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# 1AC

## Plan

The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its economic engagement in its US-Mexico Land Ports of Entry on the US-Mexico border.

## 1AC Relations Adv.

First, despite the growing importance of US-Mexico relations, new BILATERAL initiatives are necessary to jump start improvements – improving the movement of people and goods is the key location for dialogue.

O’Neil 2013  
Shannon O'Neil is Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), “U.S. Exports Depend on Mexico ” Latin America’s Moment January 11 <http://blogs.cfr.org/oneil/2013/01/11/u-s-exports-depend-on-mexico/>

Hidden behind the troubling headlines, however, is another, more hopeful Mexico — one undergoing rapid and widespread social, political, and economic transformation. Yes, Mexico continues to struggle with grave security threats, but it is also fostering a globally competitive marketplace, a growing middle class, and an increasingly influential pro-democracy voter base. In addition, Mexico’s ties with the United States are changing. Common interests in energy, manufacturing, and security, as well as an overlapping community formed by millions of binational families, have made Mexico’s path forward increasingly important to its northern neighbor. For most of the past century, U.S.-Mexican relations were conducted at arm’s length. That began to change, however, in the 1980s and, even more, after the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) spurred greater bilateral economic engagement and cooperation. Mexico’s democratic transition has further eased the wariness of some skeptics in Washington. Still, the U.S.-Mexican relationship is far from perfect. New bilateral policies are required, especially to facilitate the movement of people and goods across the U.S.-Mexican border. More important, the United States needs to start seeing Mexico as a partner instead of a problem.

Infrastructure investment rebalances the relationship — overcomes alternate causalities.

Selee and Wilson 12 — Andrew Selee, Vice President for Programs and Senior Adviser for the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Adjunct Professor of Government at Johns Hopkins University and of International Affairs at George Washington University, former Visiting Professor at El Colegio de Mexico, holds a Ph.D. in Policy Studies from the University of Maryland, an M.A. in Latin American Studies from the University of California-San Diego, and a B.A. in Latin American Studies from Washington University in St. Louis, and Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, previously served as a Mexico Analyst for the U.S. Military and as a researcher at American University’s Center for North American Studies, holds an M.A. in International Affairs from American University, 2012 (“Getting ready for a new era in U.S.-Mexico ties,” *Global Public Square*—Fareed Zakaria’s CNN blog, December 3rd, Available Online at http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/12/03/Getting-Ready-for-a-New-Era-in-U-S-Mexico-Ties/, Accessed 07-26-2013)

U.S.-Mexico relations have been dominated for the past six years by efforts to address drug trafficking and organized crime-related violence. This was the right thing to do while violence spiked in Mexico, but with a new administration in office after the swearing in of President Enrique Peña Nieto over the weekend, the time has come to re-balance the bilateral relationship.¶ Ties tend to have the same top three items on the agenda year after year and administration after administration: immigration; drugs and violence; and trade and economic relations. Drugs and violence have dominated in recent years, and cooperation in addressing the transnational flows of drugs, arms and illicit money, as well as support for Mexico’s efforts to strengthen public security, must continue. Although the gains are still tenuous and the situation fluid, violence in Mexico does appear to have begun to decline at a national level and major advances have been made in key border cities such as Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez.¶ Immigration dominated the early 2000's as presidents Bush and Fox sought a bilateral deal on the topic, but it has since become clear that immigration reform is first and foremost a domestic political issue in the United States. The rate of unauthorized immigration from Mexico has now dropped to historically low levels – there are at least as many leaving as arriving – which should allow for a more rational and reasoned debate on this issue in the United States.¶ However, not since the negotiation and implementation of NAFTA in the 1990s have economic relations topped the bilateral agenda. Trade and jobs should once again top the U.S. agenda with Mexico for three main reasons.¶ First, the economy most likely will be the top issue in both the United States and Mexico for the next several years. Economic issues were clearly the top issue for voters in the recent U.S. presidential elections, and in Mexico they matched public security as the top set of concerns.¶ Second, by focusing on the creation of jobs and improving the competitiveness of manufacturers on both sides of the border, we can improve the tone of the relationship. We may even find that the stickier issues of security and migration become a little less intractable.¶ Finally, the economic agenda between the two countries has the potential to yield tangible results, creating jobs and improving the competitive position of North America vis-a-vis Asia. For years, Mexico has oriented its economy toward the U.S. in hopes of harnessing the growth of the world’s most dynamic economy. Now, at a time when Mexico is growing around four percent a year – faster than the United States – Mexico can return the favor and provide a boost to the U.S. economy. Meanwhile, Mexico’s large and growing middle class has become an increasingly important market for U.S. products.¶ As it turns out, U.S. and Mexican companies do not simply sell products to one another, they build products together, with parts zigzagging back and forth across the border as goods are manufactured. As a result, a product imported from Mexico is, on average, made of 40 percent U.S. parts and materials, meaning forty cents of every dollar spent of Mexican imports stays right here in the United States. Chinese products, in contrast, contain just four percent U.S. content.¶ This also means the competitiveness of our two countries is closely linked, and improvements in productivity in one nation make a co-manufactured product cheaper and more competitive on the global market. That is to say, growth in Mexico or the United States will boost exports from both countries: when it comes to manufacturing, we are in it together.¶ To produce results, the U.S.-Mexico economic agenda needs substance, and there is plenty to do. To start out, we must make the southwest border more efficient without sacrificing security. Today, long and unpredictable wait times act as a type of border tax, cutting away at manufacturers’ competitiveness a bit more each time they send goods across the border.¶ Since we manufacture and export together, the United States should also join forces with Mexico and Canada in designing and implementing a global trade strategy. The first step is robust cooperation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, but the end goal must be to expand the agreement until countries like China and India feel they will lose out if they do not join in.¶ The countries could also tackle ways of making customs procedures more efficient, ensuring regulatory frameworks are compatible, and integrating our transportation and logistics networks to keep up with regional manufacturers, who have already integrated production.¶ In the end, it is a matter of perspective. If Mexico is seen more as a business partner than a source of intractable problems, a whole range of policy options that were previously considered too risky to be tried will be within reach. If such a change in perception occurs, the results will speak for themselves.

Successful cooperation on border crossing for goods spills over into other areas of relations – it’s the best opportunity to improve relations.

Bonner & Rozental 2009   
Robert C. Bonner Former Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Former Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Andrés Rozental Former Deputy Foreign Minister of Mexico; Former President and Founder Mexican Council on Foreign Relations (COMEXI) “Managing the United States-Mexico Border: Cooperative Solutions to Common Challenges “ Report of the Binational Task Force on the United States-Mexico Border http://www.pacificcouncil.org/document.doc?id=30

The 1,952-mile land boundary between the United States and Mexico is the place where the most contentious and difficult issues in the bilateral relationship play out – from undocumented migration and contraband trafficking to the allocation of water in a thirsty region. Nevertheless, the border region remains poorly understood – both by policymakers in distant federal capitals and by the public at large. Most people who do not live along the border or cross it frequently are unaware of the challenges of border management or of the ways in which Mexico and the United States are attempting to meet those challenges. Changes on the ground – and local responses to them – frequently outpace both national policies and public perceptions. The conjunction of a technologically advanced, capital-rich society and a modernizing, labor-exporting country creates the potential for both synergy and strife. The challenge confronting Mexico and the United States is to mitigate the conflicts that inevitably arise from this dichotomy while seizing all potential opportunities the differences generate. We envision a system of border management that moves people and goods between the United States and Mexico far more quickly and efficiently than the present arrangement but that also enhances the security of both nations. This new system would facilitate trade, encourage the emergence of regional economic clusters, promote wise stewardship of shared natural resources, and enhance efforts to preserve ecosystems that cross the national boundary. Perhaps most importantly, it would invite communities that dot and span the frontier to exploit opportunities for mutual benefit. Ultimately, the border should be as “thin” and transparent as technologically and politically possible for those engaged in legitimate travel or commerce but difficult to penetrate for those engaged in criminal activity or unauthorized transit. Management of this shared boundary should serve as a model for binational collaboration in confronting shared challenges.

**Threat of terrorism is real**

CNS News ‘12

‘Terrorists Enter U.S. from Mexico ‘From Time to Time’. “http://cnsnews.com/news/article/napolitano-terrorists-enter-us-mexico-time-time#sthash.ToT2xw4C.dpuf. Edwin Mora. EJW.

(CNSNews.com) -- Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano told Congress last week that terrorists intending to harm the American people enter the U.S. from Mexico “from time to time."¶ a July 25 hearing of the House Homeland Security Committee, Rep. Ron Barber (D-Ariz.) asked Napolitano: “As you know, Madam Secretary, there have been anecdotal reports about material evidence of the presence of terrorists along our southern border. My question is, is there any credible evidence that these reports are accurate and that terrorists are, in fact, crossing our southern border with the intent to do harm to the American people?”¶ Napolitano answered: “With respect, there have been--and the Ababziar matter would be one I would refer to that's currently being adjudicated in the criminal courts--from time to time, and we are constantly working against different and evolving threats involving various terrorist groups and various ways they may seek to enter the country.”¶ “What I can tell you, however, is that that southern border--the U.S.-Mexico border--is heavily, heavily staffed at record amounts of manpower, materiel, infrastructure and the like, and we are constantly making sure we're doing all we can to make that border as safe as possible,” she said.¶ An August 2009 audit by the Government Accountability Office that focused on Customs and Border Protection (CBP) checkpoints said that in fiscal 2008 CBP reported “there were three individuals encountered by the Border Patrol at southwest border checkpoints who were identified as persons linked to terrorism.”¶ In April 2010, CNSNews.com reported that FBI Director Robert Mueller told the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, “In Detroit, Mahmoud Youssef Kourani was indicted in the Eastern District of Michigan on one count of conspiracy to provide material support to Hezbollah. … Kourani was already in custody for entering the country illegally through Mexico and was involved in fundraising activities on behalf of Hezbollah.”¶ Five years ago, in an August 2007 interview with the El Paso Times, then-Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell echoed what Napolitano told Congress last week about terrorist coming into the U.S. across the Mexican border.¶ “So, are terrorists coming across the Southwest border?” McConnell said in that interview. “Not in great numbers.”¶ “There are some cases?” asked the El Paso Times.¶ “There are some. And would they use it as a path, given it was available to them? In time they will,” said McConnell.¶ “If they're successful at it, then they'll probably repeat it,” asked the reporter.¶ “Sure,” said McConnell. “There were a significant number of Iraqis who came across last year. Smuggled across illegally.”¶ “Where was that?” asked the reporter.¶ “Across the Southwest border,” said McConnell.

**Border infrastructure is the vial internal link to US-Mexican Relations**

CSIS, 04 - Bipartisan domestic and foreign policy think tank, conducting policy studies and strategic analyses on political, economic and security issues (Center for Strategic and International Studies, “U.S.-Mexico Border Security and the Evolving Security Relationship,” U.S.-Mexico Binational Council, 4/15/04, http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/0404\_bordersecurity.pdf)//AR

The flow of people and goods is already enormous and, barring unforeseeable calamities that could provoke major and continuing disruptions along the border, it will steadily grow as both economies expand and integrate. Given the enormous number of people and volumes of goods that legally—and illegally—cross the border in this age of international terrorism against innocent civilian targets, the multifarious dimensions of cross-border security have been elevated to an unprecedented level of importance in the United States.

