# T

### QPQ – 1NC

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Plan isn’t --- voting issue:

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

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

#### View this through competing interpretations, reasonability is bad

# DA

#### CIR will pass – Obama support and House Republicans support

Kaplan 10/24

(Rebecca, CBS News, 10/24/13, “Obama to House GOP: Pass immigration reform this year”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57609109/obama-to-house-gop-pass-immigration-reform-this-year/>, accessed 10/24/13, JZ)

In an attempt to re-start movement on the rest of his domestic agenda, President Obama on Thursday called on the House of Representatives to move legislation to reform the immigration system before the end of the year.

"This is not just an idea whose time has come, this is an idea whose time has been around for years now," Mr. Obama said. "It's good for our economy, it's good for our national security, it's good for our people, and we should do it this year."His speech came at the same time as the House Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on the flawed rollout of the Affordable Care Act exchanges.

The last major legislative action on an immigration bill was passage of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, the Senate's comprehensive legislation, back in June. The bill beefed up security along the southern border, provided a provisional legal status and eventual pathway to citizenship for people living in the country illegally, and outlined reforms for the existing visa programs.

Crafted by a bipartisan group in the Democratically-controlled Senate, that is Mr. Obama's preferred reform bill. But it didn't take long for House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, to declare the bill a non-starter for House Republicans and to promise the lower chamber would produce its own bill.

At a press conference earlier this week, Boehner said, "I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed. And I'm hopeful."

After Mr. Obama's speech, Boehner spokesman Brendan Buck added, ""The Speaker agrees that America has a broken immigration system and we need reform that would boost our economy. He's also been clear that the House will not consider any massive, Obamacare-style legislation that no one understands. Instead, the House is committed to a common sense, step-by-step approach that gives Americans confidence that reform is done the right way. We hope that the president will work with us - not against us - as we pursue this deliberate approach."

How exactly the House will move forward is unclear. But House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., has advanced a series of single-issue bills that have no Democratic support, and House Democrats introduced a version of the Senate bill that includes a border-security plan with bipartisan support in the House. A bipartisan working group that had been crafting a comprehensive bill for the House collapsed last month.

#### THA unpopular in congress – multiple reasons

Van Hollen member of the house of representatives, democrat from Maryland 13 (Chris, June 28, 2013, Congressional Record 113th Congress, “The Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act (HR 1613) And the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act (HR 2231)”, <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?r113:E28JN3-0070:/>, Accessed: 9/17/2013, TM)

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, while I support the responsible development of our nation's resources, **this** week's **legislation prioritizes drilling over protecting investors, improving rig safety, respecting coastal communities and conducting appropriate environmental review. For these reasons, I will be voting no and encouraging my colleagues do the same**. The Outer Continental Shelf **T**ransboundary **H**ydrocarbon **A**greements Authorization Act (HR 1613) **provides specific authorization for the recently negotiated U.S.-Mexico transboundary agreement and establishes standards for all future offshore oil and gas agreements with potential foreign partners** like Canada, Russia, the Bahamas and Bermuda. **If** [Page: E1006] GPO's PDF HR **1613 were a clean bill, it would be completely non-controversial. Instead, HR 1613 also proposes to waive a provision of the Dodd-Frank Act requiring disclosure of otherwise secret payments made to foreign governments in connection with oil and gas development. Repealing this right-to-know protection is harmful to investors and has no place in this otherwise non-controversial legislation.**

#### Immigration key to the economy – competitiveness, growth, jobs, innovation

Palomarez 3-6-13 [Javier, President & CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce., "The pent up entreprenuership that immigration reform woudl unleash" Forbes -- www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/]

Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy.¶ Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades.¶ Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants.¶ Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies.¶ There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed. After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place.¶ Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses.¶ While immigrants are both critically-important consumers and producers, they boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well.¶ Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want.¶ For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost.¶ Immigration reform would also address another important angle in the debate – the need to entice high-skilled immigrants. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need.¶ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years.¶ As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Prevents global decline

Caploe ‘9

(David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis)=

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

#### Nuclear war

**Auslin ‘9**

(Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would **dramatically raise tensions** inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

# CP

#### The Federative Republic of Brazil should engage with Mexico in the area of transboundary hydrocarbons and drill in the Gulf of Mexico and Mexico will agree to this.

