot spots has refuted one important aspect of the IPCC models we lack a mechanism that fully explains these supposed outcomes. Hence the IPCC, and its supporters, have been able to ignore this "refutation." So by the end of last year, we were in a similar situation to the 19th century astronomers, who had figured out that the sun could not be "burning" its fuel - or it would have turned to ashes long ago - but could not explain where the energy was coming from. Then along came Einstein and E=mc2. Hard to explain Similarly, the climate sceptics have had to explain why the hotspots are not where they should be - not just challenge the theory with their observations. This is why I felt so lucky to be in the right place at the right time when I heard Roy Spencer speak at the New York conference on climate change in March. At first I thought this was just another paper setting out observations against the forecasts, further confirming Evans' earlier work. But as the argument unfolded I realised Spencer was drawing on observations and measurements from the new Aqua satellites to explain the mechanism behind this anomaly between model forecasts and observation. You may have heard that the IPCC models cannot predict clouds and rain with any accuracy. Their models assume water vapour goes up to the troposphere and hangs around to cook us all in a greenhouse future. However, there is a mechanism at work that "washes out" the water vapour and returns it to the oceans along with the extra CO2 and thus turns the added water vapour into a NEGATIVE feedback mechanism. The newly discovered mechanism is a combination of clouds and rain (Spencer's mechanism adds to the mechanism earlier identified by Professor Richard Lindzen called the Iris effect). The IPCC models assumed water vapour formed clouds at high altitudes that lead to further warming. The Aqua satellite observations and Spencer's analysis show water vapour actually forms clouds at low altitudes that lead to cooling. Furthermore, Spencer shows the extra rain that falls from these clouds cools the underlying oceans, providing a second negative feedback to negate the CO2 warming. Alarmists' quandary This has struck the alarmists like a thunderbolt, especially as the lead author of the IPCC chapter on feedback has written to Spencer agreeing that he is right! There goes the alarmist neighbourhood! The climate is not highly sensitive to CO2 warming because water vapour is a damper against the warming effect of CO2. That is why history is full of Ice Ages - where other effects, such as increased reflection from the ice cover, do provide positive feedback - while we do not hear about Heat Ages. The Medieval Warm Period, for example, is known for being benignly warm - not dangerously hot. We live on a benign planet - except when it occasionally gets damned cold. While I have done my best to simplify these developments they remain highly technical and many people distrust their own ability to assess competing scientific claims. However, in this case the tipping point theories are based on models that do not include the effects of rain and clouds. The new Nasa Aqua satellite is the first to measure the effects of clouds and rainfall. Spencer's interpretation of **the new data means all previous models and forecasts are obsolete**. Would anyone trust long-term forecasts of farm production that were hopeless at forecasting rainfall? The implications of these breakthroughs in measurement and understanding are dramatic to say the least. The responses will be fun to watch.

**We’ll end this debate here**

**Beisner 10**—former associate professor of interdisciplinary studies in economics, government, and public policy, Covenant. PhD, University of St. Andrews (Calvin, Global Warming Alarmism Melts Down with Phil Jones's Admissions, 24 February 2010, http://www.crosswalk.com/news/commentary/11626575/, AMiles)

Forget all you've heard about unprecedented global warming; global warming so rapid it can't be natural but must be anthropogenic; global warming threatening to devastate economies, ecosystems, and perhaps even human civilization itself; global warming on which "the science is settled" and "the debate is over." Forget it all. On February 13, Dr. Phil Jones, long-time director of the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia (until he stepped down in December under investigation for scientific misconduct) and the provider of much of the most important data on which the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and many governments have based fears of unprecedented global warming starting in the mid-1970s, gave an interview to the BBC in which he made some shocking revelations. Jones admitted that he did not believe that "the debate on climate change is over" and that he didn't "believe the vast majority of climate scientists think this." Al Gore, Barack Obama, Barbara Boxer, did you hear that? Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, Union of Concerned Scientists, did you hear that? Ed Begley, Robert Kennedy, Richard Cizik, Jim Ball, did you hear that? Jones made a number of admissions damaging his cause and credibility: He admitted that there was no statistically significant difference between rates of warming from 1860-1880 and 1910-1940 and the rate from 1975-1998, though he and other DAGW believers had for years said the rate in the last period was unprecedented and therefore couldn't be natural but must be manmade. Jones admitted that there has been no statistically significant warming for the last 15 years (though he personally believes this is only a temporary pause in manmade warming). Jones admitted that natural influences could have contributed to the 1975-1998 warming. Significantly, he mentioned only the sun and volcanoes--the latter a brief cooling factor--and completely omitting reference to ocean circulations such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the North Atlantic Oscillation, and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, and changes in cloudiness stemming from both the ocean circulations and changes in influx of cosmic rays. All of these have been demonstrated to have strong effect on global temperature. Jones admitted that the revelation of data handling failures at CRU and elsewhere (such as the U.K. Meteorological Office) had shaken the trust many people have in science. Jones admitted that the Medieval Warm Period might well have been as warm as the Current Warm Period (1975-present), or warmer . If that were true, "then obviously the late-20th century warmth would not be unprecedented," though he persisted in doubting the MWP to have been global and as warm as the present. The former CRU director's admissions do more than justify climate change skeptics' caution -- it opens the floodgates on other mismanagement by Jones and fellow climate change proponents. The UK's Mail Online reported that Jones has admitted having trouble "keeping track" of the data he has used in constructing the research papers claiming unprecedented recent warming. The Mail Online said Jones said there was truth in colleagues' observations "that he lacked organizational skills, that his office was swamped with piles of paper and that his record keeping is 'not as good as it should be'." It also reported that colleagues say "the reason . . . Jones refused Freedom of Information requests is that he may have actually lost the relevant papers." In a separate interview with the BBC's Roger Harrabin Jones said American data centers suffered similar poor record keeping--which implies that none of the datasets on which the IPCC and other bodies have relied is really trustworthy. With the surface temperature data admittedly corrupt and unverifiable, that leaves data from weather balloons and satellites--which show no statistically significant global warming from 1975 to the present. **Jones's concessions are no tempest in a teapot. They strike at the root of global warming fears and the credibility of temperature data on which the IPCC and governments around the world relied**. It has already been concluded that Jones and the CRU violated Britain's Freedom of Information Act, though the conclusion came too late for prosecution. An inquiry by the University of East Anglia into whether Jones is guilty of serious scientific misconduct continues--following the resignation from the inquiry panel of Dr. Philip Campbell, editor in chief of Nature , after it was revealed that, shortly after the Climategate emails were released, he had "told Chinese state radio . . . that he did not believe that the emails had shown any evidence of improper conduct." The comment clearly demonstrated Campbell's bias in the matter and disqualified him from participating on the panel, though he did not reveal the fact himself. Ironically, Nature is the journal in which Dr. Michael Mann used the tactic that Jones referred to in one of the most famous of the Climategate emails as "Mike's Nature trick." A similar investigations continues at Pennsylvania State University into whether Mann, a paleoclimatologist famous for his now discredited "hockey stick" graph of global temperatures over the last millennium and author of many of the Climategate emails, committed scientific misconduct. When even the Times of London, long a promoter of global warming alarm, forthrightly reports, in the midst of all the news of the collapse of credibility of data purported to support belief in it, that other serious scientists say the world is not warming, you know the gig is up. The Times quotes Dr. John Christy, professor of atmospheric science at the University of Alabama at Huntsville and a former lead author for the IPCC, as saying, "The temperature records cannot be relied on as indicators of global change" and then goes on to explain Christy's and others' criticisms at length. "The story is the same for each" region he has analyzed, Christy said. "The popular data sets show a lot of warming but the apparent temperature rise was actually caused by local factors affecting the weather stations, such as land development." The Times also cites Dr. Ross McKitrick, professor of economics at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada (and a co-author of the Cornwall Alliance's Renewed Call to Truth, Prudence, and Protection of the Poor: An Evangelical Examination of the Theology, Science and Economics of Global Warming) as saying that his service as an IPCC reviewer "turned him into a strong critic." And the Times refers to a study of U.S. weather stations by Anthony Watts and Joseph D'Aleo that demonstrates that most do not meet standards for siting, construction, and maintenance, resulting in the strong warm bias.

**It’s not man made**

**Wojick 5** (David, President of Climatechange.org, Electricity Daily, January 10)

U.S. climate change research policy is seriously out of whack. There is growing evidence that solar variability is responsible for most of the global warming in the last century ( ED, Dec 15,2004). Coal fired power plants are being blamed for much of this warming, but if it is actually the sun at work then we are wasting time and a lot of money trying to cut carbon dioxide emissions. Clearly the Bush administration should be looking into this solar angle. But it is not, even though its $2 billion a year Climate Change Science Program just underwent a massive review. The CCSP is doing outdated, entrenched science, that assumes humans are to blame for what may well be a natural phenomenon. The problem is that the federal science program was defined 15 years ago. It was assumed then that the climate is naturally unchanging, so humans must be the cause of the observed warming. Since then we have learned that climate, like weather, is never constant, but the research program has not changed accordingly. In the last 6-8 years the sun has emerged as a big driver of Earth s climate change. For example, consider the findings of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which conducts massive periodic reviews of climate science. In 1995 the IPCC said that the sun was not a factor in the warming over the last century. In 2001 it concluded that more than half of that warming was solar induced, not human induced. Given that the IPCC tends to be biased toward the theory of human induced warming, **this was a huge admission**. The scientific trend marked by the IPCC s flip flop has continued. The research problem is that the known variations in solar energy are not strong enough to account for all of the observed global warming. But in the last five years a number of indirect, amplifying mechanisms have been identified. The result is that we now know how **the sun might account for all of the warming**, and there is growing evidence that it does. Research problems do not get any better, or more important, than this. The policy problem is that the CCSP has no plans to do solar-climate research. Because carbon dioxide was assumed to be the culprit, the annual CCSP budget has a $110 million carbon cycle component. But CO2 is a trace gas and the CO2 increase to date cannot explain the observed warming, without assuming a water vapor feedback, so the CCSP also includes a $150 million water-cycle component. There is no corresponding solar-cycle research, what little is done on solar is round-off error. The word solar barely occurs in the new CCSP Strategic Plan, and occurs not at all in the plan s milestones. In short, the climate research program has assumed an old, speculative answer to the warming question (humans are doing it) and is throwing vast quantities of money at that answer. Billions of dollars over the last 15 years. Now that a new answer is emerging (it s the Sun, after all) the CCSP has failed to notice. Clearly its time to put some of these big science bucks into solar climate research. U.S. energy policy hangs in the balance.