There can be no doubt that the future of Mexico-U.S. relations will for the indefinite future be shaped to a large degree by how the two countries work together to manage, selectively inspect, and regulate cross-border traffic. One objective, which will perhaps be of equal importance in both countries, is that no attack on the United States be perpetrated from terrorist bases in Mexico or that no terrorists easily cross the border on their way to attacking U.S. targets. In the United States, it is highly unlikely that there will be any significant partisan political disagreements about these and related imperatives of border security. In short, this bilateral relationship is among the most strategically important the United States has anywhere in the world. The long, porous border and the practical impossibility of ever establishing mechanisms that could reliably monitor all of the human and material traffic across the border create a harrowing dilemma for U.S. officials in Congress and the executive branch. Perhaps the only certainty in this context is that greater and greater border and security cooperation will be called for.

Border is a key area for counter-terrorism – here are 7518 reasons

Murdock 4/25, Deroy Murdock, Media Fellow of The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, nationally syndicated columnist with the Scripps Howard News Service, 4/25/13, (“The Southern Border: Our Welcome Mat for Terrorists”, [http://www.nationalreview.com/article/346591/southern-border-our-welcome-mat-terrorists](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/346591/southern-border-our-welcome-mat-terrorists" \t "_blank), AW)

**There are** at least **7,518 reasons** **to** **get** the U.S./Mexican **border under control.** That equals the number of aliens apprehended in fiscal year 2011 from the four nations the U.S. government labels “state sponsers of terrorism” and ten additional “countries of interest.” Since January 2010, those flying into America via these 14 nations face enhanced screening; as the Transportation Security Administration announced, “Effective aviation security must begin beyond our borders.” U.S. national security merits at least that much vigilance on our borders.¶ The roaring immigration-reform debate this year largely addresses Hispanic aliens who illegally cross the border. Far more worrisome, however, are the thousands who break into America from countries “where we have concerns, particularly about al-Qaeda affiliates,” a top State Department official told CNN.¶ These include Cubans, Iranians, Sudanese, and Syrians whose governments are federally designated “state sponsors of terrorism.” As indicated by the latest information in Table 34 of Customs and Border Protection’s Immigration Yearbook 2011, 198 Sudanese were nabbed while penetrating the USA. Between FY 2002 and 2011, there were 1,207 such arrests. (These figures cover all U.S. borders, although, as Table 35 confirms, 96.3 percent of the overall detainee population intruded from Mexico.) Like other immigrants, most Sudanese seek better lives here. But some may be vectors for the same militant Islam that literally tore Sudan in two.¶ In FY 2011, 108 Syrians were stopped at our borders; over ten years, the number is 1,353. Syria is a key supporter of Hezbollah, and Bashar Assad’s unstable regime reportedly has attacked its domestic opponents with chemical weapons.¶ As for Iranians, 276 were caught in FY 2011, while 2,310 were captured over the previous ten years. Iran also backs Hezbollah, hates “the Great Satan,” and craves atomic weapons.¶ The other ten “countries of interest” are Algeria, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Yemen, and:¶ **Afghanistan**: The Taliban’s stronghold and current theater of America’s longest war. Afghans halted in FY 2011: 106. Prior ten fiscal years: 681.¶ **Nigeria**: The land of underwear bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab suffers under sharia law in its northern provinces. Respective data: 591, 4,525.¶**Pakistan**: Hideaway of the Pakistani Taliban and the late Osama bin Laden. 525, 10,682.¶ **Saudi Arabia**: Generous benefactor of radical imams and militant mosques worldwide; birthplace of 15 of the 19 September 11 hijackers. 123, 986. **Somalia:** Home of Indian Ocean pirates and al-Qaeda’s al-Shabaab franchise. In October 1993, Islamic terrorists there shot down two Black Hawk helicopters, killed 18 U.S. soldiers, and dragged several of their bodies through Mogadishu’s streets. 323, 1,524.¶ At a Capitol Hill hearing last July, Homeland Security secretary Janet Napolitano conceded that terrorists enter the U.S. via the U.S./Mexican border “from time to time.”¶ The House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Oversight last November published A Line in the Sand: Countering Crime, Violence, and Terror at the Southwest Border. As this study explained:¶ The Congressional Research Service reports that between September 2001 and September 2012, there have been 59 homegrown violent jihadist plots within the United States. Of growing concern and potentially a more violent threat to American citizens is **the** **enhanced** **ability** **of** Middle East terrorist organizations, aided by their relationships and growing presence in the Western Hemisphere, to exploit the Southwest border to enter the United States undetected.¶ A Line in the Sand offers chilling portraits of some who treat the southern border as America’s welcome mat.¶ • On January 11, 2011, U.S. agents discovered Said Jaziri in a car trunk trying to enter near San Diego. Saidsaid that he had traveled from his native Tunisia to Tijuana and paid smugglers $5,000 to sneak him across the border. The French government previously convicted and deported Jaziri for assaulting a Muslim whom he considered insufficiently devout. In 2006, Jaziri advocated killing Danish cartoonist Kurt Westergaard for creating what Jaziri called sacrilegious drawings of the Prophet Mohammed.¶ • Somalia’s Ahmed Muhammed Dhakane told authorities in 2011 that he earned up to $75,000 per day **smuggling** East Africans into America. His clients included three al-Shabaab terrorists. As the House report states: “Dhakane cautioned that each of these individuals is ready to die for their cause and would fight against the United States if the jihad moved from overseas to the U.S. mainland.”¶ • On June 4, 2010, Anthony Joseph Tracy (a.k.a. Yusuf Noor) was convicted of conspiring to slip aliens into America. Tracy told federal investigators that Cuban diplomats used his travel agency in Kenya — Noor Services Ltd. — to transfer 272 Somalis to Havana. They proceeded to Belize, through Mexico, and then trespassed into the U.S. Tracy, who converted to Islam in prison in the 1990s, claims he refused to assist al-Shabaab. But officials discovered an e-mail in which he casually wrote: “i helped a lot of Somalis and most are good but there are some who are bad and i leave them to ALLAH . . . ”¶ And remember: These anecdotes and statistics involve individuals whom authorities intercepted. No details exist about aliens from these countries who successfully have infiltrated America.

**High risk – no tech barriers**

Kenneth C. **Brill 12**, is a former U.S. ambassador to the I.A.E.A. Kenneth N. Luongo is president of the Partnership for Global Security. Both are members of the Fissile Material Working Group, a nonpartisan nongovernmental organization. Nuclear Terrorism: A Clear Danger, [www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/nuclear-terrorism-a-clear-danger.html?\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/nuclear-terrorism-a-clear-danger.html?_r=0" \t "_blank)

Terrorists exploit **gaps in security**. The   current global regime for protecting the nuclear materials that terrorists desire for their ultimate weapon is far from seamless. It is based  largely on **unaccountable**, voluntary arrangements that are **inconsistent**across borders. Its **weak links make it dangerous and inadequate to prevent nuclear terrorism.**¶ Later this month in Seoul, the more than 50 world leaders who will gather for the second Nuclear Security Summit need to seize the opportunity to start developing an accountable regime to prevent nuclear terrorism.¶ There is **consensus** among international leaders that **the threat** of nuclear terrorism **is real**, not a Hollywood confection. President Obama, the leaders of 46 other nations, the heads of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the UnitedNations, and numerous experts have called nuclear terrorism one of the most serious threats to global security and stability. It is also **preventable with more aggressive action**.¶ At least four **terrorist groups**, including Al Qaeda, have demonstrated **interest** in using a nuclear device. These groups operate in or near states with histories of questionable nuclear security practices. Terrorists do not need to steal a nuclear weapon. **It is** quite **possible** quite to make an improvised nuclear device from  highly enriched uranium or plutonium being used for civilian purposes. And there is a black market uranium in such material. There have been 18 confirmed thefts or loss of weapons-usable nuclear material. In 2011, the Moldovan police broke up part of a smuggling ring attempting to sell highly enriched uranium; one member is thought to remain at large with a kilogram of this material.

LPOE protection prevents infiltration – it’s a hotspot of cooperation

Mariclaire Acosta et al 12 – Project Director, Freedom House – Mexico Bill Bratton Chairman, Kroll Advisory Solutions, former Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department and former New York City Police Commissioner Geoffrey Cowan President, The Annenberg Foundation Trust at Sunnylands John Engler President, Business Roundtable, former Governor of Michigan Rafael Fernández de Castro Chair, Department of International Studies, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, former Foreign Policy Advisor to President Calderón Michael Govan CEO and Wallis Annenberg Director, Los Angeles County Museum of Art Jane Harman Director, President, and CEO, Wilson Center, former Member of Congress Carlos Heredia Director of International Studies, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, CIDE, former Member of Congress Phil Heymann James Barr Ames Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, former Deputy Attorney General Barry Jackson Chief of Staff to the Speaker of the House John Boehner Enrique Krauze Historian and Essayist, Founder and Editor-in-Chief of Letras Libres Isaac Lee President, News, Univision Communications Inc. Emilio Lozoya Chairman, JFH Lozoya Investments Mel Martinez Chairman, Florida, Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean for JPMorgan Chase & Co., Chairman, JPMorgan Chase Foundation Doris Meissner Senior Fellow, Migration Policy Institute, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, (“Policy Recommendations for U.S.-Mexico Relations”, [http://sunnylands.org/files/posts/159/stronger\_f.pdf](http://sunnylands.org/files/posts/159/stronger_f.pdf" \t "_blank), AW)

At the same time, the United States faces a major ¶ challenge in ensuring the safety of its citizens ¶ against terrorist attacks, and it depends significantly ¶ on intelligence sharing and law enforcement ¶ cooperation from its two neighbors, Mexico and ¶ Canada. Indeed, this cooperation has been one of ¶ the untold stories of engagement between U.S. and ¶ Mexican federal agencies over the past decade, ¶ with the result that the U.S.-Mexico border has ¶ not yet been used for terrorist activities. However, ¶ continued vigilance and more sophisticated forms ¶ of cooperation will be needed to avoid the evolving ¶ threats from terrorist organizations.

Indeed, one of the greatest opportunities for **bi-national cooperation on security**, which would help **address** both Mexican concerns about transnational organized crime and U.S. concerns about **terrorism**, would be **to** **develop** more **sophisticated approaches to** managing **ports of entry at the border**. By using risk management techniques and the latest technology, the two countries could develop more effective ways of detecting potential threats, ranging from drugs to firearms to bombs, and simultaneously facilitate commerce and the exchange of people across the border. While much attention has been focused on beefing up security between ports of entry, the reality is that most of **the real threats** to the two countries **are at the ports of entry** rather than between them. A **new focus on** these **could be a win-win for both countries** and for both security and trade. For the United States, Mexico is a key partner in ¶ international affairs. **Mexico works hard to protect ¶ the U**nited **S**tates **from terrorist threats** and to ¶ weaken transnational organized crime groups. It ¶ is a middle income country, currently holds the ¶ presidency of the G-20, and is expected to grow ¶ steadily for many years to come. Jim O’Neil of ¶ Goldman Sachs, for example, expects Mexico to have ¶ the seventh largest economy in the world by 2020. ¶ Mexico has long served as a bridge between the ¶ developed and developing worlds, and the U.S. can ¶ take advantage of this fact by working closely with ¶ Mexico on issues of common interest

Nuclear terrorism causes extinction –escalates to Russia and China

Ayson 10 – Robert Ayson 10, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible thatsome sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where **an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war**. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors**.** Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhapsIran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan**.** But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political **leaders** not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism(as discussed earlier)Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.