#### **Brazil solves- provides the best leadership in Latin America**

Gratius, Associated Professor for international relations at the Complutense University in Madrid, and Saraiva, Rio Branco Chair in International Relations, 13

(Susanne Gratius and Miriam Gomes Saraiva, June 4, 2013, “Continental Regionalism: Brazil’s prominent role in the Americas”, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?id=164758> accessed 9/8/13, TM)

The new millennium is somewhat different. The global scenario is more fragmented, marked by a trend towards multi-polarisation, and the global economy has been hit first by the financial crisis that struck the US in 2008, and now with even more serious impacts from the euro crisis. The problems inside the European Union have damaged the credibility of the European regional integration model, and cast into doubt both the economic strategy adopted thus far and the very future of integration in the continent and beyond. This new reality has paved the way for the rise of new players and contrasting worldviews from the liberalism that prevailed in the 1990s: different conceptions and priorities towards certain deep-rooted principles in the West, such as the responsibility to protect, democracy and human rights. In South America, the emergence, since the early 2000s, of new left-wing governments keen to bring about political reform, reducing these countries’ alignment with the United States, and the powerful crisis in Argentina, weakening its influence in the region, have given Brazil more scope for autonomy in the region. 1. Brazil’s foreign policy between global and regional projection In these times of change in the shaping of a new world order, Brazil has begun to stand out for its assertive participation in international politics, where it has favored anti-hegemonic,[1] multi-polar positions and its increasingly strong leadership in its own region. During the Lula administration from 2003 to 2010, Brazil gradually started step-by-step to shoulder the costs inherent in cooperation, governance and integration in the region.[2] At that time, the Brazilian Development Bank BNDES – with a total budget that exceeds that of the Inter-American Development Bank – began to finance infrastructure projects in South American. [3] The election of Lula da Silva at the end of 2002 and the ensuing rise of an autonomy-oriented group in Brazil’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs cast the country’s foreign policy in a new light.[4] Diplomatic support for existing international regimes in the 1990s gave way to a proactive push towards modifying these regimes in favour of southern countries or Brazil’s particular interests, which was defined by Lima as soft revisionism.[5] The idea of bringing other emerging or poorer southern countries on board to counterbalance the might of traditional Western powers served as the basis for the country’s international actions. While coalitions with emerging partners helped boost Brazil’s global pretensions, [6] its diplomatic efforts were geared towards bolstering its international standing independently of any other nation, with its role as a global player being firmly grounded in the ideas of autonomy and universalism that were the predominant diplomatic thinking at the time. Alongside Brazil’s international rise, its leadership in South America also started to be seen as a priority. Indeed, the moves to boost its global and regional projection came simultaneously and were seen by Brazil as mutually beneficial. The cooperation with its regional neighbors was perceived by policy-makers as the best way for Brazil to realize its potential, support economic development and form a bloc with stronger international influence. The creation of the South American Defence Council and the Brazilian command of the UN peacekeeping force in Haiti, whose troops are drawn from different countries in the region, were seen as helping Brazil towards a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. According to Flemes, in its upward progress in a new, more multi-polar world order, Brazil would need regional clout in global negotiations, but would not be tied down to any form of institutionalization that might restrict its autonomy.[7]

#### Brazil solves oil supply – pre-salt deposits

Bodman former United States Secretary of Energy and previous Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Treasury Department, Wolfensohn ninth president of the World Bank Group and SweigNelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies 11 (Samuel W. Bodman, James D. Wolfensohn, and Julia E. Sweig, July 2011“Independent Task Force Report No. 66 Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations”, p.32-33, TM)

The opening of the oil sector to competition in 1997 and partial privati- zation of Petrobras ushered in an era of rapid growth in oil production and exploration investment. Privatization of many of the state-owned power distribution and generation companies during the same period also boosted investment in distribution networks and new power- generation capacity. **Brazil’s oil production more than doubled after lib- eralization, reaching 2.6 million barrels per day in 2009 and transform- ing Brazil from an oil importer to a net exporter**. Petrobras remains the dominant actor in the industry but is joined by more than forty domes- tic and international companies actively investing in the nearly five hundred upstream exploration and production blocks that have been auctioned to date.

