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**Mexico shifting from fossil fuels to renewables development now**

Cision, 6/14 (Cision, 06/14/2013, Cision News, “Vision for Renewable Energy in Mexico Looks Promising,” http://news.cision.com/north-american-production-sharing--inc-/r/vision-for-renewable-energy-in-mexico-looks-promising,c9428687)//VP

The UNEP report on regional surges in green energy investment pointed to spending growing steadily in Mexico as investments continue to pour in from the U.S. and other foreign countries that understand the importance of emerging economies when it comes to cost-competitiveness for wind and solar power manufacturing. In fact, a U.S. Department of Energy report notes how investments in environmentally friendly energy sources are shifting to developing nations such as Mexico with its energy grid construction that is also providing huge investment openings for U.S. and other foreign company investment. For instance, Mexico has an international reputation as an energy producer. However, the country is moving away from just focusing foreign investments on its vast natural oil reserves. In turn, Mexico is presenting investors with an opportunity to invest in its new energy grid construction projects that are powered by wind and solar sources over previous methods that focused more on oil and other fossil fuels.

**Status quo hydrocarbons restrictions spur shift to renewables – plan reverses this trend**

Wilson Center, 10 (“U.S.-Mexico Cooperation on Renewable Energy: Building a Green Agenda”, 3/24, Wilson Center, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/us-mexico-cooperation-renewable-energy-building-green-agenda)//VP

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.

**Successful shift to renewables in Mexico will be modeled globally – solves climate change**

Gibbs, 09 – White House Press Secretary (Robert, The White House Office of the Press Secretary, 4/16, ”U.S.-MEXICO  ANNOUNCE BILATERAL FRAMEWORK ON CLEAN ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE,” http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/us-mexico-announce-bilateral-framework-clean-energy-and-climate-change)//VP

During their discussions in Mexico City today, the two leaders agreed on the importance of promoting clean energy and combating climate change and the value of joint and practical collaboration in achieving these goals. The Bilateral Framework establishes a mechanism for political and technical cooperation and information exchange, and to facilitate common efforts to develop clean energy economies. It will also complement and reinforce existing work between the two countries. The Bilateral Framework will focus on: renewable energy, energy efficiency, adaptation, market mechanisms, forestry and land use, green jobs, low carbon energy technology development and capacity building. The framework will also build upon cooperation in the border region promoting efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to adapt to the local impacts of climate change in the region,, as well as to strengthen the reliability and flow of cross border electricity grids and by facilitating the ability of neighboring border states to work together to strengthen energy trade. Senior officials from both countries will be working over the coming weeks to further elaborate the framework. Specific areas of joint cooperation under the Bilateral Framework may include: · Collaborating on training/workshops and information exchanges for government officials to explore possible cooperation on greenhouse gas inventories, various greenhouse gas reduction strategies, and market mechanisms; · Through our collaboration in the Border 2012 program, working with our respective border states to provide opportunities for information exchange and joint work on renewable energy, such as wind and solar, that could include technical and economic project feasibility studies, project development, and capacity building in the border region. Other border work could include a bilateral border crossing planning group to develop strategies to reduce emissions from idling vehicles, among other initiatives that may be deemed appropriate; · Expanding our extensive bilateral collaboration on clean energy technologies to facilitate renewable power generation including by addressing transmission and distribution obstacles between our countries; fostering Energy Service Company market development; and highlighting existing and proposed areas for cooperation on clean energy and energy efficiency under the North American Energy Working Group; · Promoting academic and scientific exchanges on renewable energy; · Pursuing projects on adapting to climate change, including coastal or disaster risk reduction activities as well as adaptation in key sectors; and · Working jointly with other countries to take advantage of growing Mexican expertise on greenhouse gas inventories, adaptation and project planning. This work could also possibly include a shared US/Mexican initiative to help developing countries in the Americas create low carbon development strategies plans for adaptation to climate change, and monitoring and accounting for the results. Both countries stressed that a financial architecture to mobilize investment in climate-friendly technologies is crucial to a successful agreed outcome in Copenhagen. Several countries have made specific proposals on financial mechanisms, including Mexico. Recognizing Mexico’s leadership on climate change, the United States announced its support for Mexico to host the Sixteenth United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 16) in 2010. The United States was also pleased that Mexico will host a meeting of the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate (MEF) in preparation for a Leaders meeting to take place in July after the G-8 meeting in Italy.

**Climate change is a trump card – it’s the greatest existential threat**

Goldgeier, 6/9 – Dean of the School of International Service at the American University in Washington (James, 2013, “J.F.K.'s 'Strategy of Peace'”, Lexis)//VP

Fifty years ago, not long after the Cuban missile crisis brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war, President John F. Kennedy took the stage at American University’s commencement and delivered one of the finest presidential speeches in the history of U.S. foreign policy.¶ The fundamental existential question of the time was whether the two superpowers would engulf the planet in an all-out nuclear war. In response, Kennedy articulated that day a “strategy of peace,” declaring: “We have no more urgent task” than the pursuit of peace.¶ In a series of events held this spring at American University to commemorate the anniversary of this remarkable address, prominent speakers highlighted many of the core themes of Kennedy’s speech, including the need for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the importance of engaging adversaries.¶ Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons remains a central global challenge, and it is easy to draw lessons from Kennedy’s remarks in reflecting upon relationships such as those between the United States and North Korea, Israel and Iran, and India and Pakistan.¶ At a deeper level, however, Kennedy’s speech was about the nuclear threat, the pursuit of peace over war, and the U.S. relationship with the Soviet Union, because those were the existential predicaments of the second half of the 20th century.¶ While nonproliferation and nuclear arms reduction agendas remain central today, as we honor Kennedy’s legacy 50 years later, our most critical undertaking as a nation will be to grapple seriously with the existential threat of our time: climate change.¶ Climate change goes well beyond the impact of rising sea levels on low-lying communities.¶ Scholars from numerous disciplines — political science, geography, demography, sociology, anthropology, economics and the natural sciences — are studying climate change’s impact on future violence and conflict as dramatic shifts and unexpected variations in weather patterns affect food production, human migration and settlement, and the availability of fresh water. The U.S. Defense Department and defense ministries abroad have raised the alarm of the real threat of climate change-induced conflict.¶ As climate variation affects populations worldwide, our leaders acknowledge the need for action. Yet many observers contend that the politics around this issue make action impossible.¶ As Kennedy argued forcefully in his “strategy of peace,” the United States must lead here, as it did in pursuing negotiations with its supreme adversary five decades ago.¶ Kennedy’s legacy should inspire today’s leaders to pursue a strategy of peace to address this century’s existential threat, which may lead to a far more unstable world order than that which we ever imagined during the Cold War.¶ In his address at American University, Kennedy called for “not merely peace in our time but peace in all time.” Fifty years later, to honor his legacy, we should call for not merely a habitable planet in our time, but a habitable planet for all time.

### 1NC

**TBHA is in Congress now and will be ratified**

**Martin and Wood 13** – \*Director of the Energy Program at the Institute of the Americas at the University of California, San Diego; \*\*Director of the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, professor for 17 years in Mexico and previously was director of the International Relations Program at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) in Mexico City (Jeremy M. and Duncan, “U.S. ShoUld Act QUickly on trAnSboUndAry hydrocArbon Agreement With mexico,” World Politics Review, May 3, 2013, http://www.iamericas.org/news/WPR\_US\_Mexico\_05032013.pdf)//Bwang

These are all positive steps, and their progress will be monitored closely by U.S. and international observers, especially Mexico. But it bears underscoring that further delay in U.S. adoption of the agreement makes little sense. The agreement is not an overly polarizing issue domestically: in fact, quite the opposite. Several lawmakers have described it as a win-win for both Mexico and the U.S. As the U.S. Congress debates the deal, it is worth revisiting the four key reasons the agreement merits an expeditious approval in the coming weeks. First, approval of the deal in the U.S. would be an important sign of bilateral concord, particularly at the outset of a new administration in Mexico and a second term for Obama. This is important, as it underscores the two nations’ increasing ability to work together and conclude complicated agreements—and cooperation—on binational issues unrelated to immigration or crime and drugs. Second, this agreement makes clear that both nations are keenly aware of the energy potential of the Gulf, particularly along the maritime border. But it also firmly establishes the issue of increased regulation and standards for drilling in a bilateral agreement. Since the April 2010 Macondo accident, the largest oil spill in U.S. history, the U.S. has been more concerned with drilling safety not just in the U.S. but also in neighboring countries around the Gulf such as Cuba and Mexico. This agreement formalizes interaction in terms of regulation and any responses to incidents along the maritime border. Third, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was correct to emphasize the commercial opportunity and energy security element of the accord when it was first announced. The agreement provides the possibility for U.S. firms to join with Mexico’s national oil company, Pemex, to exploit deep-water oil resources in the Gulf of Mexico along the countries’ maritime boundaries. This could provide important opportunities for U.S. companies, including exciting joint venture opportunities with Pemex long thought impossible. Finally, the agreement is relevant and worthy of attention in both the U.S. and Mexico because of the important role of Mexican oil in the U.S. energy security equation, and the importance of the U.S. market for Mexican oil exports and revenue. During her remarks at the signing ceremony, Clinton called the agreement part of a commitment to improve energy security for both countries and to ensure safe, efficient, responsible exploration of the oil and gas reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico. This last point has echoed throughout the congressional hearings on the topic, while members of Congress from both parties and from across the country have focused on the importance of collaboration with our neighbors, shared technology and the opportunity to boost energy security on both sides of the border. The president’s visit to Mexico and the accompanying surge in interest in the agreement provide the necessary momentum to facilitate passage of the bill and take the critical first steps toward implementation. Waiting any longer to do so merely delays the many benefits the agreement has to offer and sends the wrong signal about the need for the U.S. and Mexico to work together in the Gulf of Mexico, and on energy issues more generally. □

**Voting issue – their aff is not only in Congress but has a ridiculously high chance of passage. This moots all links to neg DA’s which are a key internal link to fairness and education.**

**Vote Neg on presumption – they need to prove a high chance their aff isn’t being done**

### 1NC

**Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in a national network of liquid fluorine thorium nuclear energy reactors.**

**The CP solves fossil fuel dependence – expertise and empirics prove**

Cowan, 10 – The Examiner, internally cites Dr. Carlo Rubbia, an Italian particle physicist who won the 1984 Nobel Prize in Physics, graduate of Scuola Normale in Italy, PhD in physics from Columbia University, former President of the National Agency for Atomic Energy (Aaron, August 30, 2010, “Thorium could replace oil and coal in five years says Nobel prize winner,” <http://www.examiner.com/article/thorium-could-replace-oil-and-coal-five-years-says-nobel-prize-winner)//VP>

\*we don’t advocate gendered language\*

Particle physicist and Nobel prize winner Carlo Rubbia claims that mankind could get all its power from a special type of nuclear reactor fuelled by the element thorium, eliminating the need for coal and oil for power generation in as little as five years, if the political will and economic commitment existed, according to reporting on August 30, 2010. Thorium has long been viewed as a promising fuel source for nuclear power generation compared to uranium. For one thing, by weight, one can extract several hundred times more energy from thorium than uranium ores, because only certain isotopes of uranium can be used for fission. Furthermore, thorium is more plentiful than uranium, the latter of which can require complicated and expensive refinement and enrichment processes. Thorium, by contrast often is a waste material left over from other heavy metal extraction processes. Because of its high availability, it is less likely for the supply of this fuel source to be disrupted. In Rubbia's scheme, additional fuel could also be made by using thorium to power a particle accelerator to breed a manmade form of uranium called U233. However, these materials still would not be as easy to turn into weapons as materials from present day reactors, and would be fully compliant with Non-Proliferation Treaty agreements. Rubbia's designs call networks of small reactors each generating less than a gigawatt each, unlike the more monolithic nuclear plants online today. These reactors would be buried underground for safety and security reasons, reducing many of the current attendant costs. Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, New Mexico actually proposed and designed a similar, small, manufactured thorium reactor that would only produce a few hundred megawatts per unit, just last year, and is looking at commercializing it. Therefore these types of ideas have been revived, to an extent, perhaps due to the government's current willingness to provide funding for nuclear projects again.