## 1AC Trade Adv.

U.S.-Mexico trade is set to expand, but border congestion makes the relationship unsustainable — the plan boosts U.S. manufacturing and overall competitiveness.

Wilson and Lee 11 — Christopher E. Wilson, is an Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. He develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs. He is the author of Working Together: Economic Ties between the United States and Mexico (Wilson Center, 2011) and has coauthored op-ed columns for the Wall Street Journal and Dallas Morning News. Chris previously served as a Mexico Analyst for the U.S. Military and as a researcher for Dr. Robert Pastor at American University’s Center for North American Studies. In Mexico, he worked with the international trade consultancy IQOM, Inteligencia Comercial, and with American students studying regional political and social issues. Before joining the Wilson Center as Associate, Chris worked as a consultant with the Mexico Institute on U.S.-Mexico economic relations. He completed his M.A. in International Affairs at American University, focusing on U.S. foreign policy and U.S.-Mexico relations, and Erik Lee, serves as Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University. He is responsible for a legislative research, policy advising and coordination with numerous partners in the United States, Mexico and Canada on various collaborative initiatives related to trade, security and sustainability. He is the co-author of “Realizing the Full Value of our Crossborder Trade with Mexico” and “Realizing the Value of Tourism from Mexico to the United States” (2012). He serves on the international advisory board for the journal Latin American Policy. Mr. Lee was previously program officer for the Merage Foundation for the American Dream, assistant director at the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego and assistant managing director at the Southwest Consortium for Environmental Research and Policy at San Diego State University. He has consulted for philanthropic and educational organizations and has also served as a resource for a large number of local, national and international media outlets. Before completing his master's degree in Latin American Studies at UCSD in 2000, Mr. Lee worked as a university administrator and instructor in Hermosillo, Sonora. The two are coauthors of the trade and competitiveness chapter in the forthcoming "State of the Border Report," (Christopher E. Wilson, Erik Lee, Site Selection, July 2012, “Whole Nations Waiting,” <http://www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/jul/us-mex-border.cfm>, Accessed 09-09-2013)

Commerce between the United States and Mexico is one of the great — yet underappreciated — success stories of the global economy. In 2011 U.S.-Mexico goods and services trade reached the major milestone of one-half trillion dollars with virtually no recognition. The United States is Mexico's top trading partner, and Mexico — which has gained macroeconomic stability and expanded its middle class over the last two decades — is the United States' second largest export market and third largest trading partner.¶ Seventy percent of bilateral commerce crosses the border via trucks, meaning the border region is literally where "the rubber hits the road" for bilateral relations. This also means that not only California and Baja California, but also Michigan and Michoacán, all have a major stake in efficient and secure border management.¶ The quantity of U.S.-Mexico trade is impressive, but its quality makes it unique. The United States and Mexico do not just sell goods to one another, they actually work together to manufacture them. Through production sharing, materials and parts often cross back and forth between factories on each side of the border as a final product is made and assembled. As a result, U.S. imports from Mexico contain, on average, 40 percent U.S. content, and Mexico's imports from the U.S. also have a high level of Mexican content.¶ This system of joint production has two important consequences. First, it means that our economies are profoundly linked. We tend to experience growth and recession together, and productivity gains or losses on one side of the border generally cause a corresponding gain or loss in competitiveness on the other side as well. Second, the fact that goods often cross the border several times as they are being produced creates a multiplier effect for gains and losses in border efficiency. Whereas goods from China only go through customs and inspection once as they enter the U.S. or Mexico, products built by regional manufacturers bear the costs of long and unpredictable border wait times and significant customs requirements each time they cross the U.S.-Mexico border.¶ Corridors in Crisis¶ This trade relationship requires major infrastructure to function effectively. The largest trade corridor, often referred to as the NASCO corridor, links central and eastern Mexico to Texas, the American Midwest, Northeast, and Ontario, utilizing the key Laredo-Nuevo Laredo ports of entry (POEs). Other important trade arteries include the CANAMEX Corridor, which connects western Mexico to the intermountain United States and Canadian province of Alberta, as well as the shorter but high-volume I-5 corridor connecting California to Baja California. As the economies of both the U.S. and Mexico grow, it is likely that this network of freight transportation infrastructure — and the land POEs that serve as nodes in this network — will experience added stress.¶ Unfortunately, the infrastructure and capacity of the ports of entry to process goods and individuals entering the United States has not kept pace with the expansion of bilateral trade or the population growth of the border region. Instead, the need for greater border security following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 led to a thickening of the border, dividing the twin cities that characterize the region and adding costly, long and unpredictable wait times for commercial and personal crossers alike. Congestion acts as a drag on the competitiveness of the region and of the United States and Mexico in their entirety. Solutions are needed that strengthen both border security and efficiency at the same time.¶ The integrated nature of the North American manufacturing sector makes eliminating border congestion an important way to enhance regional competitiveness. The global economic crisis forced manufacturers to look for ways to cut costs. After taking into consideration factors such as rising fuel costs, increasing wages in China and the ability to automate an ever greater portion of the production process, many American companies decided to nearshore factories to Mexico or reshore them to the United States, taking advantage of strong human capital and shorter supply chains. Bilateral trade dropped significantly during the recession but has since rebounded strongly, growing significantly faster than trade with China.¶ But the growth of trade continues to add pressure on the already strained POEs and transportation corridors. Several studies have attempted to quantify the costs of border area congestion to the economies of the United States and Mexico. In what is perhaps a testimony to the fragmented and geographically disperse nature of the border region, most of these studies have focused on particular North-South corridors of traffic and trade rather than taking a comprehensive, border-wide approach. The specific results of the studies (see table on p. 108) are quite varied. Nonetheless, one message comes through quite clearly — long and unpredictable wait times at the POEs are costing the United States and Mexican economies many billions of dollars each year.¶ Moderate investments to update infrastructure and to fully staff the ports of entry are certainly needed, as long lines and overworked staff promote neither efficiency nor security. But in a time of tight federal budgets, asking for more resources cannot be the only answer. Strategic efforts that do more with less, improving efficiency and reducing congestion, are also needed. Trusted traveler and shipper programs (i.e. the Global Entry programs, which includes programs such as SENTRI, FAST, C-TPAT) allow vetted, low-risk individuals and shipments expedited passage across the border.¶ Common Voice¶ Improving these programs and significantly expanding enrollment could increase throughput with minimal investments in infrastructure and staffing — all while strengthening security by giving border officials more time to focus on unknown and potentially dangerous individuals and shipments. The development of the 21st Century Border initiative by the Obama and Calderón administrations has yielded some advances in this direction, but the efforts need to be redoubled.¶ The 1990s were the decade of NAFTA and skyrocketing trade. The 2000s saw security concerns grow and recession struck. The new decade has only just begun, but the potential is there for a resurgence of competitiveness and regional integration. There are strong ideas — including trusted traveler and shipper programs, preclearance, customs harmonization, and public-private partnerships — that have enormous potential.

Infrastructure investment facilitates trade

Rozental et al 10 (Andrés Rozental,¶ Former Deputy Foreign Minister of ¶ Mexico; Former President and Founder ¶ Mexican Council on Foreign Relations ¶ (COMEXI), Robert C. Bonner, Former Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection; Former Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Chappell Lawson, Associate Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Adjunct Fellow, Pacific Council on International Policy , “Managing the United States-Mexico Border: ¶ Cooperative Solutions to Common Challenges,” 2010 http://www.pacificcouncil.org/document.doc?id=30, RLA)

Congestion at crossing points imposes considerable costs on tourists, commuters, ¶ consumers, business owners, and border communities; the financial price alone of ¶ delays at the border reaches billions of dollars per year. In some areas along the ¶ border, including the San Diego-Tijuana corridor, expediting cross-border commerce is ¶ the single most important measure that the governments could take to promote ¶ economic development. ¶ Although facilitation is often viewed as the flip side of security, there are ways to ¶ simultaneously expedite trade and improve security. For instance, new detection ¶ technologies and intelligent risk management strategies enhance public safety while ¶ facilitating cross-border travel and commerce. ¶ One crucial barrier to trade facilitation is the deficit in border infrastructure, which ¶ simply has not kept pace with massive increases in trade and transit since ratification of ¶ the NorthAmericanFreeTradeAgreement**.** Federal spending on ports of entry would ¶ have a very high rate of return; for this reason, both countries should make a long-term ¶ commitment to fund border infrastructure and (in the short run) disproportionately ¶ direct stimulus money toward the ports of entry. ¶ Even with additional stimulus spending, however, federal funding will remain insufficient ¶ to address the infrastructure deficit; both countries must find other sources of financing ¶ for border crossing points and the roads that feed into them. This money can come in ¶ part from the private sector, with the market rather than the state determining the ¶ magnitude of private investment in border infrastructure. ¶ Beyond infrastructure, better exploitation of technology, refined risk-based ¶ segmentation of traffic, and operational changes at the ports of entry (including ¶ staffing) can all reduce transit time. Because the marginal cost of operating an existing ¶ port of entry is extremely low compared to both the cost of building a new port of entry ¶ and the marginal benefit of more rapid transit, inadequate staffing of the ports of entry ¶ should never become a bottleneck. ¶ So far neither government has articulated a goal for wait times. The Task Force believes ¶ that average wait times at the border should not exceed 20 minutes in either direction, ¶ at any port of entry, with minimal variation about this average.

Cross-border trade catalyzes biotech innovation — that spreads globally and establishes an international model

SDD 7 — San Diego Dialogue, a division of University of California San Diego Extension, contributing to the advancement of research, relationships and solutions to the San Diego-Baja California crossborder region's long-term challenges in innovation, economy, health and education. As a part of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), Division of Extended Studies and Public Programs, the Dialogue is an entirely self-funded public policy organization (San Diego Dialogue, *Crossborder Group Inc.*, June 2007, “Borderless Biotech & Mexico’s Emerging Life Sciences Industry”, <http://www.sandiegodialogue.org/pdfs/Borderless_Biotech.pdf>, Accessed 07-26-2013 | AK)

This document is yet another part of a continuing effort to describe Mexico’s evolution in technology and science. Clearly, certain intriguing crossborder opportunities appear to exist in the case of life sciences – whether in ag-biotech, biocontrols, genomics research, pharmaceutical manufacturing, medical devices, or clinical trials. While all of Mexico cannot expect to immediately become a world-leader in all areas of this sector, its history already shows examples of regional genius and connections with California’s biotech and pharmaceutical industries. The question remains: can this history be expanded upon - and will it include San Diego? Given that San Diego has the largest concentration of US-based biotechnology firms along the US-Mexico border and one of the largest in the United States, there is a strong case and a unique opportunity to work with the dynamic regions that make up Mexico’s emerging life sciences industry. Direct flights from both San Diego’s or Tijuana’s airports to these regions provides access that few other locations in the United States can take advantage of. The broad use of English by many of Mexico’s technology leaders eliminates yet another barrier to increased interaction, scientific collaboration, and possibly investment. Such an opportunity, first discussed in Borderless Innovation, can help act as a catalyst for both increasing multi-regional competitiveness in life science companies, as well as accelerate Mexico’s growth in this sector. Just as the strength of a helix is based on the connections between its components, so too the potential for San Diego to become both a portal and a partner for Mexico's emerging life sciences regions creates opportunities for each side of the crossborder region. Joining together the talent and capabilities of San Diego, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Morelos, Nuevo León, and Baja California in the development of a life sciences partnership may create a unique, international model that goes beyond borders. Ultimately, such a partnership might also extend to many other regions – in the US, Mexico, Canada, Europe and Asia – supporting new job growth, new discoveries, and a world of borderless biotech.