**It will be slow**

**Carter 7—**paleontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist, PhD from Cambridge University, 2007 is an Adjunct Research Professor at James Cook University (Robert M., “The Myth of Dangerous Human-Caused Climate Change”, the AusIMM New Leaders’ Conference, May 2-3)

Though not a pollutant, it is nonetheless the case that carbon dioxide absorbs space-bound infrared radiation, thereby increasing the energy available at Earth’s surface for warming or increased evaporation (eg de Freitas, 2002). Radiation theory thus accepted, there remain four problems with turning an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide into global warming alarmism. First, the relationship between increasing carbon dioxide and increasing temperature is logarithmic, which lessens the forcing effect of each successive increment of carbon dioxide (Figure 4). Second, in increasing from perhaps 280 ppm in pre-industrial times to 380 ppm now, carbon dioxide should already have produced 75 per cent of the theoretical warming of ~1°C that would be caused by a doubling to 560 ppm (Lindzen, 2006); as we move from 380 to 560 ppm, at most a trivial few tenths of a degree of warming remain in the system. Claims of greater warming, such as those of the IPCC (2001), are based upon arbitrary adjustments to the lambda value in the Stefan-Boltzmann equation, and untested assumptions about positive feedbacks from water vapour. Third, the ice core data show conclusively that, during natural climate cycling, changes in temperature precede changes in carbon dioxide by an average 800 years or so (Fischer et al, 1999; Indermuhle et al, 2000; Mudelsee, 2001; Caillon et al, 2003); similarly, temperature change precedes carbon dioxide change, in this case by five months, during annual seasonal cycling (Kuo, Lindberg and Thomson, 1990). And, fourth, Boucot, Xu and Scotese (2004) have shown that over the Phanerozoic little relationship exists between the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide and necessary warming, including that extensive glaciation occurred between 444 and 353 million years ago when atmospheric carbon dioxide was up to 17 times higher than today (Chumakov, 2004).

**Warming’s a joke—**

**a) Empirically denied**

**Michaels 2K—**and Balling 2000 - Prof Environmental Sciences @ U Virginia, and Prof Climatology @ ASU The Satanic Gasses Pg. 106 (The – up).

That tenet is obvious both from theoretical points of view and based on practical observations. When dinosaurs roamed the earth, the carbon dioxide concentration was around 10 times higher than it was before the industrial revolution. And yet the temperature was only about 10°C (18°F) above what it is today, if the relationship between carbon dioxide and temperature were constant, then temperatures during that era should have been more than twice as warm. Not only that, but there is a lag between when the greenhouse effect changes and when the earth's oceans which are very slow to warm catch up.

**b) Consensus**

**Unruh 8**—Unruh, News Editor for Word Net Daily, 5/19/2008 [Bob Unruh, May 19 2008, Word Net Daily, “31,000 scientists reject 'global warming' agenda”, <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=64734>]

More than 31,000 scientists across the U.S. – including more than 9,000 Ph.D.s in fields such as atmospheric science, climatology, Earth science, environment and dozens of other specialties – have signed a petition rejecting "global warming," the assumption that the human production of greenhouse gases is damaging Earth's climate. "There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate," the petition states. "Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth." The Petition Project actually was launched nearly 10 years ago, when the first few thousand signatures were assembled. Then, between 1999 and 2007, the list of signatures grew gradually without any special effort or campaign. But now, a new effort has been conducted because of an "escalation of the claims of 'consensus,' release of the movie 'An Inconvenient Truth' by Mr. Al Gore, and related events," according to officials with the project. "Mr. Gore's movie, asserting a 'consensus' and 'settled science' in agreement about human-caused global warming, conveyed the claims about human-caused global warming to ordinary movie goers and to public school children, to whom the film was widely distributed. Unfortunately, Mr. Gore's movie contains many very serious incorrect claims which no informed, honest scientist could endorse," said project spokesman and founder Art Robinson. Robinson, a research professor of chemistry, co-founded the Linus Pauling Institute of Science and Medicine with Linus Pauling in 1973, and later co-founded the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine. He also publishes the Access to Energy newsletter. WND submitted a request to Gore's office for comment but did not get a response. Robinson said the dire warnings about "global warming" have gone far beyond semantics or scientific discussion now to the point they are actually endangering people. "The campaign to severely ration hydrocarbon energy technology has now been markedly expanded," he said. "In the course of this campaign, many scientifically invalid claims about impending climate emergencies are being made. Simultaneously, proposed political actions to severely reduce hydrocarbon use now threaten the prosperity of Americans and the very existence of hundreds of millions of people in poorer countries," he said. In just the past few weeks, there have been various allegations that both shark attacks and typhoons have been sparked by "global warming." The late Professor Frederick Seitz, the past president of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and winner of the National Medal of Science, wrote in a letter promoting the petition, "The United States is very close to adopting an international agreement that would ration the use of energy and of technologies that depend upon coal, oil, and natural gas and some other organic compounds." "This treaty is, in our opinion, based upon flawed ideas. Research data on climate change do not show that human use of hydrocarbons is harmful. To the contrary, there is good evidence that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide is environmentally helpful," he wrote. Accompanying the letter sent to scientists was a 12-page summary and review of research on "global warming," officials said. "The proposed agreement would have very negative effects upon the technology of nations throughout the world, especially those that are currently attempting to lift from poverty and provide opportunities to the over 4 billion people in technologically underdeveloped countries," Seitz wrote. Robinson said the project targets scientists because, "It is especially important for America to hear from its citizens who have the training necessary to evaluate the relevant data and offer sound advice." He said the "global warming agreement," written in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997, and other plans "would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind." "Yet," he said, "the United Nations and other vocal political interests say the U.S. must enact new laws that will sharply reduce domestic energy production and raise energy prices even higher. "The inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness include the right of access to life-giving and life-enhancing technology. This is especially true of access to the most basic of all technologies: energy. These human rights have been extensively and wrongly abridged," he continued. "During the past two generations in the U.S., a system of high taxation, extensive regulation, and ubiquitous litigation has arisen that prevents the accumulation of sufficient capital and the exercise of sufficient freedom to build and preserve needed modern technology. "These unfavorable political trends have severely damaged our energy production, where lack of industrial progress has left our country dependent upon foreign sources for 30 percent of the energy required to maintain our current level of prosperity," he said. "Moreover, the transfer of other U.S. industries abroad as a result of these same trends has left U.S. citizens with too few goods and services to trade for the energy that they do not produce. A huge and unsustainable trade deficit and rapidly rising energy prices have been the result. "The necessary hydrocarbon and nuclear energy production technologies have been available to U.S. engineers for many decades. We can develop these resources without harm to people or the environment. There is absolutely no technical, resource, or environmental reason for the U.S. to be a net importer of energy. The U.S. should, in fact, be a net exporter of energy," he said. He told WND he believes the issue has nothing to do with energy itself, but everything to do with power, control and money, which the United Nations is seeking. He accused the U.N. of violating human rights in its campaign to ban much energy research, exploration and development. "In order to alleviate the current energy emergency and prevent future emergencies, we need to remove the governmental restrictions that have caused this problem. Fundamental human rights require that U.S. citizens and their industries be free to produce and use the low cost, abundant energy that they need. As the 31,000 signatories of this petition emphasize, environmental science supports this freedom," he said. The Petition Project website today said there are 31,072 scientists who have signed up, and Robinson said more names continue to come in. In terms of Ph.D. scientists alone, it already has 15 times more scientists than are seriously involved in the U.N.'s campaign to "vilify hydrocarbons," officials told WND. "The very large number of petition signers demonstrates that, if there is a consensus among American scientists, it is in opposition to the human-caused global warming hypothesis rather than in favor of it," the organization noted.