**Broad consensus errs neg – it’s a limitless supply**

Evans-Pritchard, 10 – Writer for the Telegraph (Ambrose, internally cites Dr. Rubbia and Kirk Sorensen, former NASA aerospace engineering and chief nuclear technologist at Teledyne Brown, August 29, 2010, “Obama could kill fossil fuels overnight with a nuclear dash for thorium,” http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/comment/7970619/Obama-could-kill-fossil-fuels-overnight-with-a-nuclear-dash-for-thorium.html)//VP

Muddling on with the status quo is not a grown-up policy. The International Energy Agency says the world must invest $26 trillion (£16.7 trillion) over the next 20 years to avert an energy shock. The scramble for scarce fuel is already leading to friction between China, India, and the West. There is no certain bet in nuclear physics but work by Nobel laureate Carlo Rubbia at CERN (European Organization for Nuclear Research) on the use of thorium as a cheap, clean and safe alternative to uranium in reactors may be the magic bullet we have all been hoping for, though we have barely begun to crack the potential of solar power. Dr Rubbia says a tonne of the silvery metal – named after the Norse god of thunder, who also gave us Thor’s day or Thursday - produces as much energy as 200 tonnes of uranium, or 3,500,000 tonnes of coal. A mere fistful would light London for a week. Thorium burns the plutonium residue left by uranium reactors, acting as an eco-cleaner. "It’s the Big One," said Kirk Sorensen, a former NASA rocket engineer and now chief nuclear technologist at Teledyne Brown Engineering. "Once you start looking more closely, it blows your mind away. You can run civilisation on thorium for hundreds of thousands of years, and it’s essentially free. You don’t have to deal with uranium cartels," he said. Thorium is so common that miners treat it as a nuisance, a radioactive by-product if they try to dig up rare earth metals. The US and Australia are full of the stuff. So are the granite rocks of Cornwall. You do not need much: all is potentially usable as fuel, compared to just 0.7pc for uranium. After the Manhattan Project, US physicists in the late 1940s were tempted by thorium for use in civil reactors. It has a higher neutron yield per neutron absorbed. It does not require isotope separation, a big cost saving. But by then America needed the plutonium residue from uranium to build bombs. Brussels turned to its technical experts, who happened to be French because the French dominate the EU’s nuclear industry. "They didn’t want competition because they had made a huge investment in the old technology," he said. Another decade was lost. It was a sad triumph of vested interests over scientific progress. "We have very little time to waste because the world is running out of fossil fuels. Renewables can’t replace them. Nuclear fusion is not going work for a century, if ever," he said. The Norwegian group Aker Solutions has bought Dr Rubbia’s patent for an accelerator-driven sub-critical reactor, and is working on his design for a thorium version at its UK operation. Victoria Ashley, the project manager, said it could lead to a network of pint-sized 600MW reactors that are lodged underground, can supply small grids, and do not require a safety citadel. It will take £2bn to build the first one, and Aker needs £100mn for the next test phase. The global energy crunch needs equal "action". If it works, Manhattan II could restore American optimism and strategic leadership at a stroke: if not, it is a boost for US science and surely a more fruitful way to pull the US out of perma-slump than scattershot stimulus.

### 1NC

**Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling – political capital is key to success and solving a government shut down**

Pace 9/12 Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles.¶ That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ The White House also may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit, House Speaker John Boehner on Thursday said the GOP will insist on curbing spending.

**Plan sparks a debate – Obama and House disagree**

Boman, 6/26 – Senior Editor of Rigzone (Karen, 2013, “White House Cannot Support Gulf Transboundary Bill,” http://www.rigzone.com/news/oil\_gas/a/127326/White\_House\_Cannot\_Support\_Gulf\_Transboundary\_Bill)//VP

The Obama administration cannot support a bill that would move forward establishing a framework for oil and gas exploration and production in the transboundary zone in the Gulf of Mexico, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) reported Tuesday. The White House does support the goal set out in H.R. 1613 to provide Congressional approval of the agreement and allow the Secretary of the Interior to implement the agreement. However, the administration "strongly objects" to exempting actions taken by public companies in accordance with transboundary agreements from requirements under Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act and the Securities and Exchange Commission's Natural Resource Extraction Disclosure Rule. "As a practical matter, this provision would waive the requirement for the disclosure of any payments made by resource extraction companies to the United States or foreign governments in accordance with a transboundary hydrocarbon agreement," OMB said in a statement. "The provision directly and negatively impacts U.S. efforts to increase transparency and accountability, particularly in the oil, gas and minerals sectors." OMB noted that the Obama administration looks forward to working with Congress to enact legislation that would focus the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Agreement, without the inclusion of extraneous and unnecessary provisions. H.R. 1613, also known as the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement Authorization Act, was proposed earlier this year by U.S. House of Representative members Jeff Duncan (R-S.C.), House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (R-Wash.) and House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Chairman Matt Salmon (R-Ariz.). The lawmakers see the bill as a means of helping the United States achieve energy independence and better energy cooperation with Mexico as well as while lowering energy costs and creating jobs.

**Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove**

Davidson 9/10 Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

**Nuclear war**

Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### Wetlands

**No impact to biod - Empirically denied and alternate causality – hundreds of thousands of species die annually**

**Paltrowitz, 01** (JD Brooklyn Journal of I-Law, 2001 (A Greening of the World Trade Organisation”)

However, the panel did not take into account the practical reality that negotiations are time-consuming. The environment, animal life and human life can all be irreparably harmed as time passes. n105 For instance, one scholar has reported [\*1807] that "the world is losing between 27,000 and 150,000 species per year, approximately seventy-four species every day, and three every hour and up to seventy percent of the world's fisheries are depleted or under stress after years of over-exploitation." n106 This concern is especially pertinent in the case of the eastern spinner dolphin and coastal spotted dolphin, which are on the endangered species list. n107 Yet, even for the dolphin species that are not endangered, a similar concern applies because if dolphins continue to be maimed or killed in tuna purse seines then their numbers could become seriously depleted to the point where they may be put on the endangered species list. In short, Tuna-Dolphin I shows the preeminence of trade values at the expense of environmental values. Therefore, the panel's acknowledgment of the WTO's Preamble rang hollow when it stated: " . . . that the provisions of the GATT impose few constraints on a contracting party's implementation of domestic environmental policies." n108

**2. Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable**

**Doremus, 00** (Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story . That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action . Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. 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. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. 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. 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. 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.

**3. Collapse is common – won’t spillover**

**Antibiotic disease empirically denied – diseases have been around forever and haven’t caused extinction. Plus, genetic diversity ensures that some humans will always survive.**

**Intervention checks – if 50% of the population started dying, people would take precautions to prevent future outbreaks.**

**Oil policy ensures regional actors protect the Gulf**

Jones, 11 - Prof-History-Rutgers (“Time to Disband the Bahrain Based US Fifth Fleet”, 6/10, [http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/06/time-to-disband-the-bahrain-based-us-fifth-fleet/240243/1/)](http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/06/time-to-disband-the-bahrain-based-us-fifth-fleet/240243/1/%29)//VP

Aside from enabling brutal behavior, the logic behind our heavy military presence in the Gulf may be outdated. Ever since President Jimmy Carter outlined a strategic doctrine that stated the U.S. would "use any means necessary, including military force" to protect its "vital interests" in the Persian Gulf, the United States has seen its military commitments to the region intensify. Since the mid-1980s, the U.S. has in a sense been engaged in one long war in the Gulf. It helped intensify the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, led Desert Storm in 1990 and 1991, imposed no-fly zones over Iraq in the 1990s, and invaded Iraq in 2003, all to some extent on the basis of the Carter Doctrine. If security and stability are measured by the absence of conflict, the American military approach to the Gulf has not been much of a success. But the Gulf, after all, is a tough neighborhood, and the U.S. has maintained the oil access it's sought. Had the world not intervened in 1990, Saddam Hussein could well have used his captured of Kuwaiti oil fields for political leverage against his many enemies. Iran could try the same using its own vast energy resources. But these anxieties are based on a fundamental miscalculation -- that oil is in tight supply and that its distribution or flow must be protected. These fears are rooted in the oil crises of the 1970s, when Arab oil embargoes and the Iranian revolution shook the world economy and helped tip the U.S. into recession. The reality is that, today, there is not too little oil. There is too much oil. There has been ever since the 1970s crises led oil producers to develop new energy resources in deep-water wells, oil sands, shale, and heavy crude, all of which have drastically expanded the global energy supply. But oil producers, following the example of oil companies in the 20th century, have been committed, especially recently, to manufacturing scarcity. They do so in order to drive up prices and revenues, a significant share of which they redistribute at home in an effort to buy the favor and the quiescence of their subjects. This is especially true in Saudi Arabia and Bahrain. Since the late 1960s, oil states have viewed the provision of cradle-to-grave social services as a basic part of their ruling contract. But as they've expanded services and wealth, they have eliminated opportunities for political participation. It is an expensive arrangement, one that depends on sufficient revenues. As a result, the regimes are dependent on their prize for survival. For all the geostrategic considerations that surround protecting oil, the bottom line is that energy producers have to sell their product. They cannot drink it. Given this, and given that fears of instability drive prices up even further, it is not necessary for outside powers like the U.S. to protect them. In the long run, protecting the oil producers has only entrenched a system in which "friendly" oil powers limit production and, rather than serve global markets, work against them. It is unfavorable but predictable, an arrangement that Washington has accepted for decades. Although successive presidents have come under pressure to end American dependency on Middle Eastern oil, since the early 1970s, billions of petrodollars have recycled through the U.S. economy.

**No impact**

**Gladwell, 95** (Malcolm, The New Republic, 7/17/95 and 7/24/95, “The Plague Year”, Lexis)

What would a real Andromeda Strain look like? It would be highly infectious like the flu, spread through casual contact. But it would also have to be structured in such a way as to avoid the kind of selection bias that usually exists against virulent strains. For that reason, it would need to move stealthily through its host, infecting so silently that the victim would not know to take precautions, and so slowly that the victim would have years in which pass on the infection to someone else. The Andromeda Strain, in short, the virus that really could kill 80 or 90 percent of humanity, would be an airborne version of HIV. In fact, doomsday types have for years been conjuring up this possibility for the end of mankind. The problem, however, **is that it is very difficult to imagine how such a super-virus could ever come about**. For a start, it is not clear how HIV could become airborne and still be lethal. (This was the argument of Howard Temin, the late Nobel Prize-winning virologist.) What makes HIV so dangerous is that it seeks out and selectively kills the key blood cells of the human immune system. To be airborne, it would have to shift its preference to the cells of the respiratory system. (Ebola, which is not nearly so selective, probably doesn't need to change personality to become airborne.) How, then, could it still cause aids? Why wouldn't it be just another cold virus? Then there is the problem of mutation. To become airborne, HIV would have to evolve in such a way as to become more durable. Right now the virus is highly sensitive to changes in temperature and light. But it is hardly going to do any damage if it dies the moment it is coughed into the air and exposed to ultraviolet rays. HIV would have to get as tough as a cold virus, which can live for days on a countertop or a doorknob. At the same time HIV would have to get more flexible. Right now HIV mutates in only a limited manner. The virus essentially keeps changing its clothes, but its inner workings stay the same. It kills everyone by infecting the same key blood cells. To become airborne, it would have to undergo a truly fundamental transformation, switching to an entirely different class of cells. How can HIV make two contradictory changes at the same time, becoming both less and more flexible? **This is what is wrong with the Andromeda Strain argument**. Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adopt a specific strategy, but every strategy carries a corresponding cost, and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly, but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all but halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable, remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability, its essential rigidity, is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. aids is almost invariably lethal because its attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: **as contagious as flu, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation** that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the **limitations** of microscopic life forms.

### Environment

**Warming doesn’t cause extinction**

**Carter et. Al 11–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (March 8th, “[Surviving](file:///C:\Users\Vivienne\Marc\Desktop\Surviving) the Unpreceented Climate Change of the IPCC” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>) Jacome

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate.