Biotech solves food shortages that are coming from climate change

Doyle ’08

(Alister Doyle is Reuter’s Environmental Correspondent. “Biotechnology seen as a key to solving food crisis.” *Reuters.* <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/06/03/us-food-summit-biotech-idUSL0356693120080603>. June 3rd, 2008. EJW.)

(Reuters) - Biotechnology can help solve the world's food crisis with benefits such as flood-resistant rice in Bangladesh or higher cotton yields in Burkina Faso, a senior U.S. official said at a U.N. food summit on Tuesday.¶ "Biotechnology is one of the most promising tools for improving the productivity of agriculture and increasing the incomes of the rural poor," U.S. Agriculture Secretary Ed Schafer said.¶ "We are convinced of the benefits it offers to developing countries and small farmers," he told a U.S.-led briefing on the sidelines of the June 3-5 summit seeking ways to combat high food prices when climate change may aggravate shortages.¶ Some green groups say genetically-engineered crops threaten biodiversity while many European consumers are wary of eating products dubbed by critics as "Frankenfoods".¶ Schafer said biotechnology, including genetically-modified organisms (GMOs), could help produce more food by raising yields and producing crops in developing nations that are resistant to disease and pests.¶ "Genetic engineering offers long-term solutions to some of our major crop production problems," said Philippine Agriculture Minister Arthur Yap. But he said that it was not a panacea for all of his country's agricultural problems.¶ Progress being made in the Philippines included research into rice and coconuts resistant to disease, he said.¶ "We're also working on virus-resistant papaya, papaya hybrids with a longer shelf life that should be ready for market in 2009," he said.¶ Climate change could aggravate production around the world with more droughts, floods, disruptions to monsoons and rising sea levels, says the U.N. Climate Panel. In Africa alone, 250 million people could face extra stress on water supplies by 2020.¶ COTTON¶ Burkina Faso Agriculture Minister Laurent Sedogo said the African country had worked with U.S. agriculture group Monsanto to battle pests that blighted the cotton crop.¶ "We are about to plant 15,000 hectares" of a new crop that was resistant to pests, he said. That would also cut down on the use of pesticides that could damage the health of farmers.¶ The World Bank and aid agencies estimate that soaring food prices could push as many as 100 million more people into hunger. About 850 million are already hungry.¶ Bangladesh said that it was going ahead with efforts to make crops able to survive floods and more salinity in the soil.¶ A cyclone last year "is a wake-up call for all of us", said C.S. Karim, an adviser to Bangladesh's agriculture ministry. "It shows the vulnerability of Bangladesh. "

World War III results as countries use weapons to fight for food

Calvin 1998 (William H.; Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences – University of Washington) January "The Great Climate Flip-Flop" Atlantic Monthly 281:1 EBSCO

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands – if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem – and could lead to a Third World War – but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.

Trade solves all the incentives for war

Griswold 11 Daniel Griswold is director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute and author of Mad about Trade: Why Main Street America Should Embrace Globalization. “Free Trade and the Global Middle Class,” Hayek Society Journal Vol. 9. http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/Hayek-Society-Journal-Griswold.pdf

Our more globalized world has also yielded a “peace dividend.” It may not be obvious when our daily news cycles are dominated by horrific images from the Gaza Strip, Afghanistan and Libya, but our more globalized world has somehow become a more peaceful world. The number of civil and international wars has dropped sharply in the past 15 years, along with battle deaths. The reasons behind the retreat of war are complex, but again the spread of trade and globalization have played a key role. Trade has been seen as a friend of peace for centuries. In the 19th century, British statesman Richard Cobden pursued free trade as a way not only to bring more affordable bread to English workers but also to promote peace with Britain’s neighbors. He negotiated the Cobden-Chevalier free trade agreement with France in 1860 that helped to cement an enduring alliance between two countries that had been bitter enemies for centuries. In the 20th century, President Franklin Roosevelt’s secretary of state, Cordell Hull, championed Iower trade barriers as a way to promote peaceful commerce and reduce international tensions. Hull had witnessed first-hand the economic nationalism and retribution after World War I. Hull believed that “unhampered trade dovetail[s] with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers and unfair economic competition, with war. Hull was awarded the 1945 Nobel Prize for Peace, in part because of his work to promote global trade. Free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend towards democracy, and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by raising the cost of war. As national economies have become more intertwined, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means the loss of human lives and tax dollars, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. Trade and economic integration has helped to keep the peace in Europe for more than 60 years. More recently, deepening economic ties between Mainland China and Taiwan are drawing those two governments closer together and helping to keep the peace. Leaders on both sides of the Taiwan Straight seem to understand that reckless nationalism would jeopardize the dramatic economic progress that region has enjoyed. A third reason why free trade promotes peace is because it has reduced the spoils of war. Trade allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Such assets cannot be easily seized by armies. In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming relatively less important in high-tech, service economies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by freely trading what they can produce best at home. The world today is harvesting the peaceful fruit of expanding trade. The first half of 20th century was marred by two devastating wars among great powers of Europe. In the ashes of World War II, the United States helped found the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, the precursor to the WTO that helped to spur trade between the United States and its major trading partners. As a condition to Marshall Plan aid, the U.S. government also insisted that the continental European powers, France, Germany, and Italy, eliminate trade barriers between themselves in what was to become the European Common Market. One purpose of the common market was to spur economic development, of course, but just as importantly, it was meant to tie the Europeans together economically. With six decades of hindsight, the plan must be considered a spectacular success. The notion of another major war between France, Germany and other Western European powers is unimaginable. Compared to past eras, our time is one of relative world peace. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has dropped sharply in the past two decades. Virtually all the conflicts today are civil and guerilla wars. The spectacle of two governments sending armies off to fight in the battlefield has become rare. In the decade from 1998 through 2007, only three actual wars were fought between states: Erithrea-Ethiopia in 1998-2000, India-Pakistan in 1998-2003, and the United States-Iraq in 2003. From 2004 through 2007, no two nations were at war with one another. Civil wars have ended or at least ebbed in Aceh (in Indonesia), Angola, Burundi, Congo, Liberia, Nepal, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone. Coming to the same conclusion is the Human Security Centre at the University of British Colombia in Canada. In a 2005 report, it documented a sharp decline in the number of armed conflicts, genocides and refuge numbers in the past 20 years. The average number of deaths per conflict has fallen from 38,000 in 1950 to 600 in 2002. Most armed conflicts in the world now take place in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the only form of political violence that has worsened in recent years in international terrorism. Many causes lie behind the good news--the end of the Cold War, the spread of democracy, and peacekeeping efforts by the major powers among them—but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. In a chapter in the 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report, Dr. Erik Gartzke of Columbia University compared the propensity of countries to engage in wars to their level of economic freedom. He came to the conclusion that economic freedom, including the freedom to trade, significantly decreases the probability that a country will experience a military dispute with another country. Through econometric analysis, he found that, “Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free.” A 2006 study for the Institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany, found that the same pacific effect of trade and globalization. Authors Solomon Polachek and Carlos Seiglie found that “trading nations cooperate more and fight less.” In fact, a doubling of trade reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a conflict by 20 percent. Trade was the most important channel for peace, they found, but investment flows also has a positive effect. A democratic form of government also proved to be a force for peace, but primarily because democracies trade more. All this helps explain why the world’s two most conflict-prone regions—the Arab Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa—are also the world’s two least globally and economically integrated regions. Terrorism does not spring from poverty but from ideological fervor and political and economic frustration. If we want to blunt the appeal of radical ideology to the next generation of Muslim children coming of age, we can help create more economic opportunity in those societies by encouraging more trade and investment ties in the West. The U.S. initiative to enact free trade agreements with certain Muslim countries, such as Morocco, Jordan, Bahrain and Oman, represent small steps in the right direction. An even more effective policy would be to unilaterally open Western markets to products made and grown in Muslim countries. A young man or woman with a real job at export-oriented factory making overcoats in Jordan or shorts in Egypt is less vulnerable to the appeal of an Al-Qaida recruiter. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace or inoculation against terrorism, anymore than they guarantee democracy and civil liberty. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. Any relationship involving human beings will be messy and non-linear. There will always be exceptions and outliers in such complex relationships involving economies and governments. But deeper trade and investment ties among nations have made it more likely that democracy and civil liberties will take root, and less likely those gains will be destroyed by civil conflict and war.

Trade wars cause global war

Spicer, Olin Foundation, 96 (The Challenge from the East and the Rebirth of the West, p. 121)

The choice facing the West today is much the same as that which faced the Soviet bloc after World War II: between meeting head-on the challenge of world trade with the adjustments and the benefits that it will bring, or of attempting to shut out markets that are growing and where a dynamic new pace is being set for innovative production. The problem about the second approach is not simply that it won’t hold: satellite technology alone will ensure that consumers will begin to demand those goods that the East is able to provide most cheaply. More fundamentally, it will guarantee the emergence of a fragmented world in which natural fears will be fanned and inflamed. A world divided intorigidtrade blocs will be a deeply troubled and unstable place in which suspicion and ultimately envy will possibly erupt into a major war. I do not say that the converse will necessarily be true, that in a free trading world there will be an absence of all strife. Such a proposition would manifestly be absurd. But to trade is to become interdependent, and that is a good stop in the direction of world stability. With nuclear weapons at two a penny, stability will be at a premium in the years ahead.

Trade decreases social pressure for war

Eiras, ‘4 [Ana Isabel, Senior Policy Analyst at the Heritage Foundation, “Why America Needs to Support Free Trade” http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/bg1761.cfm]

Free trade fosters an enormous chain of economic activity, the benefits of which culminate in a social desire to be at peace with neighboring and even faraway nations with which trade is conducted or might be conducted in the future. When individuals see how beneficial it is to live in an economically free society; when they see how freedom allows them to improve their lives and those of their families; when they can create new businesses, engage in commerce, or work for a decent salary or wage, adding dignity to their lives, they want peace to preserve all these good things. By contrast, when people live under economic oppression and are at the mercy of a small ruling authority that dictates every aspect of their lives and limits their ability to realize their potential, they resent the life they have and learn to hate better lives elsewhere. If they cannot enjoy the fruits of their efforts and cannot realize their potential; if they cannot feel free to do business, work freely, and trade freely; if they do not have anything to gain or to lose, they begin to feel that any change--even war--might be better. They have no incentive to desire peace with their neighbors. For this reason, the areas of greatest conflict in the world also happen to be those that are economically repressed. (See Map.) The Economic Freedom Map, drawn annually from the Index, shows, for example, that countries that are the most economically repressed have also suffered civil wars and unrest. The areas of the Middle East in which civil wars and terrorist havens abound are both economically repressed and mostly unfree. North Korea, a country plagued by starvation and poverty, is repressed. Brazil, Argentina, parts of Africa, and some former Soviet republics--all mostly unfree--have high levels of poverty and periodically suffer political and economic crises.