**c) Cooling now**

**Taylor 9** (James, Senior Fellow @ Heartland Institute, “Global Cooling Continues,” March 1, http://www.heartland.org/publications/environment%20climate/article/24739/Global\_Cooling\_Continues.html)

Continuing a decade-long trend of declining global temperatures, the year 2008 was significantly colder than 2007, and global temperatures for the year were below the average over the past 30 years. The global temperature data, reported by NASA satellite-based temperature measurements, refuted predictions 2008 would be one of the warmest on record. Data show 2008 ranked 14th coldest of the 30 years measured by NASA satellite instruments since they were first launched in 1979. It was the coldest year since 2000. (See accompanying figure.) Satellite Precision NASA satellites uniformly monitor the Earth’s lower atmosphere, which greenhouse gas theory predicts will show the first and most significant effects of human-caused global warming. The satellite-based measurements are uncorrupted by urban heat islands and localized land-use changes that often taint records from surface temperature stations, giving false indications of warming. The uncorrupted satellite-based temperature measurements refute surface temperature station data finding 2008 to be one of the top 10 warmest years on record. “How can an ‘average year’ in one database appear to be a [top 10] warmest year in another?” asked meteorologist Joe D’Aleo on his International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project Web site. “Well, the global databases of [surface station reports] are all contaminated by urbanization, major station dropout, missing data, bad siting, instruments with known warm biases being introduced without adjustment, and black-box and man-made adjustments designed to maximize [reported] warming,” explained D’Aleo. Warming Trend Overstated “The substantial and continuing La Niña cooled the Earth quite a bit in 2008, to the point that it was slightly below the 30-year average [1979-2008] but slightly above the 20-year average [1979-1998],” said John Christy, distinguished professor of atmospheric science and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH). “From research we have published, and more to come soon, we find that land surface air temperatures misrepresent the actual temperature changes in the deep atmosphere—where the greenhouse effect is anticipated to have its easiest impact to measure. Surface thermometers are affected by many influences, especially surface development, so the bulk atmospheric measurements from satellites offer a straightforward indicator of how much heat is or is not accumulating in the air, for whatever reason,” Christy explained. “Recent published evidence also supports the long-term trends of UAH as being fairly precise, so the observed rate of warming is noticeably less than that projected by the IPCC ‘Best Estimate’ model simulations which, we hypothesize, are too sensitive to CO2 increases,” Christy added.

**d) Prefer our evidence**

**Lindzen 10—**professor of meteorology, MIT. Member of the National Academy of Sciences, and the Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters, and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society. PhD, Harvard (Richard, Climate Science In Denial, 22 April 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704448304575196802317362416.html?mod=rss\_Today's\_Most\_Popular, AMiles)

In what has come to be known as "climategate," one could see unambiguous evidence of the unethical suppression of information and opposing viewpoints, and even data manipulation. The Climatic Research Unit is hardly an obscure outpost; it supplies many of the authors for the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Moreover, the emails showed ample collusion with other prominent researchers in the United States and elsewhere. One might have thought the revelations would discredit the allegedly settled science underlying currently proposed global warming policy, and, indeed, the revelations may have played some role in the failure of last December's Copenhagen climate conference to agree on new carbon emissions limits. But with the political momentum behind policy proposals and billions in research funding at stake, the impact of the emails appears to have been small. The general approach of the official scientific community (at least in the United States and the United Kingdom) has been to see whether people will bother to look at the files in detail (for the most part they have not), and to wait until time diffuses the initial impressions in order to reassert the original message of a climate catastrophe that must be fought with a huge measure of carbon control. This reassertion, however, continues to be suffused by illogic, nastiness and outright dishonesty. There were, of course, the inevitable investigations of individuals like Penn State University's Michael Mann (who manipulated data to create the famous "hockey stick" climate graph) and Phil Jones (director of the CRU). The investigations were brief, thoroughly lacking in depth, and conducted, for the most part, by individuals already publicly committed to the popular view of climate alarm. The results were whitewashes that are quite incredible given the actual data. In addition, numerous professional societies, including the American Society of Agronomy, the American Society of Plant Biologists and the Natural Science Collections Alliance, most of which have no expertise whatever in climate, endorse essentially the following opinion: That the climate is warming, the warming is due to man's emissions of carbon dioxide, and continued emissions will lead to catastrophe. We may reasonably wonder why they feel compelled to endorse this view. The IPCC's position in its Summary for Policymakers from their Fourth Assessment (2007) is weaker, and simply points out that most warming of the past 50 years or so is due to man's emissions. It is sometimes claimed that the IPCC is 90% confident of this claim, but there is no known statistical basis for this claim—it's purely subjective. The IPCC also claims that observations of globally averaged temperature anomaly are also consistent with computer model predictions of warming. There are, however, some things left unmentioned about the IPCC claims. For example, the observations are consistent with models only if emissions include arbitrary amounts of reflecting aerosols particles (arising, for example, from industrial sulfates) which are used to cancel much of the warming predicted by the models. The observations themselves, without such adjustments, are consistent with there being sufficiently little warming as to not constitute a problem worth worrying very much about. In addition, the IPCC assumed that computer models accurately included any alternative sources of warming—most notably, the natural, unforced variability associated with phenomena like El Nino, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, etc. Yet the relative absence of statistically significant warming for over a decade shows clearly that this assumption was wrong. Of course, none of this matters any longer to those replacing reason with assertions of authority. Consider a letter of April 9 to the Financial Times by the presidents of the U.S. National Academy of Science and the Royal Society (Ralph Cicerone and Martin Rees, respectively). It acknowledges that climategate has contributed to a reduced concern among the public, as has unusually cold weather. But Messrs. Cicerone and Rees insist that nothing has happened to alter the rather extreme statement that climate is changing and it is due to human action. They then throw in a very peculiar statement (referring to warming), almost in passing: "Uncertainties in the future rate of this rise, stemming largely from the 'feedback' effects on water vapour and clouds, are topics of current research." Who would guess, from this statement, that the feedback effects are the crucial question? Without these positive feedbacks assumed by computer modelers, there would be no significant problem, and the various catastrophes that depend on numerous factors would no longer be related to anthropogenic global warming. That is to say, the issue relevant to policy is far from settled. Nonetheless, the letter concludes: "Our academies will provide the scientific backdrop for the political and business leaders who must create effective policies to steer the world toward a low-carbon economy." In other words, the answer is settled even if the science is not.

**Consensus means nothing**

**Geddes 5**—Executive Vice President of the Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment, 2005 [Peter Geddes, June 2005, Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, “The Dangers of Scientific Consensus”, JSTOR]

Historically, the greatest scientists were great precisely because they broke with the consensus. This is important to remember when discussing global warming and other environmental issues. Such issues arc always contentious, because they share two characteristics: they are technically complex and highly emotional. Can you think of a single environmental issue that isn't both? Advocates for dramatic action on climate change often base their appeal on the authority of scientific "consensus". For example, "A majority of climate scientists, including 99 of the worlds Nobel Prize winners, have signed a petition for the world's leaders to act immediately to reduce greenhouse gas emissions". When experts disagree, we naturally assume the majority is likely to be correct. This is a reasonable way to make sense of legitimate scientific uncertainty, but we should remember two points. First, science, unlike the race for homecoming queen, is not a popularity contest. While most unlikely in the climate change debate, scientific "consensus" may be overturned by a single experiment. When new results emerge and peers repeat them consistently, the old consensus crumbles. The scientific method is the foundation of modem science. We use it to distinguish reality from fantasy and truth from propaganda. Appeals based on authority are especially suspect. For example, the Catholic Church once condemned as heretics those who did not subscribe to their preferred model of the universe - that the Earth, not the sun, was at the center. Here's an irony: our knowledge of the world advances when we learn that something we believed to be true turns out not to be. For example, Aristotle asserted that heavier objects fall faster than lighter ones. This was the conventional wisdom for over 2000 years. Galileo tested this theory by dropping different objects from certain heights and rolling balls down inclined planes. From these experiments he formulated the law of falling bodies. Here's the second point. Policy controversies involve trade-offs among competing values. Responsible policy makers know that environmental quality is only one of several important and competing values. Just as people on fixed budgets must choose between buying medicine or more heat, societies must choose between competing goods and values (eg more open space, safer roads, or more funding for education). These trade-offs arc inescapable, and it is irresponsible to pretend they don't exist. Some activists claim that "the science tells us" we must follow a particular course of action. Those who dissent are attacked as heretics, individuals with suspect motives, industry flunkies, or simply reactionaries. Global warming is such a potentially important issue that it should not be hijacked by ideology of any stripe. Recall rhe Russian experience under Lysenko. His pseudo-scientific theories of plant genetics were used to justify creating the "New Soviet Man". They set back Soviet science by at least a generation.

# 1NR

### 2NC Russia/China

#### DA outweighs—failure on talks causes U.S. military intervention and miscalculated nuclear war with Russia and China within the next month – biggest extinction risk due to arsenal size – that’s Press TV

#### Timeframe outweighs

#### A) You can only die once

#### B) Future policymakers solve long-term scenarios

Turns the case

#### Turns credibility faster than solvency - sends immediate signal of US’ open-ended commitment to military aggression

#### Nuclear-biological war---turns hegemony

Lunev, 1 – Former Soviet Union Military Officer and Worked for the CIA and FBI (Stanislav, 6/19/01, “Sino-Russian Treaty Challenges US”, <http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2001/7/18/194633.shtml>) CMR

It is known that Red China considers as its own sovereign territory not only Taiwan, but most of the international waters of the South China Sea and practically all islands in that sea as well. Beijing also is already involved in territorial disputes with a dozen neighboring countries including Japan, the Philippines, Vietnam, India, and others that have the bad luck to be near neighbors of Communist China. There is no doubt that, by using a treaty with "democratic" Russia, Beijing will **dramatically increase** its political and military pressure over not only Taiwan but also its neighboring countries, especially in the favorable resolution of territorial disputes. As a result of this development, the danger of military conflict with U.S. involvement will grow very quickly, and **escalation of tension** in the Western Pacific could become a reality in the near future**.** As another result of this treaty, Russia and China will increase their collaboration against American and allied interests by continuing the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical warfare technologies, **especially nuclear missile weapons**. There is no doubt that Moscow and Beijing have determined that despite their international obligations, they will support proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in an effort to challenge and **restrict America's abilities to project U.S. power and deploy a forward presence abroad**. Increased weapons sales to North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Cuba and other rogue states will provide these countries with **new capabilities to undermine American interests worldwide.** Russia and China are heavily involved in proliferation efforts not only for the money involved, but also and mostly because they know that when many rogue nations have nuclear and missile weapons, the U.S. military, limited by arms control agreements, will not be able to exercise its policy of nuclear deterrence.