**Warming is natural**

**Carter et. Al 12–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (February 2012, “Eight Centuries of Climate Change in Northeast Spain” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2012/feb/8feb2012a3.html>

According to Morellon *et al*. (2011), "in the context of present-day global warming, there is increased interest in documenting climate variability during the last millennium," since "it is crucial to reconstruct pre-industrial conditions to discriminate anthropogenic components (i.e., greenhouse gases, land-use changes) from natural forcings (i.e., solar variability, volcanic emissions)." Against this backdrop, Morellon *et al*. conducted a multi-proxy study of several short sediment cores they recovered from Lake Estanya (42°02'N, 0°32'E) in the Pre-Pyrenean Ranges of northeast Spain, which "provides a detailed record of the complex environmental, hydrological and anthropogenic interactions occurring in the area since medieval times." More specifically, they say that "the integration of sedimentary facies, elemental and isotopic geochemistry, and biological proxies (diatoms, chironomids and pollen), together with a robust chronological control, provided by AMS radiocarbon dating and 210Pb and 137Cs radiometric techniques, enabled precise reconstruction of the main phases of environmental change, associated with the Medieval Warm Period (MWP), the Little Ice Age (LIA) and the industrial era." And what did they find? The thirteen researchers identified the MWP as occurring in their record from AD 1150 to 1300, noting that their pollen data reflect "warmer and drier conditions," in harmony with the higher temperatures of the Iberian Peninsula over the same time period that have been documented by Martinez-Cortizas *et al*. (1999), the higher temperatures of the Western Mediterranean region found by Taricco *et al*. (2008), and the global reconstructions of Crowley and Lowery (2000) and Osborn and Briffa (2006), which "clearly document warmer conditions from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries," which warmth, in the words of Morellon *et al*. is "likely related to increased solar irradiance (Bard *et al*., 2000), persistent La Niña-like tropical Pacific conditions, a warm phase of the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, and a more frequent positive phase of the North Atlantic Oscillation (Seager *et al*., 2007)." Following hard on the heels of the MWP, Morellon *et al*. note the occurrence of the LIA, which they recognize as occurring from AD 1300 to 1850. And here they report that, on the Iberian Peninsula, "lower temperatures (Martinez-Cortizas *et al*., 1999) characterize this period," which "coincided with colder North Atlantic (Bond *et al*., 2001) and Mediterranean sea surface temperatures (Taricco *et al*., 2008) and a phase of mountain glacier advance (Wanner *et al*., 2008)." And following the LIA they identify the transition period of AD 1850-2004 that takes the region into the Current Warm Period. In discussing all three of these distinctive periods, they say that "a comparison of the main hydrological transitions during the last 800 years in Lake Estanya and solar irradiance (Bard *et al*., 2000) reveals that lower lake levels dominated during periods of enhanced solar activity (MWP and post-1850 AD) and higher lake levels during periods of diminished solar activity (LIA)." And *within* the LIA, they note that periods of higher lake levels or evidence of increased water balance occurred during the solar minima of Wolf (AD 1282-1342), Sporer (AD 1460-1550), Maunder (AD 1645-1715) and Dalton (AD 1790-1830). In light of these several observations it would appear that the multi-centennial climate oscillation uncovered by Morellon *et al*. has been driven by a similar oscillation in solar activity, as well as by multi-decadal solar activity fluctuations superimposed upon that longer-period oscillation. And these relationships suggest that there is no compelling need to attribute 20th-century global warming to the concomitant increase in the air's CO2 content. Natural variability appears quite capable of explaining it all.

**Negative feedbacks prevent warming**

**Evans 12** ­–consultant of the Australian Greenhouse Office/Department of Climate Change, main modeler of carbon in Australia’s biosphere 1999-2005, mathematician, engineer with 6 university degrees, Ph.D. from Stanford in electrical engineering (David. M. W., “The Skeptic’s Case”, 2/24/12; < https://mises.org/daily/5892/The-Skeptics-Case>)//Beddow

The serious skeptical scientists have always agreed with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2. The argument is entirely about the feedbacks. The feedbacks dampen or reduce the direct effect of the extra CO2, cutting it roughly in half.[5] The main feedbacks involve evaporation, water vapor, and clouds. In particular, water vapor condenses into clouds, so extra water vapor due to the direct warming effect of extra CO2 will cause extra clouds, which reflect sunlight back out to space and cool the earth, thereby reducing the overall warming. There are literally thousands of feedbacks, each of which either reinforces or opposes the direct-warming effect of the extra CO2. Almost every long-lived system is governed by net feedback that dampens its response to a perturbation. If a system instead reacts to a perturbation by amplifying it, the system is likely to reach a tipping point and become unstable (like the electronic squeal that erupts when a microphone gets too close to its speakers). The earth's climate is long-lived and stable — it has never gone into runaway greenhouse, unlike Venus — which strongly suggests that the feedbacks dampen temperature perturbations such as that from extra CO2. The climate models have been essentially the same for 30 years now, maintaining roughly the same sensitivity to extra CO2 even while they got more detailed with more computer power. How well have the climate models predicted the temperature? Does the data better support the climate models or the skeptic's view? One of the earliest and most important predictions was presented to the US Congress in 1988 by Dr James Hansen, the "father of global warming": Hansen's climate model clearly exaggerated future temperature rises. In particular, his climate model predicted that if human CO2 emissions were cut back drastically starting in 1988, such that by year 2000 the CO2 level was not rising at all, we would get his scenario C. But in reality the temperature did not even rise this much, even though our CO2 emissions strongly increased — which suggests that the **climate models greatly overestimate the effect of CO2 emissions**. A more considered prediction by the climate models was made in 1990 in the IPCC's First Assessment Report:[8] It's 20 years now, and the average rate of increase in reality is below the lowest trend in the range predicted by the IPCC. Ocean Temperatures The oceans hold the vast bulk of the heat in the climate system. We've only been measuring ocean temperature properly since mid-2003, when the Argo system became operational.[9][10] In Argo, a buoy duck dives down to a depth of 2,000 meters, measures temperatures as it very slowly ascends, then radios the results back to headquarters via satellite. Over 3,000 Argo buoys constantly patrol all the oceans of the world. The ocean temperature has been basically flat since we started measuring it properly, and not warming as quickly as the climate models predict. The climate models predict a particular pattern of atmospheric warming during periods of global warming; the most prominent change they predict is a warming in the tropics about 10 km up, the "hotspot." The hotspot is the sign of the amplification in their theory (see figure 1). The theory says the hotspot is caused by extra evaporation, and by extra water vapor pushing the warmer, wetter lower troposphere up into volume previously occupied by cool dry air. The presence of a hotspot would indicate amplification is occurring, and vice versa. We have been measuring atmospheric temperatures with weather balloons since the 1960s. Millions of weather balloons have built up a good picture of atmospheric temperatures over the last few decades, including the warming period from the late 1970s to the late '90s. This important and pivotal data was not released publicly by the climate establishment until 2006, and then in an obscure place.[13] Here it is: In reality there was no hotspot, not even a small one. So in reality there is no amplification — the amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist.[16] The climate models predict that when the surface of the earth warms, less heat is radiated from the earth into space (on a weekly or monthly time scale). This is because, according to the theory, the warmer surface causes more evaporation and thus there is more heat-trapping water vapor. This is the heat-trapping mechanism that is responsible for the assumed amplification in figure 1. Satellites have been measuring the radiation emitted from the earth for the last two decades. A major study has linked the changes in temperature on the earth's surface with the changes in the outgoing radiation. Here are the results: This shows that in reality the earth gives off more heat when its surface is warmer. This is the opposite of what the climate models predict. This shows that the climate models trap heat too aggressively, and that their assumed amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist. **All the data here is impeccably sourced — satellites, Argo, and weather balloons.[**18] The air and ocean temperature data shows that the climate models overestimate temperature rises. The climate establishment suggest that cooling due to undetected aerosols might be responsible for the failure of the models to date, but this excuse is wearing thin — it continues not to warm as much as they said it would, or in the way they said it would. On the other hand, the rise in air temperature has been greater than the skeptics say could be due to CO2. The skeptic's excuse is that the rise is mainly due to other forces — and they point out that the world has been in a fairly steady warming trend of 0.5°C per century since 1680 (with alternating ~30 year periods of warming and mild cooling) where as the vast bulk of all human CO2 emissions have been after 1945. We've checked all the main predictions of the climate models against the best data: Test Climate Models Air temperatures from 1988 Overestimated rise, even if CO2 is drastically cut Air temperatures from 1990 Overestimated trend rise Ocean temperatures from 2003 Overestimated trend rise greatly Atmospheric hotspot Completely missing → no amplification Outgoing radiation Opposite to reality → no amplification The climate models get them all wrong. The missing hotspot and outgoing radiation data both, independently, prove that the amplification in the climate models is not present. Without the amplification, the climate model temperature predictions would be cut by at least two-thirds, which would explain why they overestimated the recent air and ocean temperature increases. Therefore, The climate models are fundamentally flawed. Their assumed threefold amplification by feedbacks does not in fact exist. The climate models overestimate temperature rises due to CO2 by at least a factor of three. The skeptical view is compatible with the data. The data presented here is impeccably sourced, very relevant, publicly available, and from our best instruments. Yet it never appears in the mainstream media — have you ever seen anything like any of the figures here in the mainstream media? That alone tells you that the "debate" is about politics and power, and not about science or truth. This is an unusual political issue, because there is a right and a wrong answer, and everyone will know which it is eventually. People are going ahead and emitting CO2 anyway, so we are doing the experiment: either the world heats up by several degrees by 2050 or so, or it doesn't. Notice that the skeptics agree with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2; they just disagree about the feedbacks. The climate debate is all about the feedbacks; everything else is merely a sideshow. Yet hardly anyone knows that. The government climate scientists and the mainstream media have framed the debate in terms of the direct effect of CO2 and sideshows such as arctic ice, bad weather, or psychology. They almost never mention the feedbacks. Why is that? Who has the power to make that happen?

### PEMEX

**There is no bioterrorist threat. The most sophisticated terrorist group ever tried attacking with a biological agent 9 times and the attacks were so bad no one even noticed they were happening.**

**Mueller, 05** (John, Professor of Political Science at OhioState. May 2005. International Studies Perspectives, Volume 6 Issue 2 Page 208-234, Simplicity and Spook: Terrorism and the Dynamics of Threat Exaggeration)

Properly developed and deployed, biological weapons could indeed, if thus far only in theory, kill hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions, of people. The discussion remains theoretical because biological weapons have scarcely ever been used even though the knowledge about their destructive potential as weapons goes back decades, even centuries in some respects (the English, e.g., made some efforts to spread smallpox among American Indians in the French and Indian War) (Christopher, Cieslak, Pavlin, and Eitzen, 1997:412).Belligerents have eschewed such weapons with good reason: biological weapons are extremely difficult to deploy and to control. Terrorist groups or rogue states may be able to solve such problems in the future with advances in technology and knowledge, but the record thus far is unlikely to be very encouraging to them. For example, Japan reportedly infected wells in Manchuria and bombed several Chinese cities with plague-infested fleas before and during the Second World War. These ventures may have killed thousands of Chinese, but they apparently also caused thousands of unintended casualties among Japanese troops and seem to have had little military impact.18 In the 1990s, Aum Shinrikyo, a Japanese cult that had some 300 scientists in its employ and an estimated budget of $1 billion, reportedly tried at least nine times over 5 years to set off biological weapons by spraying pathogens from trucks and wafting them from rooftops, hoping fancifully to ignite an apocalyptic war. These efforts failed to create a single fatality—in fact, nobody even noticed that the attacks had taken place.

**Terrorists won’t pursue or use nuclear weapons**

**Waltz, 03** (Kenneth, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, 2003, p. 130)

For terrorists who abandon tactics of disruption and harassment in favor of dealing in wholesale death and destruction, instruments other than nuclear weapons are more readily available. Poisons and germs are easier to get than nuclear weapons, and poisoning a city’s water supply, though rather complicated, is more easily done than blowing a city up. Nevertheless, terrorists may seek to gain control of nuclear materials and use them to threaten or destroy. Yet, with shaky control of nuclear weapons materials in Russia and perhaps in Pakistan, and with the revelation in 1994 that the United States had lost track of some of its nuclear materials, one can hardly believe that nuclear weapons spreading to another country or two every now and then adds much to the chances that terrorists will be able to buy or steal nuclear materials. Plentiful sources are already available. Nuclear terror is a problem distinct from the spread of nuclear weapons to a few more countries. Terrorists have done a fair bit of damage by using conventional weapons and have sometimes got their way by threatening to use them. Might terrorists not figure they can achieve more still by threatening to explode nuclear weapons on cities of countries they may wish to bend to their bidding? Fear of nuclear terror arises from the assumption that if terrorists *can* get nuclear weapons they *will* get them, and then all hell will break loose. This is comparable to assuming that if weak states get nuclear weapons, they will use them for aggression. Both assumptions are false. Would the courses of action we fear, if followed, promise more gains than losses or more pains than profits? The answers are obvious. Terrorists have some hope of reaching their long-term goals through patient pressure and constant harassment. They cannot hope to do so by issuing unsustainable threats to wreak great destruction, threats they would not want to execute anyway.