Trade creates a forum for peaceful dispute settlement

O’Driscoll and Fitzgerald 2 [Dr. Gerald P. O'Driscoll, Jr., is former Director of, and Sara J. Fitzgerald is a Trade Policy Analyst in, the Center for International Trade and Economics at The Heritage Foundation. December 18, 2002 <http://www.heritage.org/Research/TradeandForeignAid/BG1617.cfm> Accessed on 7-29-03]

Countries that trade with each other are less likely to engage in actions that would disrupt economic opportunity. Many trade agreements create a forum for the settlement of disputes, thereby reducing tension among the parties to the agreement. While the benefits of engaging in trade agreements to foster diplomacy between countries are clear, they also extend to reinforcing existing relationships. The U.S. Trade Representative is currently completing negotiations for an FTA with Singapore and has recently finished negotiations with Chile. Completing these agreements is an important element of a trade agenda.

Trade wars escalate – history on our side

Miller and Elwood ‘88

[Vince and James. Founder of the International Society for Individual Liberty and ISIL VP. “Free Trade or Protectionism?” [www.isil.org](http://www.isil.org), 1988]

In Trade Wars: Both Sides Lose When the government of Country "A" puts up trade barriers against the goods of Country "B", the government of Country "B" will naturally retaliate by erecting trade barriers against the goods of Country "A". The result? A trade war in which both sides lose. But all too often a depressed economy is not the only negative outcome of a trade war . . . When Goods Don't Cross Borders, Armies Often Do      History is not lacking in examples of cold trade wars escalating into hot shooting wars: Europe suffered from almost non-stop wars during the 17th and 18th centuries, when restrictive trade policy (mercantilism) was the rule; rival governments fought each other to expand their empires and to exploit captive markets. British tariffs provoked the American colonists to revolution, and later the Northern-dominated US government imposed restrictions on Southern cotton exports – a major factor leading to the American Civil War. In the late 19th Century, after a half century of general free trade (which brought a half-century of peace), short-sighted politicians throughout Europe again began erecting trade barriers. Hostilities built up until they eventually exploded into World War I. In 1930, facing only a mild recession, US President Hoover ignored warning pleas in a petition by 1028 prominent economists and signed the notorious Smoot-Hawley Act, which raised some tariffs to 100% levels. Within a year, over 25 other governments had retaliated by passing similar laws. The result? World trade came to a grinding halt, and the entire world was plunged into the "Great Depression" for the rest of the decade. The depression in turn led to World War II. The #1 Danger To World Peace. The world enjoyed its greatest economic growth during the relatively free trade period of 1945-1970, a period that also saw no major wars. Yet we again see trade barriers being raised around the world by short-sighted politicians. Will the world again end up in a shooting war as a result of these economically-deranged policies? Can we afford to allow this to happen in the nuclear age? "What generates war is the economic philosophy of nationalism: embargoes, trade and foreign exchange controls, monetary devaluation, etc. The philosophy of protectionism is a philosophy of war."

Trade wars cause global war

Spicer, Olin Foundation, 96 (The Challenge from the East and the Rebirth of the West, p. 121)

The choice facing the West today is much the same as that which faced the Soviet bloc after World War II: between meeting head-on the challenge of world trade with the adjustments and the benefits that it will bring, or of attempting to shut out markets that are growing and where a dynamic new pace is being set for innovative production. The problem about the second approach is not simply that it won’t hold: satellite technology alone will ensure that consumers will begin to demand those goods that the East is able to provide most cheaply. More fundamentally, it will guarantee the emergence of a fragmented world in which natural fears will be fanned and inflamed. A world divided intorigidtrade blocs will be a deeply troubled and unstable place in which suspicion and ultimately envy will possibly erupt into a major war. I do not say that the converse will necessarily be true, that in a free trading world there will be an absence of all strife. Such a proposition would manifestly be absurd. But to trade is to become interdependent, and that is a good stop in the direction of world stability. With nuclear weapons at two a penny, stability will be at a premium in the years ahead.

## 1AC Manufacturing Adv.

Scenario 1: Chinese Manufacturing

Rising labor costs mean China is on the cusp of transitioning to high-skill manufacturing

Rein ’10 [August 24, 2010. Shaun Rein is the founder and managing director of the China Market Research Group, a strategic market intelligence firm. “Three Big Trends Changing China For Multinationals” Forbes. <http://www.forbes.com/2010/08/24/china-multinationals-branding-leadership-careers-rein.html>]

Chinese companies increasingly knowing how to brand is one of three big trends multinationals need to stay on top of now. The second is rising labor costs. Many people are surprised that Chinese workers in factories from Toyota to Honda have begun demanding higher salaries and better working conditions. They shouldn’t be. Rising labor costs are not a short-term trend. They are an ongoing phenomenon, and they are why apparel makers have been relocating production to Indonesia, Vietnam and other lower-priced markets for years. Pricing pressures will continue. Why the shift? First, there is a demographic change taking place. Because of the one-child policy that China implemented in the late 1970s, there are fewer younger workers in the labor pool. Second, young Chinese are optimistic about their futures. They have seen their country emerge as an economic superpower, and they feel they deserve a piece of the pie. They want to buy Estée Lauder cosmetics, Zara clothes, Nokia phones and their own homes too. They need high salaries to lead the lives they want and are less willing to work at low-wage or blue-collar jobs. A decade ago there were only 1 million Chinese graduating from universities each year. This year, there were more than 6 million, and they all see their path to prosperity in white-collar jobs. To combat rising wages and real estate costs, companies have to either relocate manufacturing capabilities to lower-cost countries, automate their production facilities and move up the value chain or relocate factories to China’s western and central regions, where wages remain relatively low. Foxconn, which makes products for Apple , Dell and Hewlett-Packard and which received heavy criticism this year for its poor working conditions, has shut many of its facilities in southern China and is relocating 300,000 workers further inland to central China, closer to the homes of many of them. Manufacturing will remain a significant part of China’s economy for years. The infrastructure and government policies are far better for it than in most markets, making producing still worth it for multinationals. However, the kinds of manufacturing will necessarily change. Instead of turning out cheap products, less-polluting factories will increasingly be pushing out high-quality electronics and auto supply parts and the like.

Chinese companies need to focus on moving up the value chain – key to long term competitiveness

Wong ’12 [January 3, 2012. Edy Wong is from the Centre for International Business Studies School of Business, University of Alberta, Canada. “China’s Move up the Value Chain. A Framework for Analysis” Georgetown University Journal of Globalization, Competitiveness, and Governability <http://gcg.universia.net/pdfs_revistas/articulo_221_1335526869750.pdf>]

While some evidence of initial success is reported, there remains much concern with China’s capability to do become a producer and exporter of high technology products. Given China’s production capability and factor endowment, it is generally accepted that further development of suitable human resources, technological know-how, management expertise skills, and other innovative skills is required for China to move up the value chain. The current supplies of such ingredients in China are considered inadequate by many for a rapid transformation and upgrade of China’s value chain position. Indeed, these are the same essential determinants of an economy’s long-term competitiveness identified in the literature on ‘new economic geography’, business studies, regional science, and innovative studies (Humphrey and Schmitz, 2002). China must continue to develop these factors as it continues on its development path. Not surprisingly, government policies in China have actively focused on the cultivation of these factors both as a matter of developmental policy and as support for Chinese firms to augment their competitiveness and move up the value chain.

Increasing US-Mexico border efficiency reduces production costs and facilitates re-shoring

Wilson 13 — Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs. He is the author of Working Together: Economic Ties between the United States and Mexico (Wilson Center, 2011), and an editor and author of the Institute’s forthcoming State of the Border Report (Christopher E. Wilson, *Wilson Center — Mexico Institute*, January 2013, “New Ideas for a New Era: Policy Options for the Next Stage in U.S.-Mexico Relations”, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new_ideas_us_mexico_relations.pdf>, Accessed 07-22-2013 | AK)

Driven by a series of global developments and technological advances, a manufacturing renaissance is taking hold in the United States and Mexico that is increasing the competitiveness of regional industry and the volume of U.S.-Mexico trade. After many companies moved their factories to Asia in search of cheap wages over the past two decades, new trends are pulling production facilities back to North America. While manufacturing wages in China were four times less than Mexico in 2000, they are now nearly equal and are expected to be 25 percent higher than Mexican labor costs by 2015.1 The simple math of wage differentials drove the past decade’s movement of factories from the U.S. and Mexico to China, but companies are taking an increasingly holistic approach in deciding where to locate factories, considering transportation costs and shipping times; exchange rate and political risks; language, culture, and time zone differences; contract and intellectual property law enforcement; security; production flexibility; the supply and cost of materials and energy; and the availability of skilled and educated workers. In most of these categories, Mexico is gaining ground or maintains a distinct advantage over other regions of the world, particularly in terms of serving markets throughout the Americas. For example, between 2007 and December 2012, the value of the Mexican Peso fell by 17 percent compared to the U.S. Dollar and by a full 33 percent compared to the Chinese Yuan, improving the competitiveness of regional exports vis-à-vis Chinese goods.2 Crude oil prices rose 231 percent between 2002 and 2012, thus raising shipping costs and incentivizing the use of shorter, regional rather than longer, transcontinental supply chains.3 New drilling techniques, however, are changing the outlook for oil and especially natural gas, opening access to new reserves, increasing production, and therefore lowering some energy costs. While this may eventually lower long-range shipping costs, the more immediate effect is proving to be a major decline in natural gas prices, which has already lowered electricity costs in some parts of the United States and has the potential to do so throughout both the region. Such a decline in prices provides a major boost to energy intensive industries, such as steel, and petrochemical producers. The United States is on the forefront of the technological advances in the energy industry and stands to gain the most from them, but Mexico could reap the benefits as well should it either reform its energy industry to take advantage of its significant shale gas reserves or develop the pipeline infrastructure to support increased gas imports from the United States. Technological advances and improvements in the manufacturing process and logistics are revolutionizing industrial production in ways that significantly change cost structures, further incentivizing those that had offshored to China to consider near-shoring in Mexico or re-shoring their production back to the United States. Robots and the high-tech sensors that allow them to function with precision are allowing many of the simple, repetitive jobs that traditionally made up factory work obsolete. The need for large numbers of relatively unskilled laborers is on the decline, and the need for high skilled technicians who can program and maintain the complex machines and robots of today’s factories is on the rise. As a result, labor costs are a shrinking portion of total production costs, as evidenced by a recent study that found only 5.3% of the price of an iPhone goes to offshore manufacturing wages.4 This shift opens an opportunity for advanced economies like the U.S. to recoup some of their share of global manufacturing, especially if the complementary nature of high-tech design and production in the U.S. is complemented with lower cost manufacturing in Mexico for the portions of production that still require a higher degree of manual labor. The widespread implementation of lean manufacturing principles has improved the efficiency and agility of factories around the world. One important area in which fat has been cut from the manufacturing process is in warehousing. Just-in-time supply chain management has minimized the costly storage of parts and products, thus fueling the trend of regionalization in manufacturing by increasing the importance of a robust network of nearby suppliers. It is also greatly increasing the need for short and predictable wait times at the U.S. land borders since an unexpected delay has the potential to shut down production until the needed parts arrive at their destination.