#### T/ econ— Nuclear Iran jacks global oil prices

Inbar, 11/2 Prof. Efraim Inbar, director of the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, is a professor of political studies at Bar-Ilan University and a fellow at the Middle East Forum, "Op-Ed: Washington Must Strike Iran, Not Bargain With It" <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/14050~~23.UoawzPmsiSp>, CMR

A nuclear Iran will affect the global political energy economy. **Iran’s location** along the Persian Gulf and the Caspian Sea – **the “energy ellipse” where** about **75 percent of the oil reserves are situated** – **gives it a handle on the price of oil, a strategic commodity**. The oil-producing states in the region will inevitably have to consider the desires of an intimidating, nuclear Iran. **Iraq is already an Iranian satellite, and Azerbaijan and other Central Asian countries may follow suite.** **A nuclear Iran might** also **become more aggressive and take over the eastern province of Saudi Arabia that is mostly populated by Shiites and holds most of the Kingdom’s oil**. While it is true that Iran and other oil-producing states cannot desist from selling oil, **Tehran will be able to decide to whom to sell and at what price**.

#### Link alone turns case – collapses signal and credible support -- Material engagement alone insufficient –

Cardenas and Noriega, 12

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, Mexico and the United States agreed on a $1 billion counter-narcotics assistance package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer and mutually beneficial security cooperation, the aid was so slowly delivered that Mexicans have been left to wonder if their raging drug war is a priority for the United States. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own. It is time for the United States to more fully recognize that “Mexico’s drug war” is more accurately “America’s drug war” that Mexico is fighting. The US Department of Justice says that Mexico’s drug-trafficking organizations are the greatest organized crime threat in the United States. The US must suppress demand for illicit drugs through education, treatment, and law enforcement, but helping Mexico sustain this fight is an indispensable responsibility as well. Moreover, increased US bipartisan political support may encourage the Mexican people and their new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, to sustain their antidrug efforts to advance the two countries’ common security, stability, and prosperity. The United States should also provide robust and innovative material support for these efforts and institutionalize law-enforcement cooperation and information sharing that are essential to the common fight against transnational criminal groups. In Central America, the institutions of government and the rule of law have been overwhelmed by the onslaught of criminal gangs that have been displaced by Mexico’s stepped-up law enforcement. Guatemala’s state apparatus has been underfunded for decades, and the institutions of Honduras have been weakened by a succession of populist caudillo presidents, systematic corruption, and the expanding presence of organized crime. El Salvador confronts the unique challenge of hardened gang members deported from the United States maintaining their ties to criminal networks in US urban centers. A public-security crisis in these countries has undermined popular confidence in elected officials and overwhelmed poorly trained and equipped security forces. Unless the United States and neighboring countries organize an international response, several of these countries may soon become ungovernable territories, producing economic failure, civil strife, and refugee crises. This challenge requires a regional rescue plan (led by the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Europe, and the multilateral development banks). The United States should encourage interested nations to organize a summit of governments and institutions to develop such a plan and agree on how it should be implemented and funded. But by far the greatest threat to security and stability in the Americas is the narco-state that has taken root in Venezuela under the unaccountable regime of Hugo Chávez. This hostile regime is managed by Cuba’s security apparatus, funded by China, armed by Russia, and partnered with Iran, Hezbollah, and Colombian and Mexican narco-traffickers. US law enforcement and federal prosecutors have gathered fresh, compelling evidence implicating senior Venezuelan officials and Chávez himself in narcotics trafficking in collusion with Colombian terrorist groups. Chávez has also forged an important strategic alliance with Iran to allow it to evade international sanctions and carry its asymmetrical threat against the United States to the country’s doorstep. Even as the international community implements new financial sanctions to deny Teheran the means to sustain a uranium enrichment program, the regime has established dozens of shadowy commercial enterprises and banks in Venezuela to launder as much as $30 billion through its petro-economy. Certainly the drug kingpins managing Venezuela today have everything to lose when Chávez succumbs to cancer. Several ruthless, anti-United States governments have a stake in trying to engineer a chavista succession, even as the government struggles with an unsustainable fiscal situation, a collapsing economy, social polarization, and a public-security crisis. In short, within the next several years, Venezuela will become a manmade disaster that will impact regional security and energy supply. America’s current policy of evading responsibility for the implosion in Venezuela is untenable and dangerous. Every serious government in the Americas has a stake in addressing these issues before they become unmanageable. The crises in Central America and Venezuela will require US leadership, intelligent diplomacy, and resources to organize an effective multilateral response. The following are recommendations for addressing these issues, listed by country or region. The Americas: Renew emphasis on intelligence capabilities and mission to confront extraregional threats and cross-border criminality; Increase dialogue with regional and European military, intelligence, and security agencies on common threats; Direct US Northern and Southern Commands, the US Coast Guard, and the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to provide “surge” engagement plans for additional funding and other support; Ensure better cooperation from the US State Department with law enforcement and intelligence efforts. Mexico: Develop strong bipartisan support in the US Congress for Mexican counternarcotics efforts and for treating Mexico as not just an “enforcer” but an ally against drug trafficking cartels, and emphasize common “North American” strategies; Set up an interagency US-Mexico financial crimes unit based at the US Treasury to improve targeting of organized-crime money-laundering operations to cripple the financial solvency of the cartels.

### Turns Relations

**Power 1**

Jonathan Power, M.Sc in economics, columnist, associate at the Transnational Forum for Peace, August 6, 2001, Toronto Star, “Can Powell guide U.S. to quiet diplomacy?” p. Lexis

Engagement, because it is a slow process, depends on the cultivated support of a well-prepared domestic base. When Carter tried to normalize relations with ex-enemy Vietnam, he came up against the antagonism of Congress and the vociferous criticism of veterans' lobbies. Years later, Clinton had more success because he had carefully solicited influential congressional leaders and, with the judicious use of American aid and the incentive of lifting sanctions, persuaded Hanoi's leadership to comply with U.S. demands.

Conceded the link

#### Link controls the direction of uniqueness – it’s inherently probabilistic, but affirmative action exists now, so it can only go one way.

Lbl

### UQ—Talks Now

Framing issue-all ev about first round-second round

#### Irrelevant—Even if talks are not 100% perfect, sanctions will crush any chance for talks

#### Talks succeeding

#### A) Iran administration is reaching out—Ayatollah’s support proves Iran’s sincerity—it’s a question of US reciprocity

#### B) Filter—reject evidence that doesn’t assume Geneva 2 talks rather than Geneva 1

#### C) Iran Minister Zarif goes neg—prefer official statements

AFP 11 – 22 (“Iran negotiators see progress in Geneva nuclear talks,” <http://www.arabnews.com/news/481396>, CMR)

TEHRAN: **Iranian negotiators said** Friday **that** progress was being made **in talks in Geneva** with world powers, **expressing hope to** bridge differences **and** sign an elusive deal over Tehran’s nuclear drive. **The remarks came after they said** Thursday “**no progress**” **had been made** over points of differences on the second day of intensive talks in the Swiss city with the so-called P5+1 group. **There is** “room for optimism,” **Foreign Minister** Mohammad Javad **Zarif told reporters** Friday, according to Iranian media, adding that **work on a draft agreement had begun**. “**Differences** of opinion **remain and we are negotiating over them**. God willing we will reach a result,” he said after a one-hour meeting with EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton earlier in the day. Zarif said without elaborating that “three or four issues of difference remain ... with one or two stronger.” The official IRNA news agency said those two issues were what Iran calls its right to enrichment as well as its under-construction heavy water reactor in Arak. Zarif’s remarks were echoed by his deputy, Majid Takht-e Ravanchi, who said **the meeting on Friday had “brought the positions of** each side closer**.”** “The issue of enrichment is a matter of discussion in the talks. We have declared that (enrichment) is our red line and we expect it is respected” in the draft agreement, Ravanchi added. Iran insists in addition to sanctions relief, the P5+1 group — the United States, Britain, France, China and Russia plus Germany — should recognize what its right to enrich uranium, a process that could fuel nuclear power plants but also provide components of a bomb. **Zarif** also **hinted at progress over lingering points of difference**. “We discussed the issues of difference yesterday, and it was only natural for delegations to confer with their capitals,” he said, according to the ISNA news agency. “In some cases, the consultations have been fruitful,” Zarif added.

D) Major breakthroughs inevitable even with stumbling blocks—prefer predictive evidence

Reuters 11 – 22 – 13 (“US, Iran still hopeful for deal in Geneva nuclear talks,” <http://www.jpost.com/Iranian-Threat/News/Iran-Still-hope-in-Geneva-nuclear-talks-332702>, CMR)

**Iran and the US** remained hopeful on Friday **that talks** between the Islamic Republic and world powers in Geneva **would result in an agreement** despite difficulties **faced by negotiators** to agree upon terms under which Tehran would curb its disputed nuclear program in exchange for limited relief from international sanctions that have crippled its economy. Negotiators appeared closer towards clinching an elusive interim deal, with diplomats saying **a major sticking point may have been overcome**. **A compromise deal over Iran's insistence that its "right" to enrich uranium be internationally recognized has been proposed**, they said, possibly **opening the way to** a breakthrough **in** intensive **negotiations** that began in Geneva on Wednesday.