**Hegemony is resilient – the US is way ahead of everyone else**

**Brooks and Wohlforth, 08** (Stephen G Brooks & William C. Wohlforth Associate Professors in the Department of Government @ Dartmouth College. World Out of Balance, p. 27-31)

“Nothing has ever existed like this disparity of power; nothing,” historian Paul Kennedy observes: “I have returned to all of the comparative defense spending and military personnel statistics over the past 500 years that I compiled in The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, and no other nation comes close.” Though assessments of U.S. power have changed since those words were written in 2002, they remain true. Even when capabilities are understood broadly to include economic, technological, and other wellsprings of national power, they are concentrated in the United States to a degree never before experienced in the history of the modern system of states and thus never contemplated by balance-of-power theorists. The United States spends more on defense that all the other major military powers combined, and most of those powers are its allies. Its massive investments in the human, institutional, and technological requisites of military power, cumulated over many decades, make any effort to match U.S. capabilities even more daunting that the gross spending numbers imply. Military research and development (R&D) may best capture the scale of the long-term investment that give the United States a dramatic qualitative edge in military capabilities. As table 2.1 shows, in 2004 U.S. military R&D expenditures were more than six times greater than those of Germany, Japan, France, and Britain combined. By some estimates over half the military R&D expenditures in the world are American. And this disparity has been sustained for decades: over the past 30 years, for example, the United States has invested over three times more than the entire European Union on military R&D. These vast commitments have created a preeminence in military capabilities vis-à-vis all the other major powers that is unique after the seventeenth century. While other powers could contest U.S. forces near their homelands, especially over issues on which nuclear deterrence is credible, the United States is and will long remain the only state capable of projecting major military power globally. This capacity arises from “command of the commons” – that is, unassailable military dominance over the sea, air, and space. As Barry Posen puts it, Command of the commons is the key military enabler of the U.S global power position. It allows the United States to exploit more fully other sources of power, including its own economic and military might as well as the economic and military might of its allies. Command of the commons also helps the United States to weaken its adversaries, by restricting their access to economic, military, and political assistance….Command of the commons provides the United States with more useful military potential for a hegemonic foreign policy than any other offshore power has ever had. Posen’s study of American military primacy ratifies Kennedy’s emphasis on the historical importance of the economic foundations of national power. It is the combination of military and economic potential that sets the United States apart from its predecessors at the top of the international system. Previous leading states were either great commercial and naval powers or great military powers on land, never both. The British Empire in its heyday and the United States during the Cold War, for example, shared the world with other powers that matched or exceeded them in some areas. Even at the height of the Pax Britannica, the United Kingdom was outspent, outmanned, and outgunned by both France and Russia. Similarly, at the dawn of the Cold War the United States was dominant economically as well as in air and naval capabilities. But the Soviet Union retained overall military parity, and thanks to geography and investment in land power it had a superior ability to seize territory in Eurasia. The United States’ share of world GDP in 2006, 27.5 percent, surpassed that of any leading state in modern history, with the sole exception of its own position after 1945 (when World War II had temporarily depressed every other major economy). The size of the U.S economy means that its massive military capabilities required roughly 4 percent of its GDP in 2005, far less than the nearly 10 percent it averaged over the peak years of the Cold War, 1950-70, and the burden borne by most of the major powers of the past. As Kennedy sums up, “Being Number One at great cost is one thing; being the world’s single superpower on the cheap is astonishing.”

**2. US withdrawal won’t cause power wars – forward deployment only encourages NATO growth and Russian expansionism**

**Gholz, Press, and Sapolsky, 97** (Eugene Gholz and Daryl Press, doctoral candidates in political science at MIT. Harvey Sapolsky, professor of public policy at MIT. International Security, Vol. 21, No. 4. Spring 1997)

Several prominent analysts favor a policy of selective engagement. These analysts fear that American military retrenchment would increase the risk of great power war. A great power war today would be a calamity, even for those countries that manage to stay out of the fighting. The best way to prevent great power war, according to these analysts, is to remain engaged in Europe and East Asia. Twice in this century the United States has pulled out of Europe, and both times great power war followed. Then America chose to stay engaged, and the longest period of European great power peace ensued. In sum, selective engagers point to the costs of others' great power wars and the relative ease of preventing them. The selective engagers' strategy is wrong for two reasons. First, selective engagers overstate the effect of U.S. military presence as a positive force for great power peace. In today's world, disengagement will not cause great power war, and continued engagement will not reliably prevent it. In some circumstances, engagement may actually increase the likelihood of conflict. Second, selective engagers overstate the costs of distant wars and seriously understate the costs and risks of their strategies. Overseas deployments require a large force structure. Even worse, selective engagement will ensure that when a future great power war erupts, the United States will be in the thick of things. Although distant great power wars are bad for America, the only sure path to ruin is to step in the middle of a faraway fight. Selective engagers overstate America's effect on the likelihood of future great power wars. There is little reason to believe that withdrawal from Europe or Asia would lead to deterrence failures. With or without a forward U.S. presence, America's major allies have sufficient military strength to deter any potential aggressors. Conflict is far more likely to erupt from a sequence described in the spiral model. The danger of spirals leading to war in East Asia is remote. Spirals happen when states, seeking security, frighten their neighbors. The risk of spirals is greatest when offense is easier than defense, because any country's attempt to achieve security will give it an offensive capability against its neighbors. The neighbors’ attempts to eliminate the vulnerability give them fleeting offensive capabilities and tempt them to launch preventive war. But Asia, as discussed earlier, is blessed with inherent defensive advantages. Japan and Taiwan are islands, which makes them very difficult to invade. China has a long land border with Russia, but enjoys the protection of the East China Sea, which stands between it and Japan. The expanse of Siberia gives Russia, its ever trusted ally, strategic depth. South Korea benefits from mountainous terrain which would channel an attacking force from the north. Offense is difficult in East Asia, so spirals should not be acute. In fact, no other region in which great powers interact offers more defensive advantage than East Asia. The prospect for spirals is greater in Europe, but continued US engagement does not reduce that danger; rather, it exacerbates the risk. A West European military union, controlling more than 21 percent of the world's GOP, may worry Russia. But NATO, with 44 percent of the world's COP, is far more threatening, especially if it expands eastward. The more NATO frightens Russia, the more likely it is that Russia will turn dangerously nationalist, redirect its economy toward the military, and try to re-absorb its old buffer states. But if the U.S. military were to withdraw from Europe, even Germany, Europe's strongest advocate for NATO expansion, might become less enthusiastic, because it would be German rather than American troops standing guard on the new borders.

**Terrorists cannot access biological weapons – multiple barriers  
Parachini, 07** (John, RAND policy analyst, Control Bioweapons but Defend biotechnology, July, p.lexis)

Sub-national groups or individuals can develop or acquire their own biological weapon capabilities for clandestine use, but it is not easy. Terrorist groups and individuals have historically not employed biological weapons because of a combination of formidable barriers to acquisition and use and comparatively readily available alternatives and disincentives. Procurement of materials and recruitment of people with skills and know-how are formidable barriers. Even if some of the materials and production equipment are procurable for legitimate scientific or industrial purposes, handling virulent biological materials and fashioning them into weapons capable of producing mass casualties is beyond the reach of most sub-national groups or individuals.

# Neg Block

### 2NC Environment

**the fact that we are alive now is sufficient to prove that their evidence is just alarmism --- ZERO risk of cascading environmental collapse --- wealth and tech solve**

**Bailey, 00** award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine, testified before Congress, author of numerous books, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, 2k [ Ronald, “[Earth Day, Then and Now](http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now) The planet's future has never looked better. Here's why.”, <http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now/4>]

"I'm scared," confessed Paul Ehrlich in the 1970 Earth Day issue of *Look*. "I have a 14 year old daughter whom I love very much. I know a lot of young people, and their world is being destroyed. My world is being destroyed. I'm 37 and I'd kind of like to live to be 67 in a reasonably pleasant world, and not die in some kind of holocaust in the next decade." Ehrlich didn't die in a holocaust, and the world is far more pleasant than he thought it would be. It is probably too much to hope that abashed humility will strike him and he'll desist in bedeviling the world with his dire and consistently wrong predictions. He's like a reverse Cassandra --Cassandra made true prophecies but no one would listen to her. Ehrlich makes false prophecies and everyone listens to him. There's much to celebrate on the 30th anniversary of Earth Day. Indeed, one of the chief things to get happy about is that **the doomsters were so wrong. Civilization didn't collapse**, hundreds of millions didn't die in famines, pesticides didn't cause epidemics of cancer, and the air and water didn't get dirtier in the industrialized countries. On the occasions when they admit things have gotten better, doomsters will claim whatever environmental progress has been made over the past 30 years is only a result of the warnings that they sounded. One of the more annoying characteristics of activists such as Ehrlich and Lester Brown is the way in which these prophets of doom get out ahead of a parade that has already started. When things get better, they claim that it's only because people heeded their warnings, not because of longstanding trends and increased efficiencies. As a result, there is always the danger that governments may actually enact their policies, thereby stifling technological progress and economic growth--and making the world worse off. Then the doomsters would be able to say "I told you so." So good or bad, they get to claim that they were right all along. What will Earth look like when Earth Day 60 rolls around in 2030? Here are my predictions: As the International Food Policy Research Institute projects, we will be able to feed the world's additional numbers and to provide them with a better diet. Because they are ultimately political in nature, poverty and malnutrition will not be eliminated, but economic growth will make many people in the developing world much better off. Technological improvements in agriculture will mean less soil erosion, better management of freshwater supplies, and higher productivity crops. Life expectancy in the developing world will likely increase from 65 years to 73 years, and probably more; in the First World, it will rise to more than 80 years. Metals and mineral prices will be even lower than they are today. The rate of deforestation in the developing world will continue to slow down and forest growth in the developed economies will increase. Meanwhile, as many developing countries become wealthier, they will start to pass through the environmental-transition thresholds for various pollutants, and their air and water quality will begin to improve. Certainly air and water quality in the United States, Europe, Japan, and other developed countries will be even better than it is today. Enormous progress will be made on the medical front, and diseases like AIDS and malaria may well be finally conquered. As for climate change, concern may be abating because the world's energy production mix is shifting toward natural gas and nuclear power. There is always the possibility that a technological breakthrough--say, cheap, efficient, non-polluting fuel cells--could radically reshape the energy sector. In any case a richer world will be much better able to cope with any environmental problems that might crop up. One final prediction, of which I'm most absolutely certain: **There will be a disproportionately influential group of doomsters** predicting that the future--and the present--never looked so bleak.

**Worst case it takes 100 years**

**Page 11**-Article Cites Study Conducted by the US National Science Foundation, Quotes Anreas Schmitner, Professor @ the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences [Lewis, The Register, Free Whitepaper-IBM System Networking RackSwitch G8264, “Global Warming Much Less Serious than Thought-New Science,” 11/25/2011, <http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/11/25/runaway_warming_unlikely/>]

Climate scientists funded by the US government have announced new research in which they have established that the various doomsday global warming scenarios are in fact extremely unlikely to occur, and that the scenarios considered likeliest - and used for planning by the world's governments - are overly pessimistic. The new study improves upon previous results by including data from the remote past, rather than only examining records from recent times. "Many previous climate sensitivity studies have looked at the past only from 1850 through today, and not fully integrated paleoclimate data, especially on a global scale," says Andreas Schmittner, professor at the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences at Oregon State uni. "When you reconstruct sea and land surface temperatures from the peak of the last Ice Age 21,000 years ago – which is referred to as the Last Glacial Maximum – and compare it with climate model simulations of that period, you get a much different picture. "If these paleoclimatic constraints apply to the future, as predicted by our model, the results imply less probability of extreme climatic change than previously thought," Schmittner adds. The baseline assumption of climate science at the moment is that given a doubling of atmospheric CO2 compared to pre-industrial levels the most probable result is that the Earth would see a surface temperature rise average of 3°C - and that there would be a significant chance of much bigger, perhaps fatal rises. Schmittner and his colleagues' analysis says that the planet's climate simply can't be this sensitive to CO2 changes, however, or much more extreme events should have occurred at certain points in the past - and they did not. For instance, if the climate were sensitive enough that doubled CO2 could mean catastrophic warming, the low carbon levels seen 21,000 years ago should have resulted in an equally lifeless iceball planet. "Clearly, that didn't happen," Schmittner says. "Though the Earth then was covered by much more ice and snow than it is today, the ice sheets didn't extend beyond latitudes of about 40 degrees, and the tropics and subtropics were largely ice-free – except at high altitudes. These high-sensitivity models overestimate cooling." According to the new improved analysis, the most probable result as and when double CO2 occurs is actually a rise of just 2.3°C - only just above the 2°C limit which international climate efforts are seeking to stay within. Plainly there's no great need to fear a rise above 450 parts per million (ppm) CO2, as people currently do - in fact there's no likely prospect of getting near a 2°C temperature rise for a century or more at present rates of CO2 increase (rising about about 2 ppm/year at the moment from a level of 390-odd). And Schmittner and his colleagues' results show a much tighter grouping of possible futures, too, so the scope for way-out doomsday scenarios is hugely reduced. The Australian [quotes](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/climate-forecasts-exaggerated-science-journal/story-e6frg8y6-1226205464958) Schmittner as saying: "Now these very large changes (predicted for the coming decades) can be ruled out, and we have some room to breathe and time to figure out solutions to the problem." The new study [is published](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/early/2011/11/22/science.1203513.abstract?sid=d47377ad-6df7-4f10-a1d7-ac371826abcf) in top-ranking boffinry journal Science. The research was funded by the US National Science Foundation. ®