Mexican manufacturing trades off with Chinese – Mexican imports are more long term and stable

Wilson ‘11 [November 2011. Christopher Wilson is Program Associate with the Woodrow Wilson Center’s Mexico Institute, where he focuses on U.S.-Mexico economic integration and border issues. “Working Together: Economic Ties Between The United States And Mexico” Mexico Institute, Woodrow Wilson International Center For Scholars. <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Working%20Together%20Full%20Document.pdf>]

When China joined the WTO in 2001, it consolidated its position as a popular location for offshore production due to extraordinarily low labor costs. Total compensation in the manufacturing industry, including wages and benefits paid both directly to employees and through taxes, totaled less than a dollar per hour. In 2003, average hourly compensation in China was just 62 cents, while in Mexico’s manufacturing sector it was $5.06.94 Many Mexican maquiladoras shut down and relocated to China. In fact, between October 2000 and March 2002, maquiladora production declined by 30%.95 Since the early 2000s, Mexican manufacturing has recovered. At the same time, economic growth in China has caused wages to rise. China’s hourly compensation costs in manufacturing more than doubled between 2003 and 2008, rising from 62 cents to $1.36 per hour. Over the same period, Mexico’s wages rose just 21%, from $5.06 to $6.12 per hour.96 While the dollar amount of the rise in labor costs was actually greater in Mexico during this period, the rate of growth suggests wages will occupy an ever-greater portion of production costs in China, a factor that, over time, could erode its competitive advantage. Still, if wages were the only factor, it would make more sense for U.S.-based companies to offshore their manufacturing to China. Several additional factors, however, have helped keep Mexico’s factories competitive. Because of geographic proximity, shipping goods between the U.S. and Mexico is cheaper (especially with the currently high fuel costs) and substantially faster than shipping to and from China. Transport usually takes a few days rather than several weeks. Similarly, executives of U.S.-based companies with production facilities abroad can communicate with plant managers and travel to Mexico to monitor and adjust production much more easily than is the case for Chinese production. Mexico’s comparative advantages, largely based on geography and NAFTA, are more long-term and stable than many of those associated with China.

Chinese economic decline causes miscalc and draws in the US

Auslin 09 (Michael, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 2009, “Averting Disaster Preventing the worst case scenario in Asia”, 2-5, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/115jtnqw.asp?page=2>)

AS THEY DEAL WITH a collapsing world economy, policymakers in Washington and around the globe must not forget that when a depression strikes, war can follow. Nowhere is this truer than in Asia, the most heavily armed region on earth and riven with ancient hatreds and territorial rivalries. Collapsing trade flows can lead to political tension, nationalist outbursts, growing distrust, and ultimately, military miscalculation. The result would be disaster on top of an already dire situation. No one should think that Asia is on the verge of conflict. But it is also important to remember what has helped keep the peace in this region for so long. Phenomenal growth rates in Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore, China and elsewhere since the 1960s have naturally turned national attention inward, to development and stability. This has gradually led to increased political confidence, diplomatic initiatives, and in many nations the move toward more democratic systems. America has directly benefited as well, and not merely from years of lower consumer prices, but also from the general conditions of peace in Asia. Yet policymakers need to remember that even during these decades of growth, moments of economic shock, such as the 1973 Oil Crisis, led to instability and bursts of terrorist activity in Japan, while the uneven pace of growth in China has led to tens of thousands of armed clashes in the poor interior of the country. Now imagine such instability multiplied region-wide. The economic collapse Japan is facing, and China's potential slowdown, dwarfs any previous economic troubles, including the 1998 Asian Currency Crisis. Newly urbanized workers rioting for jobs or living wages, conflict over natural resources, further saber-rattling from North Korea, all can take on lives of their own. This is the nightmare of governments in the region, and particularly of democracies from newer ones like Thailand and Mongolia to established states like Japan and South Korea. How will overburdened political leaders react to internal unrest? What happens if Chinese shopkeepers in Indonesia are attacked, or a Japanese naval ship collides with a Korean fishing vessel? Quite simply, Asia's political infrastructure may not be strong enough to resist the slide towards confrontation and conflict. This would be a political and humanitarian disaster turning the clock back decades in Asia. It would almost certainly drag America in at some point, as well. First of all, we have alliance responsibilities to Japan, South Korea, Australia, and the Philippines should any of them come under armed attack. Failure on our part to live up to those responsibilities could mean the end of America's credibility in Asia. Secondly, peace in Asia has been kept in good measure by the continued U.S. military presence since World War II. There have been terrible localized conflicts, of course, but nothing approaching a systemic conflagration like the 1940s. Today, such a conflict would be far more bloody, and it is unclear if the American military, already stretched too thin by wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, could contain the crisis. Nor is it clear that the American people, worn out from war and economic distress, would be willing to shed even more blood and treasure for lands across the ocean. The result could be a historic changing of the geopolitical map in the world's most populous region. Perhaps China would emerge as the undisputed hegemon. Possibly democracies like Japan and South Korea would link up to oppose any aggressor. India might decide it could move into the vacuum. All of this is guess-work, of course, but it has happened repeatedly throughout history. There is no reason to believe we are immune from the same types of miscalculation and greed that have destroyed international systems in the past.

Scenario 2: Economy

Even minor inefficiencies at the border multiply to affect both countries.

Wilson ‘11 (Christopher E., “Working Together: Economic Ties Between The United States and Mexico,” Mexico Institute,¶ Woodrow Wilson International¶ Center for Scholars, November, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Working%20Together%20Full%20Document.pd

Pg. 1-2, KD)

More than a line dividing the two countries, the nearly 2,000 mile Southwest Border connects the United States and Mexico. More than half a million people and a little less than a billion dollars in goods cross the border each day.80 The border region is made up of four U.S. and six Mexican states with tightly integrated economies that, in total, have a GDP of greater than $3.5 trillion.81 But as important as the region’s local economy is the role it plays as the gateway for the vast majority of U.S.-Mexico economic transactions. Nearly 80% of the goods traded with Mexico by all fifty states cross the border by land, making the efficient operation of the border by officials in both countries key to keeping U.S. exports competitive and¶ imports cheap.82 Well-managed borders are vital to a healthy North American economy. The intensity of commerce, and especially the widespread nature of production sharing (with products crisscrossing the border several times as they are produced) mean that seemingly minor inefficiencies in border management can have profound effects on the national economies of the U.S. and Mexico. The complex set of security challenges faced by the United States complicates border management, but maintaining a safe border does not necessarily imply sacrifices in commercial and social cross-border links.

Manufacturing K2 the economy—6 warrants

Rynn ‘11

Jon Rynn is the author of the book Manufacturing Green Prosperity: The power to rebuild the American middle class, available from Praeger Press. He holds a Ph.D. in political science and is a Visiting Scholar at the CUNY Institute for Urban Systems. Rooseveltinstitute: Six Reasons Manufacturing is Central to the Economy.http://rooseveltinstitute.org/new-roosevelt/six-reasons-manufacturing-central-economy¶ Paul Krugman recently argued that “manufacturing is one of the bright spots of a generally disappointing recovery, and there are signs — preliminary, but hopeful, nonetheless — that a sustained comeback may be under way.” He points out that the gap between what we sell and what we buy has been improving. This must be set against a background of a manufacturing decline in the United States of historic dimensions; even without adjusting for inflation, the trade deficit in goods for the United States between 2000 and 2010 was 7 trillion dollars. A turnaround in the attention of more perceptive economists and a turnaround in manufacturing may be in the works. But before that, the crucial question is: **Why is manufacturing so important?**¶ **1. Manufacturing has been the path to development**¶ **It has been the strategic achievement of rich nations** over the last several hundred years to create **a high-quality manufacturing sector** in order to **develop national wealth and power**, as Erik Reinert shows in his book “How Rich Countries Got Rich…and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor.” From the rise of England in the 19th century, to the rise of the US, Germany, Japan and the USSR in the 20th, to the newly industrializing countries like Korea, Taiwan, and now China, **manufacturing has been the key to prosperity.**¶ **2. Manufacturing is the foundation of global “Great Power”**¶ The most powerful nations in the world — the “Great Powers” — are those that control the bulk of the global production of manufacturing technology. That is, it isn’t enough simply to have factories and produce more goods, you have to know how to make the machinery that makes the goods. The key to power, then, is to make the “means of production.”¶ **As the machinery industries go, so goes Great Power**. My own research shows that about 80% of the world’s production of factory machinery has been controlled by what we would consider the “Great Powers.” Until the 1950s, the US had produced about 50%; we now produce less than China’s 16%.¶ **3. Manufacturing is the most important cause of economic growth**¶ **The growth of manufacturing machinery output, and technological improvements in that machinery, are the main drivers of economic growth**. No machinery industries, no sustained, long-term economic growth. Just consider the explosion of the Internet, iPhones, and the like — all made possible by a small subset of production machinery called semiconductor-making equipment (SME), which itself is dependent on other forms of production machinery, such as the machine tools that grind the lenses they use or the alloys of metal the metal-making industries output. These technologies reproduce themselves, as when an SME makes the semiconductors that then go to make more SMEs, or when a machine tool makes the metal components that not only go into other pieces of machinery, such as cars, but are used to produce yet more machine tools. The technological and productive potential of machine tools and SMEs affect each other as well, leading to the explosive economic growth of the last two hundred years.¶ Sign up for weekly ND20 highlights, mind-blowing stats, and event alerts**.**¶ **4. Global trade is based on goods**, not services¶ A country can’t trade services for most of its goods. According to the WTO, 80% of world trade among regions is merchandise trade — that is, only 20% of world trade is in services. This closely matches the trade percentages that even the US, allegedly becoming “post-industrial,” achieves. If in the extreme case an economy was composed only of services, then it would be very poor, because it couldn’t trade for goods; its currency would be worth very little. The dollar is also vulnerable in the long-term. A “post-industrial” economy is really a pre-industrial economy — that is, poor.¶ **5. Services are dependent on manufactured goods**¶ **Services are mostly the act of using manufactured goods. You can’t export the experience of using something. Retail and wholesale, which make up about 11% of the economy, are the act of buying and selling manufactured goods.** The same goes for real estate, another 13%, which is the act of buying and selling a “real” or physical asset, a building. Even health, which makes up about 8% of the economy, is the act of using medical equipment and drugs (all figures from 2010, value-added).¶ Finance involves the redirection of surplus resources that the nonfinancial sector of the economy produces, which means that indirectly, even finance is dependent on manufacturing. The cycle of rise and decline usually runs like this: some clever society figures out how to take advantage of the current technologies of production, thus generating huge surpluses, which either the financial forces, the very wealthy, or the military then appropriate for their own wealth and power; they kill the goose that is laying the golden eggs. To sum up: the health of the economy is critically dependent on the health of the manufacturing sector.¶ 6. Manufacturing creates jobs¶ Most jobs, directly or indirectly, depend on manufacturing — and reviving the sector could provide tens of millions of new jobs, eradicating the Great Recession. In 2005, the Japanese manufacturing sector was 20.2% of its economy, in Germany it was 23.2%, and in the US manufacturing accounted for 13.4%, according to the the OECD. Using 2005 figures, if the US had the same percentage as Japan, we would have 7 million more high-quality, long-term, well paying jobs. If we were equal with Germany, we would have 10 million more. And according to the Economic Policy Institute, **each manufacturing job supports almost three other jobs in the economy. That** makes sense, considering the other five reasons that manufacturing is central to the economy.¶ Thus, there are six solid reasons that we need to rebuild the manufacturing sector of the United States. **It’s time for the United States to wake up before it’s too late** and rebuild the foundation of a strong, prosperous, middle class economy.