**The 2006 discovery of the Tupi field in the pre-salt formation opened one of the world’s most important new oil frontiers**. According to Brazil’s national oil regulator, Agência Nacional do Petróleo, **pre-salt reserves could hold as many as fifty billion to eighty billion barrels of recoverable hydrocarbons—potentially six times Brazil’s current proven reserves of just under thirteen billion barrels.**18 If proven, **these estimates would place Brazil among the world’s ten largest oil reserve holders**, or in the range between those of Russia and Venezuela. **The pre-salt reserves have the potential to make Brazil a major global oil exporter**.19 **Pre-salt oil may begin flowing in large volumes over the next five to seven years. According to optimistic predictions, Brazil may pro- duce up to four million barrels of oil per day by 2010, one million barrels as net exports.**20

Brazil is one of just a few countries in the Western Hemisphere— Canada being another—that will significantly increase oil production over the next decade. Despite the difficulties of doing business in Brazil, **the Brazilian oil sector is one of only a handful of attractive resource bases in the world that welcomes foreign investment**. Indeed, in late 2010, Petrobras raised $70 billion in the world’s largest share offering. However, the capitalization raised some concerns of politicization as the government assumed even greater control of Petrobras and minor- ity shareholder value diminished.

# Stability

## 1NC – Pre Reform

#### 1. Oil sector will pick up- Pemex reform

Peixe oilprice.com 7-10-13 (Joao, Oil Price, “Will an End to Pemex’s Monopoly Boost Economic Growth in Mexico” <http://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/Will-an-End-to-Pemexs-Monopoly-Boost-Economic-Growth-in-Mexico.html> accessed 7-16-13 KR)

The board members at Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex), the state-run oil company of Mexico, have agreed that their company’s monopoly on oil production in the country must be ended in order to attract investment and see more development of new fields.

Mexico’s oil output volumes have been declining for eight straight years and it has been suggested that large reforms are needed to lure foreign investment to the nation’s oil and natural gas fields. The necessary changes are expected to be introduced by President Enrique Pena Nieto by the end of the summer, and it is estimated that they will encourage as much as $50 billion in investments each year.

Hector Moreira, who used to work in Mexico’s Energy Ministry, said; “we need far more investment, we need capacity in production and we need technology. We need to transform the energy sector in a very deep way. I think now is the time.”

Mexico’s economic growth has been slowing in recent years, and this is putting pressure on Pena Nieto to make changes that will stimulate more growth. According to Bloomberg, Barclays predicts the economy to grow by 2.5% in 2013, the slowest rate since 2009, and JPMorgan predict GDP to increase by 2.8%. the country’s annual growth of 1.7% over the last five years is half the rate of Brazil.

Gabriel Casillas, the chief economist for Mexico’s Banorte, stated that “this administration doesn’t only have the willingness, but the political power and political capital” to make the needed changes that could ultimately result in faster economic growth, and a stronger currency.

Energy industry reforms, and changes to the tax laws are expected to boost growth to 6% if approved, although Eduardo Cepeda, the head of JPMorgan in Mexico warns that a failure to enact the reforms this year could see the national stock market fall by 10%.

#### 2. Pemex will not collapse- modernization inevitable

Fox News Latino 7/8/13 (“Peña Nieto stresses need to modernize Pemex” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2013/06/08/pena-nieto-stresses-need-to-modernize-pemex/> accessed 8-21-13 KR)

Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto reaffirmed his commitment to maintain Petroleos Mexicanos as a state-owned company, but also stressed the need to modernize and transform the world's No. 5 oil producer.

"If we want to meet and surpass the challenges of the 21st century, we can't continue operating with frameworks and methods from last century," the head of state said in a speech in the western city of Mazatlan.

Pemex employs some 160,000 people and the taxes it pays account for roughly 40 percent of Mexico's national budget.

The company "is and will continue to be the basic patrimony of all Mexicans. The nation will continue to exercise full sovereignty" over its hydrocarbon resources, he added.

That principle is enshrined in Mexico's constitution, although leftist politicians have warned that Peña Nieto's government plans to allow private companies to acquire a stake in Pemex, a possibility Mexican authorities have periodically denied.

"Pemex will not be sold or privatized," Peña Nieto said Friday.

But he said the state-owned company "needs to be strengthened and modernized" to face the challenges of a modern world and "continue to be the engine of the country's development."

To that end, he said the company needed to improve "its model of efficiency, transparency and accountability," as well as "free up its potential in terms of investment and innovation."

"If we mobilize and transform Pemex, we'll mobilize and transform Mexico," the president added.