### 2NC Economy

**Terrorists can’t get or use biological weapons – multiple reasons**

**Brown, 05** (Matthew E. Associate, Pepper Hamilton, LLP. B.A., LaSalle University; J.D., College of William & Mary School of Law, 2005, Loyola University Chicago Institute for Health Law Annals of Health Law, “Reconsidering the model state emergency health powers act: toward state regionalization in bioterrorism response”, 14 Ann. Health L. 95)

Despite the advantages and apparent ease of obtaining biological weapons, terrorist organizations have used them very infrequently. Since 1993, five comprehensive databases have compiled detailed biological and chemical weapons use worldwide during the twentieth century. [69](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n69" \t "_self) All summarize the same findings: .there is an extremely low incidence of real biological (or chemical) events, in contrast to the number of recent hoaxes ... [;] .those events that were real, and were actual examples of use, were overwhelmingly chemical, and even in that category, involved the use of easily available, off-the-shelf, non-synthesized industrial products. Many  [\*105]  of these were instances of personal murder, and not attempted as mass casualty use... . Exactly one person had been killed in the United States in the 100 years between 1900 and 2000 as a result of an act of biological or chemical terrorism[; and] .excluding the preparation of ricin, a plant toxin that is relatively easy to prepare, there are only a few recorded instances in the years 1900 to 2000 of the preparation of biological pathogens in a private laboratory by a non-state actor. [70](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n70" \t "_self) This low incidence of bioterrorism is not an oversight by terrorist organizations. Contrary to popular belief and media representation, effective biological weapons are extraordinarily difficult to produce. Producing biological weapons requires mastery of five essential elements: 1) one must obtain an appropriate strain of the biological agent; 2) know how to handle the agent properly; 3) know how to culture the agent so that it delivers the desired effect; 4) know how to store and produce sufficient quantities of the agent; and 5) know how to disperse the agent properly. [71](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n71" \t "_self) Historically, these criteria have proven extraordinarily difficult to fulfill. For example, during the course of the United States' biological weapons program, scientists gathered approximately 675 strains of Clostridium botulinum, but only one strain ultimately proved satisfactory for weapons development. [72](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n72" \t "_self) Moreover, Doctor Jerzy Mierzejewski, the former director of Poland's biological defense laboratories, spent his entire career working with Clostridium botulinum. [73](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n73" \t "_self) At two NATO [74](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n74" \t "_self) Advanced Research Workshops, Dr. Mierzejewski described his ongoing difficulties with consistently growing cultures with lethal levels of toxin. [75](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n75" \t "_self) The doctor recounted that even minor variations in growth parameters would seriously alter toxin levels of the cultures. [76](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n76" \t "_self) While former Central Intelligence Agency director James Woolsey stated that "a B-plus high school chemistry student" could produce large quantities of virulent biological agents, [77](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n77" \t "_self) such a claim seems incredulous given Dr. Mierzejewski's extensive professional experience and his expressed frustration with producing consistent, virulent cultures. [\*106]  Professors Jonathon Tucker and Amy Sands of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies describe the difficulty of effectively dispersing a biological agent: The capability to disperse microbes and toxins over a wide area as an inhalable aerosol - the form best suited for inflicting mass casualties - requires a delivery system whose development would outstrip the technical capabilities of all but the most sophisticated terrorists. Not only is the dissemination process for biological agents inherently complex, requiring specialized equipment and expertise, but effective dispersal is easily disrupted by environmental and meteorological conditions. [78](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n78" \t "_self) Not only is it exceedingly difficult to obtain, handle, grow, store, produce, and disperse the appropriate strain of a biological agent, but those wishing to carry out a biological attack must also possess the knowledge with which to complete these tasks. Consider that the Soviet Union's biological weapons program was comprised of roughly sixty thousand people, three thousand of whom were senior-level scientists. [79](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n79" \t "_self) Although those senior scientists were experts who knew the details of their respective stages of the weapons development process, only one hundred of them knew how to carry a biological agent from its beginning stages to the final stages of weapons production. [80](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n80" \t "_self) Yet, in order for terrorists to successfully develop a biological weapon, they must acquire the information entrusted to none but the top scientists in a very sophisticated bioweapons program. Perhaps the most compelling example of the difficulty terrorists face in producing bioweapons comes from the Japanese religious cult, Aum Shinrikyo. Headed by former Japanese Parliament candidate Shoko Ashahara, the cult reportedly had amassed $ 1.5 billion through donations, religious seminar fees, and revenues from commercial enterprises by the mid-1990s. [81](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb#n81) Beginning in 1989, Aum Shinrikyo scientists and engineers began working to develop biological weapons, experimenting with botulinum toxin, anthrax, cholera, and Ebola. [82](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb#n82) After failing to successfully release botulinum toxin and anthrax in several different Japanese cities, they spent millions of dollars attempting to purchase information from  [\*107]  unemployed or poorly salaried, former Soviet bioweapons experts. [83](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n83" \t "_self) Their efforts were unsuccessful, however, and it was not until 1995 that the cult was able to isolate a disease strain suitable to weaponize. Although Aum isolated an appropriate disease strain, they were unable to properly disperse the agent, and in their nine bioterrorist attacks on Japan, no fatalities or mass illnesses resulted. [84](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n84" \t "_self) Aum Shinrikyo and contemporary fundamentalist terrorist groups like al Qaeda share many of the same characteristics. They are well-funded, well-educated, patient, and perhaps most importantly, their terrorist motivations are not irrational, but are "perfectly logical within the context of their value system." [85](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n85" \t "_self) Despite these characteristics, however, Aum Shinrikyo was unable to mount a single successful bioterrorist attack. The Aum Shinrikyo attacks on Japan, along with the 2001 anthrax attacks, represent the only bioterrorist attacks occurring worldwide in the past twenty years. [86](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=7d9c2f3a83676c5391f0825c3c65615e&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAB&_md5=c49ab93ea971244dc855989dcb1f26fb" \l "n86" \t "_self) Aum Shinrikyo's failure to successfully mount a bioterrorist strike in Japan, moreover, should be highly instructive to our national leaders as they develop a bioterrorism response policy. Given this history of bioterrorist attacks and the extreme difficulty of successful biological weapons development, it seems that fear of an imminent bioterrorist attack is unfounded.

**And, we will stay as the world hegemon – multiple indicators**

**Bandow, 10**- Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, Former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagon, Author of Several Books (Doug, "Overspent and Overextended", Cato Institute, January 7th 2010, January 25th 2010, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11113, KONTOPOULOS)

The U.S. dominates the globe militarily. America's reach exceeds that of the Roman and British Empires at their respective heights. The threats facing the U.S. pale compared to its capabilities. So why is Washington spending so much on the military?The military budget is the price we pay for the nation's foreign policy. The U.S. currently is spending nearly as much as the rest of the world. In real terms, Washington is spending more today than at any time during the Cold War, the Korean War, or the Vietnam War.In 2010 the U.S. will spend roughly $700 billion on the military. The Obama administration's original non-war defense budget was $534 billion. The latter is an increase of $20 billion, or 4 percent (2 percent after inflation). Yet conservatives attacked Obama for "cutting" military outlays. Robert Kagan of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace charged that the administration was signaling that "the American retreat has begun." It is a curious form of "retreat." The U.S. is ramping up the war in Afghanistan. American troops continue to occupy Iraq. The U.S. remains the principal member of every major Cold War alliance: NATO, U.S.-Japan, and U.S.-Korea. America is allied with every major industrialized power outside of China and Russia. U.S. troops are stationed at hundreds of installations in scores of nations around the globe. The American secretary of state continues to circle the globe instructing other nations how to order their economies, reform their political systems, and behave in international relations.

**And, the aging crisis guarantees that other countries can't challenge the US**

**Haas, 07**- Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne University (Mark, "A Geriatric Peace?", International Security, Volume 32, Number 1, Summer 2007, February 3rd 2010, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2007.32.1.112?cookieSet=1, KONTOPOULOS)

The crowding out of military and economic development spending for increased care for the elderly is not the only way in which social aging is likely to affect global power distributions. Social aging is likely to push militaries to spend more on personnel and less on other areas, including weapons development and procurement. **This is important because no nation will be able to challenge U.S. military dominance without the ability to wage highly technologically sophisticated warfare.**97 When states are forced to spend more of their military budgets on personnel than on research, development, and weapons procurement, **the odds of continued U.S. military primacy increase substantially.** The oldest of the great powers are already devoting signiªcantly more resources to military personnel than to weapons purchases and research. Over the last ten years, both France and Germany have dedicated nearly 60 percent of their military budgets to personnel, which is almost double the proportion in the U.S. budget. Germany spends nearly 4 times as much on personnel as on weapons procurement, France, Japan, and Russia roughly 2.5 times more. The United States, in contrast, dedicates only 1.29 times more money to personnel than to weapons purchases (see Table 9 for more statistics and sources).98 Social aging is a key cause of increasing military personnel costs for two main reasons. First, as societies age, more people exit the workforce than enter it. Increasing numbers of retirees in relation to new workers are likely to create labor shortages relative to previous levels of employment. The result of this trend will be increased competition among businesses and organizations— including the military—to hire workers. Consequently, if states’ militaries want to be able to attract and keep the best employees in vital areas of operation—especially those in high-technology ªelds who usually have the most employment options and can command high salaries in the private sector—they are going to have to pay more to do so. If militaries do not in-crease their outlays for personnel, their effectiveness will diminish. A 2006 report endorsed by EU defense ministers made precisely these points. The report states that “the aging of Europe’s people will lead to ªerce competition for young and skilled workers,” which will “inevitably” lead to rising military personnel per capita costs if European forces are to remain effective.99 Similarly, to keep military salaries on par with wages in its expanding economy, China (even though its armed forces are conscripted) has had to raise military wages sharply in recent years (an 84 percent increase for ofªcers and a 92 percent increase for soldiers from 1992 to 2002). In fact, according to the Chinese government, rising personnel expenses are the most important factor behind the growth of the Chinese defense budget in the last decade.100 A second factor that is increasing states’ military personnel costs at the expense of weapons procurement is the aging of the militaries themselves. The great powers’ pension obligations to retired military personnel are considerable. In Russia’s 2006 budget, more than 130.5 billion rubles, or more than 12 percent of total defense-related expenditures, were dedicated to military pensions. This figure represents roughly 35.5 billion rubles more than was spent on weapons purchases, and approximately 37.6 billion rubles more than on military research and development.101 Twenty-two percent of France’s defense budget goes to pensions.102 According to China’s government, rising pension costs are the second most important reason for increases in military spending in the last decade (after pay increases for active personnel).103 Even India, despite having the youngest population of all the great powers, currently spends almost 15 percent of its defense budget on pensions.104 Growing pension costs for military retirees are important for international power relationships because these expenditures, which are not one-time costs but ones that governments will have to pay every year for many decades, do nothing to increase states’ power-projection capabilities. Every dollar spent on retirees is one less dollar that can be spent on weapons, research, or active personnel. Consequently, every dollar spent in this area by the other great powers increases the likelihood of the continuation of U.S. primacy. Of all the major fiscal effects created by global aging, however, military pension expenditures may be the area of greatest relative weakness for the United States (other than health-care costs).105 The United States today spends more than $40 billion on military retirement.106 These costs alone would make it the seventh largest military spender in the world.107

### 2NC Renewables

**Mexico-US cooperation on climate change is key—regional spillover – perception key because of prior commitment to renewables**

SRE, 12 – Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexican Foreign Ministry (“Third Meeting of The Mexico-United States Bilateral Framework On Clean Energy And Climate Change,” October 13, Lexis)//VP

Through this bilateral initiative, the governments of Mexico and the United States have strengthened their cooperation on renewable energy, clean technologies and the fight against climate change. Their common goal is to ensure sustainable development, a secure energy supply and energy efficiency, and to progress in strengthening institutional mechanisms that successfully address the complex and diverse challenges in North America. At the meeting, implementation of the relevant bilateral projects and initiatives was reviewed. The participants agreed on the value of the dialogue and the actions taken to date, and they identified areas of opportunity that could be addressed in the future.  The critical importance of energy for the economic development of countries and the welfare of their societies was stressed, and the two sides reiterated their commitment to reducing as much as possible the environmental impact of the production and consumption of energy. The governments agreed to continue working to consolidate the efforts of the Mexico-United States Coordinating Committee of the Operational Group for Cross-border Electricity. The delegations discussed climate change in the current international context, and agreed on the importance of ensuring the full implementation of the agreements reached at the Cancun and Durban conferences. They also stressed the need to promote joint efforts to tackle climate change with transparency and trust, and they reviewed the work that has been done on the Green Climate Fund. They also acknowledged that bilateral cooperation can make significant contributions to other regional and multilateral mechanisms. An example of this is the priority given by the Mexican Presidency of the G-20 to the issue of long-term financing for climate change programs.