#### E) Only 1 issue left

Reuters 11 – 22 – 13 (“US, Iran still hopeful for deal in Geneva nuclear talks,” <http://www.jpost.com/Iranian-Threat/News/Iran-Still-hope-in-Geneva-nuclear-talks-332702>, CMR)

**Zarif** reportedly **said world powers and Iran had agreed on** Friday upon 90-percent of issues **about the Islamic Republic's disputed nuclear program** in talks in Geneva, according to Iran's Press TV. “If you’re asking about the amount of work that has been done, **we have moved forward up to 90 percent,**” the Iranian diplomat allegedly told reporters in Switzerland. Accord to Press TV, Zarif said **negotiators were now seeking to resolve** only "one to two issues". "Progress depends on how ready the delegations (of the six world powers) are to reach a solution. If they are ready, **attaining the result will be possible**," Fars quoted him as saying.

#### F) New foundations and goodwill—prefer current signaling

Gvosdev 11 – 22 – 13 (Nikolas K. Gvosdev is the former editor of the National Interest and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media, faculty of the U.S. Naval War College, “The Realist Prism: Will Congress Handcuff Obama on Iran, TPP Talks?,” <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/13398/the-realist-prism-will-congress-handcuff-obama-on-iran-tpp-talks>, CMR)

The **continuing negotiations between Iran and** the six **world powers in Geneva are designed to create an** enduring foundation **for a settlement that would guarantee Iran’s nuclear activities would not lead to the development of nuclear weapons**. **The current round of talks is supposed to** set this process into motion by getting Iran to put “a brake on its nuclear program in return for an easing of economic sanctions.” It may be that more meetings will be needed to narrow the distance between Iran’s desire to retain more of its capabilities and the West’s insistence that Iran undertake serious rollbacks of its current program, including on the crucial question of continued uranium enrichment. But the preliminary agreement as outlined in the press offers partial sanctions relief in return for Iran dismantling some aspects of its program, though falling short of immediate compliance with all U.N. Security Council resolutions demanding a complete cessation to enrichment activities. **With both sides thus showing their goodwill,** the process would be expected to continue.

#### International negotiations on track – Obama fighting off new sanctions that could collapse agreement

Hammond 11 – 19 – 13 formerly US analyst at Oxford Analytica, and a special adviser in the government of Tony Blair (Andrew, “Barack Obama focuses on foreign policy in search for a legacy,” <http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1360263/barack-obama-focuses-foreign-policy-search-legacy>, CMR)

**Landmark international negotiations with Iran are due to begin again in Geneva**, following the near breakthrough in reaching an interim nuclear deal during the last round of talks. **An interim deal**, which could set the stage for a fuller agreement later, **would** reportedly **see Iran's nuclear capacity capped for six months** in exchange for sequenced relief from international sanctions. Remaining disagreements appear to include how to handle Iran's stockpile of highly enriched uranium which can potentially be used to produce nuclear weapons. **The seriousness of negotiations** earlier this month **was underscored by the fact that foreign ministers** from Iran, the US, Russia, Britain, Germany and France, and the Chinese deputy foreign minister, **all, unexpectedly, came together to try to** break the impasse. **Prospects for success appear to have been raised by a separate deal on November 11**, whereby Iran reached a "road map for co-operation" with the International Atomic Energy Agency. This includes allowing UN inspection of key sites. **It is clear** that the **Obama** administration **wants a deal, despite** the **concerns of** US allies like **Israel and Saudi** Arabia, **and a significant number of legislators in the US Congress**, **which is considering measures to impose new sanctions on Iran** **that could** torpedo the international negotiations. Secretary of State John Kerry has now spent more time negotiating with Iranian officials than any other US high-level engagement for perhaps three decades.

#### A deal will happen – Khamenei has given approval, Iran has suspended program, and diplomatic momentum

AFP 11/18 <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/131118/round-three-bruising-iran-nuclear-talks>

Iran and world powers will be under intense pressure at their third meeting in five weeks to secure a landmark breakthrough in their decade-old nuclear standoff.¶ The stakes are high as negotiators resume talks in Geneva from Wednesday, 10 days after the end of a gruelling encounter in the same Swiss city when a deal came tantalisingly close.¶ Failure to get an accord, or getting one seen as too lenient on Iran, will make it even harder for US President Barack Obama to dissuade Congress from applying more sanctions.¶ Israel, widely assumed to have a formidable nuclear arsenal itself and which has refused to rule out bombing Iran, has said it will not be bound to any document it sees as weak.¶ Iranian President Hassan Rouhani risks losing the backing of supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei if the moderate's "charm offensive" with the West since taking office in August fails to bear fruit -- and soon.¶ "So far Iranian discipline in supporting Rouhani has been impressive and unprecedented," said Trita Parsi, author and president of the National Iranian American Council.¶ "But if Rouhani is not getting anywhere the conservatives are going to make a strong comeback, putting them in a strong position to argue he has failed and that they should go back to old policies," he told AFP.¶ Inching closer to the bomb¶ Undermining Iran's insistence that its programme is peaceful has been its steady expansion of its capacity to enrich uranium, which has civilian uses but which also can go in a bomb.¶ Iran already has enough low- and medium-enriched uranium for several bombs if it were to use its 19,000 centrifuges to process it to weapons-grade.¶ At present the United Nations atomic watchdog would detect any such attempt, but the fear is that soon this may no longer be the case as Iran adds more and more centrifuges, including modern ones that enrich much faster.¶ Another worry is the reactor being built at Arak, which theoretically could provide Iran with plutonium, an alternative to highly enriched uranium in a bomb.¶ Israeli and US sceptics complain that Iran consistently pretends to want a deal while using the time to install more equipment and enrich more uranium.¶ But the International Atomic Energy Agency said last week that since Rouhani took office, Iran has all but stopped expanding its programme. Observers called it a clear sign Khamenei wants a deal this time.¶ French objections¶ Last time in Geneva, foreign ministers dramatically jetted in after negotiators from Iran and the United States, China, Russia, Britain, France and Germany, known as the P5+1, neared a deal.¶ But French objections necessitated a re-write of the draft proposal, which was only presented to Iranians late on the final day, diplomats say. Just after midnight on November 10 the meeting broke off.¶ This time Iran's Mohammed Javad Zarif will be the only foreign minister, with the P5+1 represented by political directors in talks led by European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton.¶ On the table will be a "first-phase" deal whereby Iran suspends enrichment to medium levels, reduces uranium stockpiles and stops work at Arak.¶ In return Iran gets minor relief from some of the sanctions that have caused it major economic problems. It also wants its "right" to enrich uranium recognised.¶ This deal would give time for a final agreement to be hammered out in the coming months that permanently reduces Iran's programme to an acceptable size while sanctions are removed.¶ There have been deals before. Iran suspended enrichment between 2003 and 2005, and in 2009 there was a tentative fuel swap agreement in Geneva.¶ Diplomats and analysts were cautiously optimistic this time, although they said the preliminary accord may require more meetings.¶ "I wouldn't be surprised if it takes more time than this upcoming round, but I think a deal may be possible," Mark Fitzpatrick at the International Institute for Strategic Studies told AFP.

#### All countries on board, deal likely – sanctions WILL UNDERMINE the process collapsing the deal

Jim Sciutto 11/15 “Official: Talks 'getting close' to deal with Iran on nuclear program”, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/11/15/world/meast/iran-nuclear-deal/>

(CNN) -- The United States and other countries are "getting close" to an interim deal with Iran that would prevent its nuclear program "from advancing, and roll it back" in key areas, a senior administration official said Friday.¶ Such a deal would "extend the breakout time" that Iran would need to achieve a nuclear weapon and "shorten the time to notice if they tried," the official told reporters on the condition of not being identified.¶ The proposed deal -- covering every aspect of Iran's nuclear program, including uranium enrichment, uranium stockpiles and all nuclear facilities including military ones -- would be completed during the next round of talks in Geneva, Switzerland, though difficult issues remain, the official said.¶ "We are going to work very hard next week, the official said. "I don't know if we'll reach an agreement. I think it is quite possible that we can. But there's still tough issues to negotiate."¶ The United States, along with the four other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany -- the so-called P5+1 -- came close to a deal during talks with Iran last week in Geneva, but the discussions ended with both sides blaming each other for the lack of an agreement.¶ Palestinian team exits peace talks Iran steps up cooperation with IAEA Framework for Iran nuclear agreement¶ The P5+1 is "completely and totally unified" on the current outlines of the proposed deal, the official said.¶ The official warned against the imposition of further sanctions, which members of Congress have suggested.¶ "Further sanctions now threaten our good faith not just for Iran but for our P5+1 partners," the official said.¶ Under the plan, sanctions relief "way south" of one proposed figure of $10 billion would be "metered out over the six months of an interim agreement to ensure compliance."¶ Israel and the United States "may not see eye to eye on this tactically but are absolutely in agreement that Iran will not have a nuclear weapon," the official said.¶ News of the development came a day after President Barack Obama said additional sanctions targeting Iran's disputed nuclear program could undermine international progress already made on the issue.¶ "If we're serious about pursuing diplomacy, then there's no need for us to add new sanctions on top of the sanctions that are already very effective, and that brought them to the table in the first place," Obama told reporters Thursday at the White House.