Scholarly consensus concludes economic crisis causes and intensifies war

Royal 10 – Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense (Jedediah, “Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives,” pg 213-215.

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a “rally around the flag” effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the

US-Mexico economic cooperation is the only hope for sustaining the global economic recovery – growth in Europe, China, and Japan are too soft to keep the world economy afloat

Schiffer ‘13 Michael Schiffer President of the Inter-American Dialogue “A More Ambitious Agenda: A Report of the Inter-American Dialogue’s commission on Mexico-US relations.” February http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD9042\_USMexicoReportEnglishFinal.pdf

The first is to reinforce and deepen economic cooperation. That includes increasing the productivity and international competitiveness of both nations, opening opportunities for longterm growth and job creation, and setting the stage for further economic integration. In a world of persistent, widespread economic insecurity, the more the United States and Mexico coordinate and integrate their economies, the more ably they can compete for global markets. Their economic cooperation is more vital than ever as drivers of the global economy falter—as the European financial crisis persists, as China enters a period of slower growth, as Japan remains stalled, and as many emerging markets appear increasingly vulnerable. Among the concrete objectives the two countries should consider are development of a framework to make their shared labor markets more efficient and equitable; formation of a coherent North American energy market (which could help meet the needs of energy-poor Central America); and coordination among the United States, Mexico, and Canada in negotiations toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).

# 2AC

## Topicality

We meet – Border infrastructure improvements are economic engagement

Gephardt 2002 Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo) was the House Democratic Leader. CENTER FOR Latin American Studies UC Berkeley “Progressive Economic Engagement with Mexico and the World” Winter http://clas.berkeley.edu/Publications/Review/pdf/newswinter02.pdf

Everybody agrees that as we enter the 21st century, the global economy requires the United States to seek greater export opportunities. In addition, I believe that a new trade consensus must be rooted in our values. Not only is enhanced trade vital to U.S. economic growth and security, but it can also promote values fundamental to our democratic future: worker rights, environmental protection, and human rights. Working to open global markets and doing more to enhance global living standards will expand U.S., Mexican and global prosperity in the 21st century. Some have called the progressive approach to trade “protectionist.” That is an erroneous label. In fact, progressives are for expanded trade and for the United States meeting its leadership obligations in the international economic arena. However, we believe a broader approach is needed based on three pillars of economic policy: free and fair trade, enhanced development assistance, and debt relief for the poorest nations. Such a program could create more markets for U.S. exports, strengthen the middle class at home and abroad, and maximize our national security through a comprehensive program of engagement in all parts of the world. We need to forge a progressive approach to trade and development and create a new consensus on global economic engagement. At home in North America, we need to do more to promote trade and development with Mexico. NAFTA has been a real success in increasing trade between the U.S., Canada and Mexico, but it has done little to generate real development in Mexico. Despite the increases in trade, and enhanced Mexican productivity since 1993, a broad Mexican middle class has failed to emerge. Today Mexico is facing a serious recession and maquiladora jobs are leaving as companies move to nations, such as China, where wage rates are lower. Mexico is facing a race to the bottom and America needs to do more to combat this trend. We need to assist the government of President Vicente Fox with enhanced trade, aid and development. America has a great opportunity in the bilateral meetings at the Monterrey summit in March 2002 to work with Mexico on a progressive development plan. As a first step the resources of the North American Development Bank must be freed up to provide hundreds of millions of dollars of new environmental infrastructure along the border. Housing, health, and transportation infrastructure must also be improved at the border.

C/I – Economic Engagement can be tactical or structural linkage of economic benefits

Mastanduno 8 (Michael – Nelson Rockefeller Professor of Government and Associate Dean for the Social Sciences at Dartmouth. “Economic Statecraft” in Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors & Cases ed Smith, Hadfield, Dunne. p. 182-3)

Positive economic statecraft may be defined as the provision or promise of economic benefits to induce changes in the behaviour of a target state. 1 It is important to distinguish between two types. The first involves the promise of a well-specified economic concession in an effort to alter specific foreign or domestic policies of the target government. I call this version tactical linkage; others refer to 'carrots', or 'specific positive linkage'. A second version, which I term structural linkage and which others refer to as 'general positive linkage' or 'long-term engagement', involves an effort to use a steady stream of economic benefits to reconfigure the balance of political interests within a target country. Structural linkage tends to be unconditional; the benefits are not turned on and off according to changes in target behaviour. The sanctioning state expects instead that sustained economic engagement will eventually produce a political transformation and desirable changes in target behaviour.

## Relations Adv.

1. Loose nukes are a threat—storage facilities or the black market—18 attempted thefts of nuclear material—security isn’t well-regulated or coherent.

Brill and Luongo ‘12

(Kenneth C. Brill is a former U.S. ambassador to the I.A.E.A.Kenneth N. Luongo is president of the Partnership for Global Security. Both are members of the Fissile Material Working Group, a nonpartisan nongovernmental organization. “Nuclear Terrorism: A Clear Danger.” *The New York Times.* <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/nuclear-terrorism-a-clear-danger.html?_r=0&pagewanted=print>. EJW. 3/15/2012. )

Terrorists exploit gaps in security. **The current** global regime for protecting the **nuclear materials** that terrorists desire for their ultimate weapon is far from seamless. It **is based largely on unaccountable,** voluntary **arrangements that are inconsistent** across borders. **Its weak links make it dangerous and inadequate to prevent nuclear terrorism.¶** Later this month in Seoul, the more than 50 world leaders who will gather for the second Nuclear Security Summit need to seize the opportunity to start developing an accountable regime to prevent nuclear terrorism.¶ There is a consensus among international leaders that the threat of nuclear terrorism is real, not a Hollywood confection. President Obama, the leaders of 46 other nations, the heads of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the United Nations, and numerous experts have called nuclear terrorism one of the most serious threats to global security and stability. It is also preventable with more aggressive action.¶ At least four **terrorist groups, including Al Qaeda,** have **demonstrated interest** in using a nuclear device. These groups operate in or near states with histories of questionable nuclear security practices. Terrorists do not need to steal a nuclear weapon. It is quite possible to make an improvised nuclear device from highly enriched uranium or plutonium being used for civilian purposes. And there is a black market in such material. There have been 18 confirmed thefts or loss of weapons-usable nuclear material. In 2011, the Moldovan police broke up part of a smuggling ring attempting to sell highly enriched uranium; one member is thought to remain at large with a kilogram of this material.¶ A terrorist nuclear explosion could kill hundreds of thousands, create billions of dollars in damages and undermine the global economy. Former Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations said that an act of **nuclear terrorism “would thrust tens of millions of people into dire poverty” and create “a second death toll** throughout the developing world.”¶ Surely after such an event, global leaders would produce a strong global system to ensure nuclear security. There is no reason to wait for a catastrophe to build such a system.¶ The conventional wisdom is that domestic regulations, U.N. Security Council resolutions, G-8 initiatives, I.A.E.A. activities and other voluntary efforts will prevent nuclear terrorism. But existing **global arrangements for nuclear security lack uniformity and coherence.¶** There are no globally agreed standards for effectively securing nuclear material. There is no obligation to follow the voluntary standards that do exist and no institution, not even the I.A.E.A., with a mandate to evaluate nuclear security performance.¶ This patchwork approach provides the appearance of dealing with nuclear security; the reality is there are gaps through which a determined terrorist group could drive one or more nuclear devices.¶ Obama’s initiative in launching the nuclear security summit process in Washington in 2010 helped focus high-level attention on nuclear security issues. Unfortunately, the actions produced by the 2010 Washington Summit and that are planned for the upcoming Seoul Summit are voluntary actions that are useful, but not sufficient to create an effective global nuclear security regime.¶ The world cannot afford to wait for the patchwork of nuclear security arrangements to fail before they are strengthened. Instead, we need a system based on a global framework convention on nuclear security that would fill the gaps in existing voluntary arrangements. This framework convention would commit states to an effective standard of nuclear security practices, incorporate relevant existing international agreements, and give the I.A.E.A. the mandate to support nuclear security by evaluating whether states are meeting their nuclear security obligations and providing assistance to those states that need help in doing so.¶ **Nuclear terrorism is a real and present danger for all states**, not just a few. Preventing it is an achievable goal. The current focus on nuclear security through voluntary actions, however, is not commensurate with either the risk or consequences of nuclear terrorism. This must be rectified. If the Seoul Nuclear Security Summit makes this a priority, there can be an effective global nuclear security regime in place before this decade ends.

1. Modernization of border infrastructure is a precondition for Mexico’s cooperation on border security Only the plan solves.

Christian Science Monitor 6/26/13 Mexico breaks silence on US immigration bill: 'Walls aren't the solution '

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/Latin-America-Monitor/2013/0626/Mexico-breaks-silence-on-US-immigration-bill-Walls-aren-t-the-solution>

##### US lawmakers are considering extending the border fence as part of the added security measures that would accompany plans to provide legal status to more than 11 million immigrants, the majority of them Mexican. Foreign Minister José Antonio Meade said the legislation would benefit Mexico’s countrymen in the US. But he also warned that the proposed fence extension could impact commerce, and the enormous legal flow of products and people across the border each day. “Walls aren’t the solution to the migratory phenomenon, and they aren’t congruent with a modern and secure border,” he told media on Tuesday. “They don’t contribute to the development of the competitive region that both countries want to encourage.” Seventy percent of bilateral commerce happens over the border via trucks, and it’s worth $1 million per minute, Mr. Meade said. More than 1 million people cross the US-Mexico border legally every day. Mexico has been publicly quiet in recent years on the US debate over immigration reform after former President Vicente Fox's vocal push for US reform appeared to some to be an overreach. He made specific demands, including wanting to see reform by "year end." That was in early September 2001, days before the 9/11 terrorist attacks that would set the country on a new course and see immigration reform fall by the wayside. During the current US debate, the Mexican government has kept mum – at least publicly – on the legislation, saying the debate is an internal domestic issue. But Meade said that Mexico has sustained a “permanent dialogue” with everyone involved since lawmakers began crafting the bill. “Our country has let the United States government know that measures that could affect links between [border] communities detract from the principles of shared responsibility and neighborliness that both nations agreed upon.” On the issue of shared responsibility: Over the past year, Mexico has found itself in the uncomfortable position of deterring increased illegal immigration through its own territory. Illegal immigration between Mexico and the US fell to net zero last year, meaning that the number of crossers and returnees roughly canceled each other. However, in Texas’ Rio Grande Valley, US authorities saw an increase in apprehensions of migrants – the vast majority from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, according to a report by the Washington Office on Latin America. Mexico recently announced that Marines would take over securing its southern border. As the US debate over the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 gains steam, Meade noted Mexico’s requests are rooted in its desire for stronger economic development. These include the modernization of the infrastructure and administration of border ports of entry and measures that better facilitate the transit of products and people. During last month’s meeting in Mexico, Presidents Enrique Peña Nieto and Barack Obama promoted the idea of a unified economic region saying they could better compete globally, together

## Trade Adv.

1. Empirics are a negative warrant – every modern conflict is explained by economic contraction

Yulu ‘3

[Economic Analyst for the People’s Daily (China). “Economic Recession: The Blasting Fuse of War”. People’s Daily, 7/25/3 Lexis]

If one examines the wars broken out ever since more than a century ago, one will discover an interesting phenomenon, that is, each fairly big economic recession (or economic crisis) was inevitably followed by the eruption of a war. This is true with World I, World War II, the Gulf War, as well as the Iraq war. It can be said that economic downturn is the blasting fuse of modern war.