**Renewable doent fail - energy solves climate change**

EREC, 04 – European Renewable Energy Council (European Renewable Energy Council website, “Renewable Energy – A key solution to climate change”, 3/14, http://www.erec.org/fileadmin/erec\_docs/Documents/Publications/ClimateChangeBriefing.pdf)//VP

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 reduction 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.

**Mexico has massive renewable energy potential – but a lack development is contributing to “energy poverty” in rural areas**

**Donnelly, 10** – News Security Beat (Robert, 6/24, "US-Mexico cooperation on renewable energy: building a green agenda," http://www.newsecuritybeat.org/2010/06/u-s-mexico-cooperation-on-renewable-energy-building-a-green-agenda/#.Uc0T9vbwJV4)//VP

Mexico has large untapped areas of geothermal, wind, and solar potential, according to Duncan Wood, author of the Wilson Center report and chair of the Department of International Relations at the Instituto Tecnologico Autonomo de Mexico (ITAM). Already, the country is the world’s third-largest producer of geothermal energy, and has large geothermal deposits in Baja California near major U.S. markets, such as San Diego and Los Angeles.¶ Mexico also offers great promise in wind power, with an 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, once Mexico’s mainland electrical grid is connected to the United States.¶ Wood also pointed out that Mexico is rich in solar energy, which could be marketed to the United States—particularly from the Baja California peninsula, which is the only part of the Mexican grid currently connected the United States. In biomass, he added, little investment has been made so far.¶ Opening New Avenues for Collaboration¶ With Mexico’s oil fields experiencing long-term and, in some cases, precipitous declines, the country is plotting a “future as a green nation,” shifting its policy focus toward alternative energy development, said Wood. In addition, Mexico’s renewable sector does have 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.¶ A U.S.-Mexico taskforce on renewables was recently formed—an announcement timed to coincide with President Felipe Calderon’s April 2010 state visit to Washington—and there has been high-level engagement on the issue by both administrations. Collaboration between Mexico and U.S. government agencies through the Mexico Renewable Energy Program has enabled richer development of Mexico’s renewable resources while promoting the electrification and economic development of parts of rural Mexico.¶ Joe Dukert, an independent energy analyst affiliated with the Center for Strategic & International Studies, pointed out that U.S.-Mexico collaboration on renewables is a little-acknowledged area of bilateral cooperation, and stressed the economic complementarities that exist between the two countries on the issue. He noted, for example, that Mexico was well-positioned to furnish power to help California meet its Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) by 2020.¶ “Mexico can help them reach these [renewable energy] targets,” Dukert said. Yet at the same time, he said that Mexico needs to do more to enhance its profile as a renewable-energy supplier, and specifically suggested that energy attaches be assigned to the embassy and consulates.¶ Johanna Mendelson Forman, a senior associate with the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic & International Studies, emphasized the linkages connecting climate change, energy, and economic development. Forman warned that Mexico’s inadequate energy stocks are a problem for the United States, adding that “energy poverty is a real issue in Mexico.” Energy development and climate change—which are perceived as less polemical than other issues—are good entry points for a broader U.S.-Mexico dialogue, she remarked.

**Energy poverty perpetuates the poverty cycle**

IEF, 09 – International Energy Forum (“Reducing Energy Poverty through Cooperation & Partnership”, IEF Symposium on Energy Poverty, December 8-9, www.ief.org/\_resources/files/content/events/ief-symposium-on-energy-poverty/background-paper.pdf)//VP

The 11¶ th ¶ International Energy Forum (Rome, 20¶ -¶ 22 April 2008) noted that “over two billion people ¶ do not yet have access to modern energy services. This perpetuates the poverty cycle and inhibits ¶ economic development, availability of clean water and food, while preventing training and ¶ acceptable health standards¶ .”¶ Ministers at t¶ he Forum called for the ¶ solidarity of IEF countries and a ¶ step change in the collective efforts of all relevant international organizations to help achieve the ¶ Millennium Development Goals by halving poverty rates by 2015.¶ The same message was echoed a¶ t ¶ the Jeddah Energy Meeting ¶ (22 June 2008), ¶ where ¶ Ministers noted that “oil price rises and the ¶ underlying volatility, will have an impact on the economies of the consuming and producing ¶ countries alike, especially in the least¶ -¶ developed countries.¶ ”¶ The Jeddah Joint Statement ¶ recommended that “development assistance from national, regional and international finance and aid institutions be intensified to alleviate the consequences of higher oil prices on the least-developed countries¶ .¶ ” Further still, participants¶ a¶ t the London Energy M¶ eeting (19 December 2008) ¶ noted that “high or volatile prices for oil and other energy sources had a serious impact on low-income countries” and agreed on the importance of multilateral measures to mitigate this effect.

**Poverty is the equivalent of a nuclear war – it kills millions a year**

**Abu-Jamal, 98** (Mumia “A Quiet and Deadly Violence,” www1.minn.net/~meis/quietdv.htm)

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural" violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; "By `structural violence' I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting `structural' with `behavioral violence' by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on." -- (Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it -- really? Gilligan notes: "[E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world." [Gilligan, p. 196]

**We control uniqueness—inequality is high and rising**

**Pogge, 11** – PhD, Director of the Global Justice Program and Leitner Professor of Philosophy and International Affairs at Yale University (12/7, Thomas, Financial Task Force, “Endless Poverty Is A Human Rights Failure”, http://www.financialtaskforce.org/2011/12/07/endless-poverty-is-a-human-rights-failure/)//VP

Contrary to much official rhetoric, **these problems are not being overcome. The number of chronically undernourished** people, for instance, **has risen since** the **1996** World Food Summit in Rome where the world’s governments promised to halve it by 2015. Reported at 788 million in 1996, **this number has** in 2009 **broken above 1 billion for the first time in** human **history**. **A key driver** of the persistence of severe poverty **is rising global inequality.** While the top five percent of the world’s population increased its share of global household income from 42.9 to 46.4 percent in the 1988–2005 period, **the share of the poorest quarter declined by a third** from 1.16 to 0.78 percent — **despite all the development assistance**.[1] Clearly, and unsurprisingly, **the rules of the world economy are better aligned with the** interests of the **world’s affluent** than with those of the poor. The Task Force on Financial Integrity and Economic Development has been analyzing and fighting some important structural injustices in our global financial system, calling attention, for instance, to how corporate tax evasion in developing countries is facilitated through lax accounting standards for multinational corporations. **Since they are not required to do country-by-country reporting,** such **corporations can easily manipulate transfer prices** among their subsidiaries **to concentrate** their **profits** where they are taxed the least. As a result, they may report little to no profits in the countries in which they extract, manufacture or sell goods or services, having their worldwide profits taxed instead in some tax haven where they only have a paper presence. Task Force member Global Financial Integrity (GFI) estimates that, during the 2000–2008 time period, trade mispricing deprived developing countries of US$382.6 – US$405 billion per annum. Even more important, as seen over the last year, existing rules have allowed banks to accept for private depositfunds from public officials in developing countries. The funds found stashed by Gaddafi in various accounts exceed the annual GDP of Libya and are clearly proceeds of corruption. This type of complicity could easily be avoided: banks are already under strict reporting requirements with regard to funds suspected of being related to terrorism or drug trafficking. Yet many banks still eagerly accept and manage embezzled funds — and legally so, with secrecy laws ensuring that their banks remain attractive for such illicit deposits. GFI estimates that developing countries have lost an average of $342- 404.7 billion annually during the 2000–2008 period due to leakages via bankingsystems—more than four times the amount they have received in official development assistance. **The impact of this financial drain on the livelihood of the poor is magnified by the effects of corruption on the quality of governance**.

**1) Plan signals a reversal and recommitment to hydrocarbon economy - Focus on oil and gas production shifts focus away from renewables**

Ochoa and Vego, 12 – Writers for Renewable Energy World (Alberto, Julián, Published December 24 2012, Renewable Energy World, “Renewable Energy Review: Mexico”, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/12/renewable-energy-review-mexico)//VP

While few doubt that the new climate change law represents a turning point in Mexico’s energy agenda, there are some concerns that the country still lacks a clear regulatory framework for attracting the substantial private investment required to fulfil these ambitious renewable energy and emissions targets. The Government may find that some sort of financial subsidy is still required to make renewables projects cost-competitive with more conventional sources such as gas. Further, there are some concerns around whether Mexico’s incoming Government is likely to implement much of the climate change reform passed by current President, Felipe Calderon. President-elect, Pena Nieto, who takes office this December, has publicly affirmed his commitment to fighting climate change, but some believe his Administration is more likely to focus on conventional fuels given increasing shale gas production in the US and the prospect of large recoverable reserves in Mexico. One of Nieto’s main campaign promises had been to reinvigorate oil and gas production by reforming state-owned giant Pemex to allow more private investment.This, combined with pressure to deliver GDP growth, may take focus away from the renewables sector in the short term. However, it is perhaps too premature to dismiss the potential of the recent energy reforms — the incoming Government has a unique opportunity to establish Mexico as a leading 21st-century low-carbon economy, and only time will tell the extent to which this opportunity is realized.

**2) Renewable development on the border will remain limited through 2030, but joint cooperation between the US and Mexico can boost the industry – the plan diverts attention**

**Lee and Ganster, 12** – Writers and Researchers for SCERP (Erik and Paul, **“**The U.S.-Mexican Border Environment: Progress and Challenges for Sustainability” Chapter 11- Energy for a Sustainable Border Region in 2030, p. 321-322, http://www.worldcat.org/title/us-mexican-border-environment-progress-and-challenges-for-sustainability/oclc/793326682)//VP

Energy poses a formidable challenge to those working to achieve ¶ sustainable development goals. Energy is needed to alleviate poverty, ¶ promote economic growth, and foster social development. But as ¶ more energy is consumed, stress is placed on the environment at ¶ the local, regional, and transboundary levels. While there are no ¶ absolute answers and solutions vary by region, by country, and even ¶ by locality, a common thread in reaching solutions is being able to ¶ ask and answer the right questions. Based on an analysis of existing ¶ information and forecasts, some conclusions and recommendations ¶ are given for the border region regarding energy and use of renewable ¶ sources of energy for 2030.¶ The total primary energy consumption in the border region will ¶ increase on both sides of the border, with faster growth in Mexico. ¶ Furthermore, the fuel mix for both countries will be based very ¶ much on fossil fuels; it is expected that natural gas will increase ¶ its importance in the border fuel mix, particularly in Mexico. It is ¶ therefore urgent to concentrate on modernizing the current energy ¶ infrastructure and implementing a massive energy efficiency program.¶ Performance of existing power plants and openings of new ¶ installations should be better controlled for their potential ¶ environmental impacts, particularly on the air and water. For this ¶ measure to be effective, a binational environmental management ¶ mechanism with broad public participation and a solid variety of ¶ instruments, strategies, and joint actions will be necessary.¶ The use of renewable energy sources contributes to the sustainability ¶ of the border region and, because of this, their use should be ¶ encouraged. The U.S. side of the border is taking firm steps to this ¶ end, but still there is room for improvement given the vast array of ¶ renewable resources available locally. Mexico should be encouraged ¶ to enter the renewable market through financial and regulatory ¶ measures. However, any renewable energy implementation should ¶ be complemented by a significant increase in energy efficiency, ¶ diversification of energy sources, and a combination of wide area power generation and decentralized power generation, or a ¶ “SuperSmart grid.”¶ By 2030, the use of renewables in the border region will be ¶ modest, still in an introductory stage, but already contributing to the ¶ sustainable development of the region. Additional coordinated efforts ¶ are needed on both sides of the border for the renewables market to mature and thus set the foundations of a low-carbon U.S.-Mexican ¶ border region.