#### Sanction relief critical to deal – Obama must have the capital for continued relief, congress will fight

Leverett 11-7-13 (Flynt, senior fellow at the New America Foundation in Washington, D.C. and a professor at the Pennsylvania State University School of International Affairs, and Hillary Mann Leverett, EO of Strategic Energy and Global Analysis (STRATEGA), a political risk consultancy, “America’s moment of truth about Iran,” <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/07/333513/americas-moment-of-truth-about-iran/>, CMR)

America can also fail Iran’s test if it is unable to provide comprehensive sanctions relief as part of a negotiated nuclear settlement. The Obama administration now acknowledges what we have noted for some time-that, beyond transitory executive branch initiatives, lifting or even substantially modifying U.S. sanctions to support diplomatic progress will take congressional action. During Obama’s presidency, many U.S. sanctions initially imposed by executive order have been written into law. These bills-signed, with little heed to their long-term consequences, by Obama himself-have also greatly expanded U.S. secondary sanctions, which threaten to punish third-country entities not for anything they’ve done in America, but for perfectly lawful business they conduct in or with Iran. The bills contain conditions for removing sanctions stipulating not just the dismantling of Iran’s nuclear infrastructure, but also termination of Tehran’s ties to movements like Hizballah that Washington (foolishly) designates as terrorists and the Islamic Republic’s effective transformation into a secular liberal republic. The Obama administration may have managed to delay passage of yet another sanctions bill for a few weeks-but Congressional Democrats no less than congressional Republicans have made publicly clear that they will not relax conditions for removing existing sanctions to help Obama conclude and implement a nuclear deal. If their obstinacy holds, why should others respect Washington’s high-handed demands for compliance with its extraterritorial (hence, illegal) sanctions against Iran? Going into the next round of nuclear talks in Geneva on Thursday, it is unambiguously plain that Obama will have to spend enormous political capital to realign relations with Iran. America’s future standing as a great power depends significantly on his readiness to do so.

#### And, France was the reason Geneva 1 broke down, they are on now ON BOARD - world powers aligned and top negotiators will push the ball

Klapper 11-13-13 (Bradley, “Obama seeks time from Congress for Iran diplomacy, but lawmakers push for new sanctions,” <http://www.therepublic.com/view/story/c00a20048d354114a36da338495b6149/US-United-States-Iran>, CMR)

The administration sees itself on the cusp of a historic breakthrough, so much so that Obama hastily dispatched Kerry to Switzerland last week for the highest-level nuclear negotiations to date. The talks broke down as Iran demanded formal recognition of what it says is its right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes, and as France sought stricter limits on Iran's ability to make nuclear fuel and on its heavy water reactor to produce plutonium, according to diplomats. Still, officials said significant progress was made. The U.S., Britain, China, France, Germany, Iran and Russia will send top nuclear negotiators back to Geneva next week to see whether they can push the ball forward. And on Wednesday, Obama spoke by telephone with French President Francois Hollande. The two countries "are in full agreement" on Iran, the White House said in a statement.

#### New inspections create momentum – solves French fears

Matthew 11-13-13 (Francis, “Nuclear deal with Iran is on right track,” <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/nuclear-deal-with-iran-is-on-right-track-1.1254736>, CMR)

Despite the French, things are moving in the right direction on several tracks. While the diplomats were hammering away at each other over four days in Geneva, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) chief, Yukiya Amano, won IAEA access to Iran with an agreement that the IAEA will visit the Arak heavy-water production plant and a uranium mine at Gchine within three months. This may help allay French fears, which would improve the atmosphere at Geneva when the diplomats meet again in just over a week.

#### Moreover, all signs point to confidence in the 2nd round of Geneva talks – Negotiations at the foreign level on track – domestic politics key

Matthew 11-13-13 (Francis, “Nuclear deal with Iran is on right track,” <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/nuclear-deal-with-iran-is-on-right-track-1.1254736>, CMR)

A nuclear deal with Iran is now a real possibility. All sides have recognised that they want to find a way forward and they all agree that diplomacy can work. This is a huge shift from the deliberately confrontational days of Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and US president George W. Bush, when all sides wanted to maximise the drama of the confrontation for their own purposes. But despite high hopes of a deal being announced in Geneva early this week, it failed due to last-minute problems and a dramatic refusal from the French to rubber stamp the six-month interim programme. However, in their final debrief, European Union Foreign Policy Chief Catherine Ashton, Iran’s Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif and US Secretary of State John Kerry all spoke of how much closer they were to an agreement than they have been in decades. Nonetheless, the devil is in the detail and none more so when dealing with making Iran’s nuclear facilities open to the international community. The mechanics of ensuring full transparency at a large number of different kinds of nuclear facilities are both politically sensitive and technically difficult. They make it very easy to derail progress unless there is a clear political lead from the politicians that would encourage (or even allow) trust between the two sides.

\

### UQ—Yes Deal

#### Congressional politics on track—that’s Parsi

#### A) Obama push—he’s prevented new senate sanctions—allows existing negotiations to succeed—proves link determines direction of uniqueness

**B) 2 filters for evidence—reject evidence that doesn’t assume**

**1) Obama’s PC—resolves the barriers in their uniqueness cards**

#### 2) Recent differences resolved—the month delay ensures a deal

Baqerzadeh 11 – 20 – 13 (Nader, professor at the University of California, Irvine, “Obama in tough situation over Iran N-deal: Expert,” <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/20/335688/obama-under-pressure-over-ndeal/>, CMR)

Baqerzadeh: I think Mr. Obama is very serious about this. I think you have to recognize he is under a lot of pressure from different directions, conservatives, [and] the Israeli lobby; and he is doing everything he can to get this ball moving. ¶ [US Secretary of State] Mr. [John] Kerry spent a lot of time with [Iranian Foreign Minister] Mr. [Mohammad Javad] Zarif in Geneva last time and I think they really want to get this phase out of the way and find a way to resolve their differences and he has used a lot of capital, political capital of his administration, to get this going before any more sanctions are put down by the Senate and Congress.¶ So in a way he is in a very tough situation. I think he was successful. I heard some interviews that Senators, they said they are going to pause and wait to see what will happen. Three more days is not going to impact new sanctions. So he has given all the ammunition that he needs to move forward. ¶ Those other things about all options are on the table I think nothing has changed. He keeps repeating that and I think that has been his policy ever since, but I think he really wants to get this first phase of agreement taken care of and I think the two sides are very close from what I have read so far.

#### C) New lawmaker sympathy—prefer evidence that assumes lawmaker emotions

Simendinger 11 – 20 – 13 (Alexis, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/11/20/senators\_may\_give\_obama\_more\_time\_on\_iran\_120724.html#ixzz2lIM2lhIc , CMR)

President **Obama gained** some **additional time** Tuesday **as members of Congress continued to weigh tighter** economic **sanctions against Iran**, **though they appeared to** defer possible actionat least **until next month**.¶ “I’m inclined to believe **we should give the administration an opportunity during this negotiating period**,” John McCain told reporters after he and other senators spent two hours with the president and Secretary of State John Kerry at the White House. “We’re going to have more discussion among members on both sides involved on this issue," he said.¶ McCain said Obama and Kerry offered “some details we had not heard before,” but he did not elaborate. “There were very serious concerns about whether the Iranians will continue to have the right to enrich” uranium, he added. “They do not need the right to enrich, because they have cheated, lied and deceived” on that issue “for the last 20 years.”¶ Some of the lawmakers who talked with the president and the secretary of state have been sympathetic to Israel’s strong objections that the path pursued by the U.N. Security Council’s permanent members, plus Germany, would prove to be a “bad deal.”¶ Though lawmakers may stand down while the administration and European allies continue to negotiate with Tehran over its nuclear weapons program, senators sounded divided over the administration’s strategy to ease economic punishment as a way to test Iran’s seriousness about rolling back its nuclear ambitions. And they also sounded uncertain of the impact of legislative options, should negotiations fall apart and lawmakers then seek to act.¶ Obama urged the senators to think about a tighter sanctions approach as a punitive option after negotiations conclude, should Tehran walk away from the offer now on the table.¶ “He indicated that new sanctions should not be enacted during the current negotiations, but that they would be most effective as a robust response, should Iran not accept the P5 plus one proposal, or should Iran fail to follow through on its commitments,” spokesman Jay Carney said.¶ McCain was among a bipartisan group of senators who also wrote to Kerry warning that the United States “must ensure that the steps we take in the coming weeks and months move us towards a resolution that ultimately brings Iran in compliance with all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions, seeks to prevent Tehran from possessing any enrichment or reprocessing capability, and resolves any and all fears that Iran will develop a nuclear weapons capability.”

#### D) Diffusing momentum

- Kerry, Sherman, key white house allies

- Senate tenuously supportive

- Obama reach-out building momentum against sanctions

Dreyfuss 11-13-13 (Bob, “Did the Israel Lobby Agree to Hold Off on New Iran Sanctions?,” [http://www.thenation.com/blog/177144/did-israel-lobby-agree-hold-new-iran-sanctions#](http://www.thenation.com/blog/177144/did-israel-lobby-agree-hold-new-iran-sanctions), CMR)

The New York Times today reports, in an odd turn of phrase, that the Obama administration’s second-biggest enemy in its search for a deal with Iran is, well, the US Congress. Says the Times, the administration “is gingerly weighing a threat to the talks potentially more troublesome than the opaque leadership in Tehran: Congress.” That’s because the Senate is considering the passage of yet another round of anti-Iran sanctions, following the passage last summer of a similar bill by the House. Making explicit the fact that he understands perfectly that yet more superfluous economic sanctions now, in the midst of delicate talks with Iran, could upset the whole thing, Senator Bob Corker (R-TN) said: “I understand the problem that this creates at the negotiating table.” In other words, he understands it—and he wants to do it anyway. Today the leaders of the US negotiating team are on Capitol Hill, trying to dissuade senators from that sort of outright sabotage. Secretary of State John Kerry, along with Wendy Sherman, are meeting with members of the Senate Banking Committee and others to beg, plead and cajole the Capitol Hill busybodies, many of whom are strongly influenced by the Israel lobby and its chief arm, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. So far, it appears that the Democratic-controlled Senate, despite its AIPAC ties, is willing to go along with White House requests to avoid interfering in the talks. Reports The Wall Street Journal: Proponents of tougher sanctions could seek avenues beside the Banking Committee to move a measure.… Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) is likely to oppose such a move, however. Mr. Reid on Tuesday warned against attempts to force “extraneous issues” into the debate over the defense bill. Obama administration officials have been reaching out to a number of lawmakers in recent days to tamp down any momentum for new sanctions. Mr. Kerry has personally spoken with key senators while traveling in recent days, and was to speak to top Senate Democrats on Wednesday.