#### a. Status quo hydrocarbon restrictions prompt Mexico’s shift to renewables – the plan reverses this trend

Donnelly and Selee, Wilson Center Mexico Institute program associate and director, 10

(Robert and Andrew, 5/24/10, Woodrow Wilson Center, “U.S.-Mexico Cooperation on Renewable Energy: Building a Green Agenda”, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/us-mexico-cooperation-renewable-energy-building-green-agenda>, accessed 8/21/13, JZ)

Mexico has large and untapped geothermal, wind, and solar deposits, said Duncan Wood, chair, Department of International Relations, Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico (ITAM), and author of the Wilson Center report. The country is the world's third-largest producer of geothermal energy and has large geothermal deposits in Baja California near big U.S. markets, such as San Diego and Los Angeles. Mexico also offers high promise in wind power, with estimated potential output of 1,800 to 2,400 megawatts for Baja California and 5,000 megawatts for southern Oaxaca state. Though Oaxaca is far from the U.S. border, it will soon be able to export electricity to U.S. markets as Baja California now can, given that Mexico's mainland and peninsular electrical grids are expected to be linked in the very near future. (Right now the Baja California peninsula is connected only to the U.S. grid.) Mexico is rich in solar energy, and large marketable deposits exist particularly in northeastern Baja California, near the U.S. border. In biomass, little investment has been made so far, he said.

Wood cited recent developments that have encouraged renewable energy investment in Mexico. Mexico's oil fields are in long-term and, in some cases, precipitous decline, and the country is plotting a "future as a green nation," shifting the policy focus toward alternative energy development. Additionally, a U.S.-Mexico taskforce on renewables was recently formed—its announcement timed with President Felipe Calderon's May 2010 state visit to Washington—and there has been high-level engagement on the issue by both administrations. Mexico also will host the next U.N. Climate Change Conference, to be held in Cancún in fall 2010. Further encouraging investment in renewables, there are not the blanket prohibitions on private ventures that exist in the hydrocarbons sector, and regulatory adjustments over the past few administrations have enabled a more robust private stake in electricity generation and transmission. Collaboration between Mexico and U.S. government agencies, such as the Department of Energy and the U.S. Agency for International Development, through the framework of the Mexico Renewable Energy Program, have enabled the richer development of Mexico's renewable resources while at the same time promoting the electrification and greater general economic development of parts of rural Mexico, Wood said. Impulses to develop Mexico's renewables sector further align with regional efforts to make North America energy interdependent.

#### b. Renewable energy solves climate change- able to be carbon neutral

European Renewable Energy Council 4

(umbrella organisation of the major European renewable energy industry, trade and research associations active in the field of photovoltaics, small hydropower, solar thermal, bioenergy, geothermal, solar thermal electricity and wind energy, 3/14/04, European Renewable Energy Council website, “Renewable Energy – A key solution to climate change”, <http://www.erec.org/fileadmin/erec_docs/Documents/Publications/ClimateChangeBriefing.pdf>, pg. 2, accessed 6/30/13, JZ)

Climate change is arguably one of the greatest envi-¶ ronmental threats the world is facing. The impacts¶ of disruptive change leading to catastrophic events such as¶ storms, droughts, sea level rise and floods are already¶ being felt across the world.

While the Kyoto Protocol, which aims to reduce green-¶ house gas emissions is slowly impacting on energy¶ markets,¶ scientists are increasingly advising policymakers¶ that carbon emission reductions of beyond 60% are nee-¶ ded¶ over the next 40-50 years. How will we achieve¶ such a dramatic r¶ eduction in carbon emissions?

At the heart of the issue is an energy system based on fossil¶ fuels, that is mainly responsible for greenhouse gas emissions.

On the contrary, renewable energy provides one of the¶ leading solutions to the climate change issue. By providing¶ ‘carbon-neutral’ sources of power, heat, cooling and¶ transport¶ fuels, renewable energy options such as wind,¶ solar, biomass, hydro, wave and tidal offer a safe transition¶ to a low carbon economy.

The concept of a transition to a carbon-free economy has¶ become broadly understood and been outlined by many¶ actors from G8, the United Nations, the International¶ Energy Agency, Governments and industry alike. In the¶ long run, renewables are the only energy source that¶ provide a¶ sustainable carbon neutral energy supply.

#### c. Climate change causes extinction

Deibel, Professor of IR at National War College 7

(Terry, Foreign Affairs Strategy (Terry L. Deibel, “Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today Anthropogenic – caused by CO2”)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to het the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possible end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.