**3) The plan also opens up OCS gas development**

Beaudreau, 13 – Assistant Secretary of Land and Minerals Management for the United States Department of the Interior (Tommy P., “Statement of Tommy P. Beaudreau Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management United States Department of the Interior Before the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Committee on Natural Resources U.S. House of Representatives”, 4/25, http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Newsroom/Congressional\_Testimony/Final%20DOI%20Beaudreau%20statement%20HR%201613%20Transboundary.pdf)//VP

The Agreement provides a legal framework for cooperative offshore oil and gas development ¶ along the maritime boundary,sets clear guidelines and provides legal certainty for those ¶ operations, supports the President’s goal of ensuring domestic energy security and demonstrates ¶ our shared duty to exercise responsible stewardship of the natural resources in the Gulf of ¶ Mexico. It is built on a commitment to the safe, efficient, environmentally sound, and equitable ¶ development of transboundary reservoirs. The Agreement also offers the potential for generating ¶ additional revenue for the United States and Gulf States from the lease blocks located along the ¶ delimited U.S.-Mexico maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico.¶ The Mexican market has long been closed to participation by U.S. companies, but a 2008 energy ¶ reform law in Mexico opened a window for joint hydrocarbon exploration and development with ¶ foreign entities as long as it would take place pursuant to an international agreement on ¶ transboundary reservoirs. The Agreement would take advantage of that opening. It would also ¶ end the moratorium on development along the boundary in the Western Gap and provide U.S.-¶ qualified leaseholders with legal certainty regarding the development of transboundary reservoirs ¶ along the entire boundary so as to encourage investment. The Agreement would remove legal ¶ and structural barriers that currently impede exploration and development along our maritime ¶ boundary with Mexico. A significant portion of the U.S. maritime boundary with Mexico – the ¶ full length of the boundary in the Western Gap – is subject to a moratorium on drilling and ¶ exploration pursuant to the Western Gap Treaty. Upon entry into force the Agreement would lift ¶ the moratorium and open up this area – nearly ten percent of the U.S. portion of the Gap – to ¶ hydrocarbon development. Finally, having the Agreement in place will mitigate the safety and ¶ environmental risks that would result from unilateral exploration and development along the ¶ boundary

**OCS drilling demands a worst case analysis**

Houck, 10 — Professor of Law at the Tulane University (Oliver A. Houck, “Worst Case and the Deepwater Horizon Blowout: There Ought to Be a Law,” Environmental Law Reporter, v1, 2010, Lexis)//VP

On May 18, 2010, the CEQ announced a 30-day review of¶ NEPA policies regarding OCS drilling in the Gulf.99 The¶ public comments were predictable, and, to some extent, a¶ replay of the l986 comments many years earlier. Industry¶ claimed that the Deepwater Horizon blowout was an anomaly,¶ it had the situation in hand, it was already burdened with¶ a plethora of regulations, the only problem was implementation100;¶ environmental groups, of course, urged opposite conclusions.¶ 101 The outcome of this inquiry is pending, but it is¶ also by its very nature quite limited. OCS drilling is the tip¶ of the iceberg, a dangerous tip to be sure, but much the same¶ can be said for coal mining, oil shale, tar sands, natural gas¶ fracturing, renewed nuclear energy development, and similar¶ ventures that ignore worst cases at their (and our) peril.¶ Nor is the worst-case doctrine limited in any logical sense¶ to energy development, with major decisions involving bioengineering,¶ genetically modified crops, endocrine disruptors,¶ and ecosystem modifications ahead. OCS is currently¶ on the table, which is a good start. Worst case belongs back on the table as well. When it returns, two amendments seem desirable. The first is the removal of the “reasonably foreseeable” threshold for events of catastrophic proportion, which has become an¶ escape valve of choice for the federal family. Standard risk¶ analysis tells us that, the more severe the potential consequences, the more precaution is required. The second is to¶ restore the phrase “worst-case analysis” to its original place,¶ calling the inquiry what it is. Ever since the Supreme Court¶ picayunely seized on its absence to trash a worst-case claim,¶ the federal judiciary has largely abandoned the field, and any¶ rewrite will fare the same unless the labeling is unambiguous.¶ Words matter. There is today, ever more acutely as we launch more risky ventures with even planetary impacts at stake, a constructive¶ role for explicit worst-case analysis in the NEPA process. My¶ gifted academic colleague Bill Rodgers has called it, in the¶ context of climate change, “the power of negative thinking”102¶ It is the power of environmental groups with technical staffs,¶ academics, self-taught experts, retirees from agencies and industry, international colleagues, and the whole panoply¶ of the “loyal opposition” that keeps majority decisions at¶ least relatively honest, improves even marginal projects, and¶ makes all of us and our surroundings a little more secure.¶ It comes, through NEPA and administrative law, with the¶ concomitant power of enforcement, infusing this thinking,¶ like it or not, into the decisionmaking process, ensuring that¶ activities this big are undertaken with eyes wide open and all¶ due preparation. This is NEPA’s role. The OCS program is¶ not the only one that needs it. All major federal decisions do. Pg. 1039-1040

**Environmental disaster destroys demand – turns the aff**

Aldhous, 12 – New Scientist bureau chief and environmental correspondent (Peter, "Drilling into the Unknown," New Scientist, 1/28)//VP

So far, evidence that fracking poses serious risks to human health or the environment –; beyond the pollution associated with fossil fuel extraction –; is scant. But studies are few and hard to interpret, and feelings are running high: neighbours of new fracking operations complain of problems like breathing difficulties, nausea and headaches. "When the public is confused, the public is angry," says Bernard Goldstein, an environmental toxicologist at the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. These concerns could even **bring the** shale **gas bandwagon to a halt**. "If action is not taken to reduce the environmental impact there is a real risk of serious environmental consequences causing a loss of public confidence that could delay or stop this activity," advisers to US energy secretary Steven Chu concluded late last year.

### 1NR Inherency

**1) TBHA passed the house with large bipartisan support and will pass the Senate**

**Traino 7/11** staff writer at index journal (Chris “Hydrocarbon agreement clears House Act pushed by Duncan now awaits Senate action” 7/11/13 http://www.indexjournal.com/main.asp?SubSectionID=40&ArticleID=19678&SectionID=4 7/11/2013) //VP

A transboundary hydrocarbons agreement between the U.S. and Mexico - heavily pushed by Republican Third District U.S. Rep. Jeff Duncan - cleared the U.S. House and now awaits action from the U.S. Senate. The Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act - H.R. 1613 - recently passed the U.S. House by a 256-171 tally. The bill had bipartisan support. The bill would set into motion the terms of the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement, which governs the development of oil and natural gas resources along the U.S.-Mexico maritime border in the Gulf of Mexico. Lander In-Story The bill would lift a moratorium on drilling along the maritime border and provide access to an area thought to contain more than 170 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas. When reached by phone late last week, Duncan said he was pleased to see the bill pass the House with a bipartisan vote. "This was a good bill," Duncan said. "I think it was the right thing for America, as far as energy independence goes. I believe you will see a bipartisan vote over in the Senate. I'm hoping they take up the same House bill, but if they take up a different version ... then it would go to conference and we would see what we could do in conference.

**2) Agreement already created, ratification, bipartisanship, momentum**

**Goldwyn, 8/14** – president of Goldwyn Global Strategies, LLC, an international energy advisory consultancy, and a nonresident senior fellow with the Energy Security Initiative at the Brookings Institution. David Goldwyn served as the U.S. State Department’s special envoy and coordinator for international energy affairs from 2009-2011, reporting directly to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. In this position, Goldwyn conceived and developed the Global Shale Gas Initiative and the Energy Governance and Capacity Initiative, led ministerial-level energy dialogues with Angola, Canada, China, India, Iraq, Mexico, Nigeria and Brazil, and co-chaired a regional biofuels initiative with Brazil (David L., “Time to Implement the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement — Congress: Drop the Poison Pill”, Brookings Institute, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2013/08/14-us-mexico-transboundary-hydrocarbon-goldwyn-brown-gill)//VP

The United States and Mexico concluded a transboundary hydrocarbons agreement, officially titled the “Agreement between the United States and Mexico Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico,” (TBA) in February 2012. The agreement provides the United States substantial geopolitical, energy security and environmental benefits while potentially helping the U.S. oil and gas industry gain access to a huge market that may offer jobs and gains across a long value chain. The Mexican Senate ratified the agreement in April 2012. However, the U.S. Congress needs to enact implementing legislation to give the Department of Interior the authority to play its role in the agreement. This otherwise uncontroversial agreement is now at risk. After nearly a year of benign neglect from the Obama administration, legislation is now being considered to implement TBA. The TBA is a new type of international agreement, and using proven tools for considering treaties and executive agreements, Congress has an important role to play in its interpretation. Regrettably, without strong leadership and engagement from the administration or Congressional leaders, the U.S. House of Representatives included an unnecessary “poison pill” in its June 27, 2013 version of the authorizing bill. The Senate can do better. The TBA provides a framework for joint U.S.-Mexican development of oil and natural gas reservoirs extending across their Gulf of Mexico maritime boundary. This would be a significant achievement for U.S. industry, as Mexican constitutional restrictions have prevented international oil and gas companies from operating there in most capacities for 75 years. U.S. geopolitical and energy security interests would also benefit. Lack of foreign capital, investment and expertise has made it increasingly difficult for Mexico to maintain its position as one of the largest crude exporters to the U.S. Mexican exports declined from 1.5 million barrels per day (mmbd) in 2007 to 1.0 mmbd last year. The U.S. Gulf Coast refinery infrastructure is equipped to process comparatively heavier crude grades found in Mexico, Canada and the Middle East. The U.S. has thus replaced Mexico’s declining volumes not with growing domestic supply, but rather imports from the Middle East. Oil revenues account for more than a third of Mexico’s total government revenues. Reductions in this stream thus negatively impact Mexico’s capacity to finance programs related to expanding the rule of law, security and poverty alleviation, where implementation is important for both Mexican and U.S. security interests. Senior Mexican officials have indicated the transboundary agreement could provide crucial momentum to President Peña Nieto’s sweeping energy reforms proposed on August 12, 2013. Implementation would help prove that Mexico’s energy sector interests could be protected and global energy security enhanced through joint production regimes. This would substantiate arguments of Mexican officials who must convince their colleagues and the public that constitutional energy sector reforms benefit Mexico’s national interests, a contention still somewhat at odds with a powerful, decades-old Mexican narrative. If the U.S. fails to pass the transboundary agreement and signal support for reform, the Mexican government’s enthusiasm to work with the U.S. may dampen and the status quo of declining production and its associated negative impacts could continue. As one means to eventually boost production, Mexico has committed to unilaterally exploring the Gulf maritime border area. While the transboundary agreement offers an opportunity for more robust U.S.-Mexican safety review, de facto U.S. abrogation could poison the well for bilateral collaboration in this area. This may leave U.S. Gulf Coast communities vulnerable to negative environmental impacts from Mexican exploration activities. The House bill contains language that would introduce secrecy into payments made under the TBA by precluding the revenue transparency provisions of the so-called “Cardin-Lugar Amendment” (Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act) from applying to TBA implementation. The Cardin-Lugar Amendment requires oil, gas, and minerals companies to publicly disclose payments to governments, a U.S. requirement that has sparked similar laws in the European Union and are[r1] now under consideration in Canada and beyond. By targeting those bipartisan, robustly supported pro-openness provisions, opponents of transparency are creating opposition to the TBA where none need be present. In raw political terms, the TBA is important but not at the top of the oil and gas industry’s priority list for Congress whereas the proponents of transparency are well-organized and gaining momentum. Even the White House announced it could not support the House bill. Given that political dynamic, some proponents of the TBA are hurting their cause by encouraging the anti-transparency provision. More importantly, the pro-secrecy exemption is not necessary on the merits. First, it has no relevance for activities on the U.S. side of the Gulf. In the U.S., royalties paid for offshore production are public knowledge. Indeed, as part of its efforts to implement the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), the Obama Administration has offered – and industry and civil society welcomed – to unilaterally disclose 100% of payments received by the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) from industry for development of oil and gas concessions. ONRR receipts make up 95% of all U.S. government extractive revenues, including royalties, rents and bonuses. Second, the claim that an anti-transparency exemption is necessary to protect U.S. competitiveness on the Mexican side of the border is without foundation. Some exemption supporters claim it is necessary because Mexico could create a legal framework prohibiting payment disclosure by foreign firms. Yet the transboundary agreement provides for certain information to be kept confidential unless national laws require disclosure. Thus, the U.S. and Mexico have already reached an understanding that national governments should decide whether payments disclosure should be required. As formal negotiations for the TBA began in September 2011, Mexico acceded to this arrangement more than one year after the Cardin-Lugar Amendment became U.S. law. In other words, the TBA protects companies that will be required to disclose payments under existing U.S. law. Third, while some proponents of the exemption fear U.S. disclosure laws will render PEMEX or the Mexican Government unwilling to cooperate with U.S. firms, that Mexican leaders took the political risks necessary to pass the TBA suggests otherwise. Only a handful of companies have the technology and capital to partner with PEMEX in the deep water area under jurisdiction of the TBA, the reality of which PEMEX leaders are keenly aware as they work to diversify production sources. Within Mexico’s political leadership, it would be antithetical to President Peña Nieto’s push for more transparency and in combating corruption for him to seek less openness in the oil sector, particularly considering that PEMEX itself is not under jurisdiction of Cardin-Lugar disclosure requirements. If anything, U.S. disclosure requirements will benefit the standing of U.S. companies in Mexico by helping overcome the deep distrust they have inherited. Fourth, the TBA gives the U.S. government a veto in order to protect U.S. interests, including commercial interests. No “unitization” agreement (essentially, a joint venture between PEMEX and private companies) to develop resources under the TBA can enter into force without the Department of Interior’s approval. Therefore, any discrimination against U.S. companies can be guarded against. Finally, the exemption also overreaches in shaping the nature of not only the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary agreement, but also any future transboundary agreement. Should hydrocarbons development continue in the Arctic, future transboundary agreements with Russia or Canada may be required. Would it be in U.S. interests to facilitate revenue secrecy in Moscow? Given that the EU recently passed its own transparency measures similar to Section 1504 while Canada and Switzerland are considering similar laws, international norms regarding extractive industry transparency may be significantly different by the time agreements with Russia and Canada are negotiated. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Chairman Ron Wyden, together with Ranking Member Lisa Murkowski, have introduced implementing legislation, S.812, which offers a path to support the interests of oil companies, environmentalists, and U.S. consumers with a clean authorization. We are hopeful the Committee and full Senate will act upon S. 812. There have been bicameral and bipartisan acknowledgements of the opportunities the transboundary agreement provides the U.S. oil and gas industry, in addition to its geopolitical, energy security and environmental benefits. Congress should exorcize the poison pill so they can all be realized without further delay.