#### ---------

#### Obama has secured pause on sanctions but Senate is open to a new push

Cox 11-21-13 (Ramsey, “Reid pushes sanctions vote to December,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/191048-reid-backs-iran-sanctions-bill>, CMR)

Senate Majority Leader Harry **Reid** (D-Nev.) **said** Thursday that **he is committed to voting to strengthen Iran sanctions when the Senate returns from** its **Thanksgiving** break. “**The Senate must be** prepared to move forward **with a new bipartisan Iran sanctions bill** when the Senate returns after Thanksgiving recess. And **I am committed** to do so,” Reid said. “I believe we must do everything possible to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons capability.” **The administration has** asked Congress to wait to take action until after negotiations with Iran this week. Reid's decision pushes the sanctions vote into December, as the chamber is set to begin a two-week recess for the Thanksgiving holiday. **Reid** said he **supports the administration's diplomatic efforts, but** he **believes the Senate should stand ready to pass legislation strengthening sanctions against Iran** and those who do business with the country. “We all strongly support those negotiations, hope they will succeed, and want them to produce the strongest possible agreement,” Reid said. “However, we are also are aware of the possibility that the Iranians could keep the negotiations from succeeding. I hope that will not happen.” The administration is negotiating in Geneva with Iranian leaders to prevent the country from building a nuclear weapon. "I will support a bill that would broaden the scope of our current petroleum sanctions, place limitations on trade with strategic sectors of the Iranian economy that support its nuclear ambitions, as well as pursue those who divert goods to Iran," Reid said. "While I support the admiration’s diplomatic effort, **I believe we need to** leave our legislative options open **to act on a new**, bipartisan **sanctions bill** in December, shortly after we return."

#### Sustained PC ensures Congressional support for a final deal

- a2 israel

- PC key to fight hardliners/secure a deal

- Obama push will secure final agreement

Matthew 11-13-13 (Francis, “Nuclear deal with Iran is on right track,” <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/nuclear-deal-with-iran-is-on-right-track-1.1254736>, CMR)

Nonetheless, there is not likely to be any rush to support the deal, since Iran has very few international friends. Therefore, it will take considerable political courage for Obama to go to Congress and the Senate to argue in favour of trusting Tehran, after decades of deep mistrust. It will be a particular challenge that any deal must involve some elements that ensure Iran’s self respect, which will be a red rag to anti-Iranians in Congress and to the Israelis who will mount a fierce counter attack. Obama will be asked to spend a large amount of his dwindling political capital on getting the deal through, just at the time that he has lost control of Congress over the continuing brinkmanship to get the US government budget approved every few months, as well as over intervening in Syria. The most important argument that Obama has to emphasise is that it will stop Iran being able to develop a nuclear weapon. This fundamental element of any deal should be enough to get even the dimmest Congressman on side and it should also be enough for the Israelis.

#### Obama has successfully held off new sanctions on Iran – resisting future Congressional pressure key to a successful final deal

Lobe 11-17-13 (Jim, New York-based journalist on U.S. foreign policy with a focus on the Middle East and Central Asia, Master's degree in Philosophy and Public Policy from the London School of Economics and Political Science, “Obama Gets More Time for Iran Nuclear Deal,” <http://original.antiwar.com/lobe/2013/11/16/obama-gets-more-time-for-iran-nuclear-deal/>, CMR)

The administration of President Barack Obama appears to have succeeded in preventing Congress from enacting new sanctions against Iran before the next round of nuclear-related talks between the U.S. and other great powers and Tehran scheduled for Geneva Nov. 20. As a result, optimism that at least an interim deal may soon be achieved between Iran and the so-called P5+1 (US, Britain, France, Russia, China plus Germany) appears once again on the rise here, amidst rumors circulating late Friday that Secretary of State John Kerry himself may lead the US delegation. While some senators may still try to attach sanctions amendments to pending legislation – notably the 2014 defense authorization bill (NDAA) to be taken up next week – most observers on Capitol Hill believe they will be highly unlikely to be voted on before Congress’s two-week Thanksgiving recess, pushing any possible new legislative action against Iran into December. The administration had been concerned that new sanctions would strengthen hard-liners in Tehran, **who would use it as evidence** that **Obama** **was** either **unable or unwilling to strike a deal that would not cross Iran’s “red line”** – a refusal to recognize the Islamic Republic’s “right” to enrich uranium within certain limits under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). **Any strengthening of the hard-liners**, it was feared, **would force** President Hassan **Rouhani and** his foreign minister, Mohammed Javad **Zarif, to toughen their terms for a deal, making an agreement with the P5+1 much more difficult to achieve**. Defying pressure from the powerful Israel lobby, several key senators this week indicated they backed delaying action on new or pending sanctions legislation and giving the administration a chance to conclude at least **an interim deal that could** pave the way **to a comprehensive accord** on Iran’s nuclear program within six months to a year. “**I strongly oppose any attempt to increase sanctions** against Iran while P5+1 negotiations are ongoing,” **said** Dianne **Feinstein, the influential chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee**, in a statement issued Friday. “**The purpose of sanctions was to bring Iran to the negotiating table, and** they have succeeded in doing so**.** Tacking new sanctions onto the defense authorization bill or any other legislation would not lead to a better deal,” she said, **echoing several other colleagues**, **including the chair**man of **the Senate Armed Services Committee,** Carl Levin. “It would lead to no deal at all.”

#### Obama’s push building momentum for diplomacy over sanctions

- recent letter proves diplomacy supporters > sanctions

- momentum building – senate increasingly opposed to sanctions

- senate banking committee head + chair of senate intell comm.

- Obama pushing hard

Brown 11-15-13 (Hayes, National Security Reporter/Blogger with ThinkProgress.org, B.A. in IR from MSU, “Push For More Sanctions On Iran Draws Scant Support In Congress,” <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2013/11/15/2949351/iran-sanctions-letter/>, CMR)

A letter urging the Senate to pass further sanctions on Iran’s nuclear program failed to receive half as many supporters as a letter earlier this year calling on the Obama administration to increase diplomatic overtures towards Tehran. House Homeland Security Committee chairman Rep. Michael McCaul (R-TX) spearheaded the more recent letter, which urges the Senate’s leaders to take up a package of new sanctions against Iran that passed the House earlier this year. “The possibility of tighter sanctions will enhance our leverage in the nuclear standoff between the Iran’s Supreme Leader and the international community,” the letter argues. “We should ensure that tougher penalties will be available should Tehran be found to be using the negotiations as a stalling tactic.” McCaul’s letter is heralded as bipartisan on the site of Rep. Grace Meng (D-NY), with 53 Republicans and 10 Democrats having signed onto the document. However, the letter’s 63 signatories don’t match up with a message to President Obama earlier this year pressing for an increase in diplomacy with Iran while warning of taking actions that might throw any talks off. That effort bore the signatures of 128 members of the body, more than a quarter of the House’s total membership, including 16 Republicans. Reps. Charles Dent (R-PA) and David Price (D-NC) sponsored the letter in July, shortly before Iranian president Hassan Rouhani was inaugurated, urging Obama “to pursue the potential opportunity presented” by “reinvigorating U.S. efforts to secure a negotiated nuclear agreement.” “We must also be careful not to preempt this potential opportunity by engaging in actions that delegitimize the newly elected president and weaken his standing relative to hardliners within the regime who oppose his professed ‘policy of reconciliation and peace,’” the letter cautioned. The more recent letter also appears to have been written prior to the latest International Atomic Energy Association report on Iran’s program becoming public. “While recent assessments of the progress of Iran’s nuclear program vary … what is clear is that time is running short,” the letter says. In contrast, the IAEA said in their November quarterly report that since Rouhani took office, progress on Iran’s nuclear efforts has come to a virtual stand-still. Members of the P5+1 group — composed of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China — are currently preparing for the next round of negotiations with Iran in Geneva on Nov. 20. Senate members are slowly beginning to come out against new sanctions while the talks are ongoing, even as Sen. Tim Johnson (D-SD) mulls bringing the House’s legislation up before his Senate Banking Committee. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), chair of the powerful Senate Intelligence Committee, on Friday became the latest senator to do so. “The purpose of sanctions was to bring Iran to the negotiating table, and they have succeeded in doing so,” Feinstein wrote in a statement. “Tacking new sanctions onto the defense authorization bill or any other legislation would not lead to a better deal. It would lead to no deal at all.” The White House has been pressing the Senate to hold off on new sanctions while the negotiations continue, ramping up their rhetoric over the course of the week. On Wednesday, White House press secretary Jay Carney warned that new legislation could put America on the “march to war.” Speaking at a press appearance on Thursday, President Obama likewise made clear that he believes there’s “no need” for new sanctions at this time.