**3) it is bipartisan and the White House is on board**

Geman, 6/25 – writer for The Hill (Ben, 6-25-13, The Hill, “White House ‘cannot support’ House US-Mexico drilling bill,” http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/307769-white-house-cannot-support-house-us-mexico-drilling-bill)//VP

The White House statement, however, stops short of a veto threat despite saying it "cannot support" the measure. It says the administration looks forward to working with Congress on an implementing bill. Click here for much more on the House bill and its controversial exemption from rules required under the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial overhaul law. The Senate version of the implementing bill, sponsored by the bipartisan leadership of the Senate’s energy committee, does not include the exemption from the Securities and Exchange Commission payment disclosure rules. But proponents of the House measure say the carve-out is needed to prevent a collision with confidentiality provisions in the U.S.-Mexico accord. The underlying 2012 U.S.-Mexico accord, which has support from Republicans and the administration, is designed to enable cooperation in development of oil-and-gas along a maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico. “Implementing this Agreement will offer significant opportunities for responsible and efficient exploration and development of hydrocarbon resources in an expanded area along the U.S.-Mexico maritime boundary as well as significant new opportunities for U.S. companies,” the White House said.

**4) The plan passed the House with massive amounts of support**

**Marex 13** a privately-owned broker of financial instruments in the commodities sector and physical energy products (“U.S. House Passes Maritime Transboundary Agreement Duncan's Bill Opens 1.5 Million Acres in the Gulf for Energy Production” June 28, 2013, lexis) //VP

On Thursday, Congressman Jeff Duncan of South Carolina praised the House passage of his bill H.R. 1613, the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act. Duncan’s legislation passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 256-171, and is one of several energy related bills he’s authored since being elected to Congress. The bill will allow the United States and Mexico to explore and produce the resources which are shared or co-owned underneath the maritime border, putting in place safety and regulatory standards which currently apply to offshore energy production in U.S. Gulf of Mexico waters. “By passing this Transboundary Agreement, the House has furthered its commitment to create jobs through energy. This legislation implements a first of its kind agreement with the government of Mexico to develop shared resources located between our two countries in the Gulf,” said Duncan. “The legislation also opens roughly 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico for production and would help create American jobs and grow our economy in the process. According to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and the U.S. State Department, these areas are estimated to contain 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas, a considerable amount that will lessen our dependence on Middle Eastern sources of oil. The agreement also prioritizes safety by requiring that all operations in the region conform to U.S. safety standards and establishes a framework for possible future arrangements with other neighboring countries like Canada. Simply put, this legislation is a win-win for our country, and I am proud that it received strong bipartisan support.”

**5) momentum and members of Congress are on board**

**Martin and Wood 13** – \*Director of the Energy Program at the Institute of the Americas at the University of California, San Diego; \*\*Director of the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, professor for 17 years in Mexico and previously was director of the International Relations Program at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) in Mexico City (Jeremy M. and Duncan, “U.S. ShoUld Act QUickly on trAnSboUndAry hydrocArbon Agreement With mexico,” World Politics Review, May 3, 2013, http://www.iamericas.org/news/WPR\_US\_Mexico\_05032013.pdf)//VP

In the United States, meanwhile, progress stalled for more than a year. But just in time for yesterday’s bilateral meeting, the agreement is again under discussion as legislators revive the dormant ratification process, which is good news for those eager to see its approval in the U.S. Indeed, according to the White House, Obama spoke in positive terms yesterday about the recent progress made on the agreement: Both the House Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs and the House Committee on Natural Resources recently held hearings focused on the challenges and opportunities that approval of the accord would present for the United States. On April 18, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives that would make way for the approval and implementation of the terms of the agreement. These are all positive steps, and their progress will be monitored closely by U.S. and international observers, especially Mexico. But it bears underscoring that further delay in U.S. adoption of the agreement makes little sense. The agreement is not an overly polarizing issue domestically: in fact, quite the opposite. Several lawmakers have described it as a win-win for both Mexico and the U.S. As the U.S. Congress debates the deal, it is worth revisiting the four key reasons the agreement merits an expeditious approval in the coming weeks. First, approval of the deal in the U.S. would be an important sign of bilateral concord, particularly at the outset of a new administration in Mexico and a second term for Obama. This is important, as it underscores the two nations' increasing ability to work together and conclude complicated agreements—and cooperation—on binational issues unrelated to immigration or crime and drugs. Second, this agreement makes clear that both nations are keenly aware of the energy potential of the Gulf, particularly along the maritime border. But it also firmly establishes the issue of increased regulation and standards for drilling in a bilateral agreement. Since the April 2010 Macondo accident, the largest oil spill in U.S. history, the U.S. has been more concerned with drilling safety not just in the U.S. but also in neighboring countries around the Gulf such as Cuba and Mexico. This agreement formalizes interaction in terms of r-egulation and any responses to incidents along the maritime border. Third, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was correct to emphasize the commercial opportunity and energy security element of the accord when it was first announced. The agreement provides the possibility for U.S. firms to join with Mexico’s national oil company, Pemex, to exploit deep-water oil resources in the Gulf of Mexico along the countries' maritime boundaries. This could provide important opportunities for U.S. companies, including exciting joint venture opportunities with Pemex long thought impossible. Finally, the agreement is relevant and worthy of attention in both the U.S. and Mexico because of the important role of Mexican oil in the U.S. energy security equation, and the importance of the U.S. market for Mexican oil exports and revenue. During her remarks at the signing ceremony, Clinton called the agreement part of a commitment to improve energy security for both countries and to ensure safe, efficient, responsible exploration of the oil and gas reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico. This last point has echoed throughout the congressional hearings on the topic, while members of Congress from both parties and from across the country have focused on the importance of collaboration with our neighbors, shared technology and the opportunity to boost energy security on both sides of the border. The president’s visit to Mexico and the accompanying surge in interest in the agreement provide the necessary momentum to facilitate passage of the bill and take the critical first steps toward implementation.

**6) No delay solvency deficit and republicans support the bill**

**Esenaro, 13** (Alberto Esenaro, 4/7/13, “QUICK WHITE HOUSE RESPONSE COULD MEAN A FOOT IN THE DOOR IN MEXICO’S HYDROCARBONS SECTOR”, http://mexicanlawblog.com/quick-white-house-response-could-mean-a-foot-in-the-door-in-mexicos-hydrocarbons-sector/)//VP

In April of 2012, then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made an agreement with former president Felipe Calderón allowing joint oil exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, which would give the U.S. access to Mexico’s well-known oil riches. Interestingly, while the deal was approved with lightning speed in the Mexican Senate (where opposition to privatization is quite strong), the current Obama administration in the United States has delayed finalizing the off-shore drilling deal. According to Republican lawmakers and industry experts, a quick response is essential and foot-dragging could have disastrous consequences for Americans interested in accessing Mexican oil. The reason why consequences could be disastrous according to industry experts is that Mexico could very easily change its mind and call off the deal: public opinion on any foreign investment in the country’s hydrocarbons sector generally tends to be negative and politicians could very well submit to the will of the populace. Rep. Jeff Duncan (R-S.C.) spoke to The Hill recently after a House Foreign Relations committee hearing. Speaking about energy deals with Mexico, he said: “It’s time for the administration to act. All they have to do is send the enacting legislation over here and let us act on it, because we’re sitting on ‘go.’”

**It’s happening in the status quo –**

1) US companies already operating on transboundary hydrocarbon resources with Mexico

Simmons 4/30 (Daniel, Director of Regulatory and State Affairs at the Institute for Energy Research, BA in economics from Utah State University, J.D. from George Mason University School of Law, Master Resource: A free-market energy blog, April 30, 2013, “U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement: A Rare Victory for Oil and Gas in the Obama Era,” <http://www.masterresource.org/2013/04/u-s-mexico-transboundary-hydrocarbons-agreement/>)//VP

In an otherwise good agreement, one potential problem is a conflict between Article 20 of the agreement and the Security and Exchange Commission’s Rule 13q-1 regarding Resource Extraction Payments. Article 20 states: To the extent consistent with their national laws, the Parties shall maintain confidential, and obligate their Licensees to maintain confidential, all Confidential Data and other information obtained from the other Party or its Licensees in accordance with this Agreement. Together with Rule 13q-1, requiring “resource extraction issuers” to disclose payments made to foreign governments, Article 20 can create an impossible situation for American companies operating on transboundary hydrocarbon resources. For example, Mexican confidentiality requirements may forbid the disclosure of the very information that Rule 13q-1 requires American companies to disclose. This would lead to a situation where companies regulated by the SEC have, at very least, uncertainty about compliance with both Mexican and American disclosure laws. This uncertainty and potential disclosure conflict would place foreign state-owned oil companies, who are not regulated by the SEC, at a competitive advantage to the companies which operate in the United States are regulated by the SEC. Because much of the transboundary area is deepwater, it would require multi-billion dollar investments to produce the hydrocarbon resources. Any legal uncertainty brought about by disclosure law could easily dissuade American companies from undertaking what is already an expensive decision, in turn reducing opportunities for new jobs for Americans. Rule 13q-1 also creates a different type of competitive disadvantage for American companies operating in the Gulf of Mexico Transboundary area. The rule would allow foreign state-owned oil companies with a competitive advantage to consider business-sensitive information about American companies’ operations. If Mexico were to allow foreign-owned companies to extract oil along the deepwater transboundary area, there could very well be competition between U.S. private companies and foreign-state owned companies. Even though the deepwater technology was developed in the U.S. deepwater, the U.S. companies would be at a disadvantage. This is like playing poker but being required to show your cards to your fellow card-players.

**2) THA already signed**

**Wood, 12** - Professor, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México Senior Adviser, Mexico Institute, Renewable Energy Initiative (Duncan, “US-Mexico Cross Border Energy Cooperation: a new era in the Gulf of Mexico” March, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/March\_2012\_Transboundary\_Oil\_Agreement\_0.pdf)//VP

On the 20th of February, the governments of Mexico and the United States signed a Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement that resolves the question of what to do with potential oil reserves along the dividing line between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico. Two areas in particular have been disputed for a number of years: the Western and Eastern polygons, or "donut holes" as they are more colloquially known, comprise over 500 miles of the maritime border between the two countries and are thought to hold billions of barrels of crude oil (though nobody is sure quite how much, as comprehensive seismic scans have not been undertaken). The signing of the treaty is extremely good news as it marks the end of a decades-long process to try to determine oil rights in these two areas, opening the door to exploration and production that offers the prospect of exciting new modes of cooperation between Pemex and private oil companies. The question of what to do with the Gulf of Mexico's donut holes goes back to the 1970s. Following on from negotiations in the United Nations over the International Law of the Sea, the two countries came together to determine ownership of resources found in these two areas that were beyond their two hundred miles exclusion zones but entirely surrounded by them (thereby not qualifying as international waters). Early discussions over the areas broke down, but in the late 1990s the two countries agreed to a ten year moratorium on exploration and drilling in order to be able to negotiate a mutually agreeable settlement.