#### Experts agree – it’ll be tough, but Obama’s push holds off sanctions

- debating heating up/pressure increasing on Obama

- sanctions x deal

- key voters still on the fence

- experts agree – nothing passes in squo, deal likely

Ramsey 11-15-13 (Jasmin, managing editor of LobeLog and a journalist with a special focus on US-Iran relations whose articles have appeared in numerous print and online publications including Inter Press Service, The Guardian, Al Jazeera English, Le Monde Diplomatique and Guernica Magazine, <http://www.payvand.com/news/13/nov/1118.html>, CMR)

The anticipated agreement over Iran’s controversial nuclear programme that seemed to slip away in the last stage of talks in Geneva last week is now being hotly debated on Capitol Hill. “Right now Congress is looking at the deal that wasn’t and trying to figure out if it could be good enough to support,” Joel Rubin, who heads policy and government affairs at the Ploughshares Fund, told IPS. “Congress doesn’t sit on its hands and in this case they want to get involved on sanctions and whether or not to go forward with them, and this puts pressure on the [Barack] Obama administration,” he said. Testifying Wednesday before the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, Secretary of State John Kerry - whose unexpected participation in the talks fueled speculation that a deal was in the works - said he hoped Congress would temporarily hold off on passing more sanctions because they could impede progress. “We now are negotiating and the risk is that if Congress were to unilaterally move to raise sanctions, it could break faith with those negotiations and actually stop them and break them apart,” he said. Some key members of Congress are expressing a different view. “Tougher sanctions will serve as an incentive for Iran to verifiably dismantle its nuclear weapons program,” wrote Committee member Sen. Robert Menendez in a USA Today op-ed Wednesday. “When Iran complies, sanctions can be unwound and economic relief will follow,” said the Democratic senator, who cosponsored a bipartisan letter to the president in August that pushed for more sanctions and a credible reinforcement of the “military force” option until Iran “slowed down” its nuclear activities. While stating earlier this week that they would await Kerry’s testimony before deciding on legislation that further reduces Iran’s oil exports, several key players said they were still undecided after the hearing Wednesday. Other senators have meanwhile said they hope to add amendments involving Iran sanctions to the National Defence Authorisation Bill. But Rubin, a former congressional aide and diplomat, told IPS “nothing will be passed into law between now and next Geneva round.” “I think we were very close to a deal and I think we got pushback and everyone is talking to their capitals now about what can now be achieved and that’s a good thing,” he added. “To expect a breakthrough after 30-plus years of almost no direct contact and a breakthrough within 30 hours is too high of a bar.”

### 2NC No War Long

**No impact to hegemony – that’s Maher**

**A) Free-riding—withdrawal results in stable regional power balancers—regional powers better solve war**

**B) Exaggeration—hegemons blow up risks to keep power—their evidence has a suspect epistemology**

**C) Overstretch—prevents conflict resolution—means US heg fails even if it is good in theory**

**D) Anti Americanism—causes countries to balance against the US—prevents power expression**

**E) Multipolarity solves—Increase allies dependence on the US and solves war because they would be scared of other great powers**

**D) Reject their warrantless laundry list of vague impacts—it’s academic junk—if they want to turn the disad, hold them to the burden of having a warranted, specific card instead of analytics**

**Fettweis, 11** (Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, 9/26/11, Free Riding or Restraint? Examining European Grand Strategy, Comparative Strategy, 30:316–332, EBSCO, CMR)

Assertions that without the combination of U.S. capabilities, presence and commitments instability would return to Europe and the Pacific Rim are usually rendered in rather **vague language.** If the United States were to decrease its commitments abroad, argued Robert Art, “the world will become a more dangerous place and, sooner or later, that will redound to America’s detriment.”53 From **where would this danger arise?** Who precisely would do the fighting, and over what issues? Without the United States, would Europe really descend into Hobbesian anarchy? Would the Japanese attack mainland China again, to see if they could fare better this time around? Would the Germans and French have another go at it? In other words, where exactly is hegemony is keeping the peace? With one exception, these questions are rarely addressed.

That exception is in the Pacific Rim. Some analysts fear that a de facto surrender of U.S. hegemony would lead to a rise of Chinese influence. Bradley Thayer worries that Chinese would become “the language of diplomacy, trade and commerce, transportation and navigation, the internet, world sport, and global culture,” and that Beijing would come to “dominate science and technology, in all its forms” to the extent that soon the world would witness a Chinese astronaut who not only travels to the Moon, but “plants the communist flag on Mars, and perhaps other planets in the future.”54 Indeed China is the only other major power that has increased its military spending since the end of the Cold War, even if it still is only about 2 percent of its GDP. Such levels of effort do not suggest a desire to compete with, much less supplant, the United States. The much-ballyhooed, decade-long military buildup has brought Chinese spending up to somewhere between one-tenth and one-fifth of the U.S. level. It is hardly clear that a restrained United States would invite Chinese regional, must less global, political expansion. Fortunately one need not ponder for too long the horrible specter of a red flag on Venus, since on the planet Earth, where war is no longer the dominant form of conflict resolution, the threats posed by even a rising China would not be terribly dire. The dangers contained in the terrestrial security environment are less severe than ever before.

Believers in the pacifying power of hegemony ought to keep in mind a rather basic tenet: When it comes to policymaking, **specific threats are more significant than vague, unnamed dangers**. Without specific risks, it is just as plausible to interpret U.S. presence as redundant, as overseeing a peace that has already arrived. Strategy should not be based upon vague images emerging from the dark reaches of the neoconservative imagination.

Overestimating Our Importance

One of the most basic insights of cognitive psychology provides the final reason to doubt the power of hegemonic stability: Rarely are our actions as consequential upon their behavior as we perceive them to be. A great deal of experimental evidence exists to support the notion that people (and therefore states) tend to **overrate** the degree to which their behavior is responsible for the actions of others. Robert Jervis has argued that two processes account for this overestimation, both of which would seem to be especially relevant in the U.S. case.55 First, believing that we are responsible for their actions gratifies our national ego (which is not small to begin with; the United States is exceptional in its exceptionalism). The hubris of the United States, long appreciated and noted, has only grown with the collapse of the Soviet Union.56 U.S. policymakers famously have comparatively little knowledge of—or interest in—events that occur outside of their own borders. If there is any state vulnerable to the overestimation of its importance due to the fundamental misunderstanding of the motivation of others, it would have to be the United States. Second, policymakers in the United States are far more familiar with our actions than they are with the decision-making processes of our allies. Try as we might, it is not possible to fully understand the threats, challenges, and opportunities that our allies see from their perspective. The European great powers have domestic politics as complex as ours, and they also have competent, capable strategists to chart their way forward. They react to many international forces, of which U.S. behavior is only one. Therefore, for any actor trying to make sense of the action of others, Jervis notes, “in the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, the most obvious and parsimonious explanation is that he was responsible.”57

It is natural, therefore, for U.S. policymakers and strategists to believe that the behavior of our allies (and rivals) is shaped largely by what Washington does. Presumably Americans are at least as susceptible to the overestimation of their ability as any other people, and perhaps more so. At the very least, political psychologists tell us, we are probably not as important to them as we think. The importance of U.S. hegemony in contributing to international stability is therefore almost certainly **overrated**.

In the end, one can never be sure why our major allies have not gone to, and do not even plan for, war. Like deterrence, the hegemonic stability theory rests on faith; it **can only be falsified**, never proven. It does not seem likely, however, that hegemony could fully account for twenty years of strategic decisions made in allied capitals if the international system were not already a remarkably peaceful place. Perhaps these states have no intention of fighting one another to begin with, and our commitments are redundant. European great powers may well have chosen strategic restraint because they feel that their security is all but assured, with or without the United States.

**E) Their ev is trapped in the past—even if heg created the liberal order, it no longer is necessary to sustain it [[ALSO UNDER LIBERALISM]]**

**Ikenberry, IR prof, 11**—Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago (John, May/ June 2011, “The Future of the Liberal World Order,” *Foreign Affairs*, RBatra)

For all these reasons, many observers have concluded that world politics is experiencing not just a changing of the guard but also a transition in the ideas and principles that underlie the global order. The journalist Gideon Rachman, for example, says that a cluster of liberal internationalist ideas--such as faith in democratization, confidence in free markets, and the acceptability of U.S. military power--are all being called into question. According to this worldview, the future of international order will be shaped above all by China, which will use its growing power and wealth to push world politics in an illiberal direction. Pointing out that China and other non-Western states have weathered the recent financial crisis better than their Western counterparts, pessimists argue that an authoritarian capitalist alternative to Western neoliberal ideas has already emerged. According to the scholar Stefan Halper, emerging-market states "are learning to combine market economics with traditional autocratic or semiautocratic politics in a process that signals an intellectual rejection of the Western economic model."

But this panicked narrative misses a deeper reality: although the United States' position in the global system is changing, **the liberal international order is alive and well**. The struggle over international order today is not about fundamental principles. **China and other emerging great powers do not want to contest the basic rules and principles of the liberal international order; they wish to gain more authority and leadership within it.**

Indeed, today's **power transition** represents not the defeat of the liberal order but **its ultimate ascendance**. Brazil, China, and India have all become more prosperous and capable by operating inside the existing international order--benefiting from its rules, practices, and institutions, including the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the newly organized G-20. Their economic success and growing influence are tied to the liberal internationalist organization of world politics, and **they have deep interests in preserving that system.**

In the meantime, alternatives to an open and rule-based order have yet to crystallize. Even though the last decade has brought remarkable upheavals in the global system--the emergence of new powers, bitter disputes among Western allies over the United States' unipolar ambitions, and a global financial crisis and recession--**the liberal international order has no competitors**. On the contrary, the rise of non-Western powers and the growth of economic and security interdependence **are creating new constituencies for it.**