## Manufacturing Adv.

### 2AC – Shunning

#### Weigh consequences—moral absolutism reproduces evil

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

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

#### Hypocrisy Disad - U.S. human rights violations undermines its credibility to push for rights internationally

Halperin 7(Morton H., Testimony to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, “Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy,” 7-12-2007, www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/07/halperin\_testimony.html)

The United States should also actively work with the United Nations and especially the Human Rights Council to help to advance human rights and to protect human rights activists. Here, as elsewhere, we need to recognize that by failing to observe internationally recognized human rights ourselves we reduce American credibility to champion human rights for others. I understand that many in the Congress and elsewhere are troubled by the first year of operations of the new Council. I share those concerns. However, it is far too soon to give up on the Council or to cut its funding. I am confident that human rights activists in Cuba, Egypt, and Azerbaijan share this view.

#### Shunning is worse for human rights and causes injustices—your author

Beversluis 89 (Eric H. April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2)

Finally, shunning can itself cause injustices. Should we shun a nation that violates the rights of some or all of its citizens if the burden will fall primarily on those victims? For example, sanctions against South Africa are often rejected on the grounds that they will hurt the South African blacks the most. Yet it is not clear what weight this argument has. Certainly shunning will cause economic hardship for South Africa, hardship which the oppressive regime may well transfer to the black people. But the oppressed people may welcome that additional burden, since it may, as it were, lighten their overall burden by recognizing their plight and their worth (lVtlrde, dignity) as human beings. It may give them the moral encouragement needed to carryon their struggle. Finally, the cries of the black people against apartheid, along with their strikes and boycotts, seem to be evidence that they themselves are willing to make the sacrifices to fight apartheid. In other cases, however, the burden of shunning may in no way help the oppressed people. Then shunning itself would clearly be unjust and should not be done; alternative sanctions must be devised which will affect the offending members of the society.

## Counterplan

Certainty key – without it, border delays and investment decline are inevitable

U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 11 (“Steps to a 21st Century U.S.-Mexico Border”

<http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/reports/2011_us_mexico_report.pdf> )

Businesses rely on just-in-time inventory management and depend on predictability and speed in their supply chains. Consequently, supply chains are critical to businesses’ underlying value, growth potential, and economic competitiveness. In many cases, before a product is completed, it may have crossed the border numerous times, necessitating a swift crossing process. An efﬁcient supply chain is a lifeline for economic cooperation and mutual prosperity, and it contributes to our two countries’ competitive advantage. Unfortunately, supply chains often come to a halt due to border delays, security concerns, and infrastructure constraints. These issues create an environment of uncertainty in the business community, and uncertainty is the enemy of investment, job creation, economic prosperity, and supply chain security. We need to address these issues together in order to grow our trade relationship. Solving these issues will take collaboration, and the solutions are both short and long term. The business community is ﬁnding that sometimes likely solutions to border congestion are not being tried or, once tried, implemented. Nevertheless, we are encouraged by a recent willingness by leadership at CBP to engage in pilots and test new innovative ways to approach the border. Industry recognizes the challenges that face regulators in reforming policy; however, more needs to be done.

Conditions fail – perceived as bullying

Barnes 11 Joe Barnes, the Bonner Means Baker Fellow at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, written extensively on international economics, with a focus on the geopolitics of energy, April 29, 2011, “The Future of Oil in Mexico”, <http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-BarnesBilateral-04292011.pdf>.

Nonetheless, the ability of the United States to encourage reform is severely limited. Mexican leaders are extremely sensitive to perceived -bullying- by the United States. Too public a U.S. position—particularly on opening up Mexican oil fields to foreign development—might actually undermine reform efforts. In any instance, the United States should be modest in its calls for reform in Mexico. After all. Mexico is not the only North American country with constitutional and cultural constraints on good public policy. As noted, the United States appears incapable of stopping the flow of weapons to Mexico. Recently queried on this. President Obama was reduced to spluttering about the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.37

## CIR Politics

Low chance of passage

Weigant 1/30

Chris Weigant, political writer, 1/30 [“Reviewing Immigration Reform's Chances,” http://www.chrisweigant.com/2014/01/30/reviewing-immigration-reforms-chances/#more-8570]

OK, that's it for our clips. What happened after these columns were written was that the Senate did indeed pass the Gang of Eight bill, by almost as big a margin as I predicted (68 voted for it). Since then, the House has dragged its feet and stalled. Until today.¶ House Republicans have unveiled their plan, which (as I predicted) contains: "Sure, we'll give some sort of papers to these folks, let them stay, and even let them work... but there's no need to give them the hope of ever becoming a full citizen." Or maybe not. We'll see what their actual bill says, when it appears. **By redefining it as a "special path to citizenship," Republicans are hoping that people won't notice that the normal path to citizenship involves a 20-year**-long backlog of applicants. You think the DMV's bad? Try waiting two decades for a response from a governmental agency.¶ House Republicans see this as a brilliant wedge issue. If they dangle work papers in front of immigrants, then some will thankfully go for it while others will hold out for a real path to citizenship. This divides the pro-immigrant Democrats, Republicans figure. And they may well be right -- it'll be interesting to see how Democrats react in the next week or so. But, once again, the only two real things a green card holder is denied are a seat on a jury and a vote at the ballot box. And I don't think Republicans are too worried about the jury thing, to put it mildly.¶ Getting back to what Boehner just proposed. **What are the chances of it passing the House? Unknown. Boehner is** almost certainly **going to have to** ignore the self-imposed "Hastert Rule" at some point, meaning he'll have to **get** a bunch **of Democrats on board** with the proposal**. This will give Democrats** quite a bit of **leverage** **in the negotiations** over language in the bills.¶ But **even assuming that a legislative package does pass the House**, there is one thing in the Republican announcement which really caught my eye, in the news story I read. It can be read as an affirmation of that "small bills only" obsession, but indeed **it is** no more than **a veiled threat:¶** [The immigration problem] cannot be solved with a single, massive piece of legislation that few have read and even fewer understand, and therefore, we will not go to a conference with the Senate's immigration bill. The problems in our immigration system must be solved through a step-by-step, common-sense approach that starts with securing our country's borders, enforcing our laws, and implementing robust enforcement measures.¶ Translated from Washington-ese, this means that **Boehner is demanding**, in essence, **that the Senate** just **happily pass whatever bills the House Republicans approve of, and ignore the bill that passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.** **This is going to be a non-starter**, if Harry Reid has any backbone whatsoever. Conference committees are that "regular order" Republicans have been whining about, and regular order is indeed what should happen here. The House and the Senate are going to have to compromise somehow, whether John Boehner likes it or not. Of course, that is only if the ultimate goal is actually putting a final bill on President Obama's desk. And I am not convinced that this is John Boehner's real goal.¶ Maybe that's too cynical. Boehner is making one crafty move, by scheduling the entire exercise after the Republican primary season, from all accounts. What this means is that House Republicans won't have to vote on anything before winning their own primary elections. This means the Tea Party can't use these votes in any primary challenges this year -- a huge weight off incumbent Republicans. This is politically astute of Boehner, meaning he may well be more sincere than I'm inclined to give him credit for. Stranger things have happened.¶ But **even if Boehner does pass** some **bills, if he refuses to negotiate with the Senate then nothing is going to become law**. The Republicans, however, will be able to reach out to Latinos by saying "We tried, but the Democrats killed it," which is all some Republicans think is politically necessary.¶ To sum up, while a year ago I put the chances at immigration reform actually happening at a now-laughable "80-85 percent," I would now have to lower those odds significantly. I would say there is 80-85 percent chance of at least one bill passing the House (the bill that says "lots and lots and lots of border security money"). I would set **the chances of the House passing** truly **comprehensive immigration reform** (in other words, enough House bills to match the Senate's effort in scope) **at** maybe **60 percent**, given Boehner's leak today to the media. But I would only put the chances of a **comprehensive package passing both the House and Senate and arriving on Obama's desk at about 40-45 percent, at best**. And even that, **at this point, seems pretty wildly optimistic.**

Won’t pass for months

Berman 1/30

Russell Berman, politico writer, 1/30 [“House GOP campaign chief: Immigration vote 'probably months out',” http://thehill.com/homenews/house/196990-gop-campaign-chief-immigration-vote-probably-months-out#ixzz2rvzjlOyw]

CAMBRIDGE, Md. — **The House GOP campaign chief** on Thursday **said any floor vote on immigration reform is “probably months out,”** **downplaying the possibility that the party will move quickly to legislation** after considering a series of leadership principles this week.¶ “When you lay out a major policy initiative like immigration, **I don’t know when it’s going to appear on the schedule,”** said Rep. Greg Walden (R-Ore.), chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee. “My hunch is it doesn’t come up, you know, tomorrow. It’s probably months out.”¶ Walden, a member of the GOP leadership, cautioned that he does not control the House floor schedule. But he voiced little concern that a push on immigration would bring the political risk of primary challengers for Republican members.¶ **The House is likely to consider its** annual **budget proposal first**, Walden said, meaning **immigration reform would not come up until later in the spring**.¶ “Most of the primaries will have ended by then, and by the time you get to June, most of them are behind you,” he noted.¶ In additional to the substance of legislation, the timing of a move on immigration is the subject of intense debate among Republicans. Some advocates of reform want to move quickly to build momentum and allow time for negotiations with the Senate, while others want to wait until after primary deadlines.¶ **Whether the House will advance legislation at all is unclear**. The leadership is presenting principles to members in a session later Thursday, and the response of the rank and file will determine whether there is a consensus to move forward.¶ Speaking to reporters at the retreat, Rep. Patrick McHenry (R-N.C.) echoed the concerns of other conservatives on immigration, saying that while it was “important” to rally behind principles, it might not be the right time to push further with specific legislation that could split the conference.¶ “I don’t think it’s strategy for us to divide ourselves,” he said.¶ Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.) said he was ready to tackle immigration reform, even if some of his colleagues were not.¶ “I’m willing to take up this issue at any time,” he said.

no path to citizenship

Weigal 1/30

David Weigal, Slate, 1/30 [“House Republicans: No "Special Path" to Citizenship for Illegal Immigrants (Except for DREAMers)” http://www.slate.com/blogs/weigel/2014/01/30/house\_republicans\_no\_path\_to\_citizenship\_for\_illegal\_immigrants\_except\_for.html]

CAMBRIDGE, Md.—ThinkProgress's Igor Volsky and immigration writer David Leopold scooped everyone and obtained the House GOP's statement of principles before they were even released. To those of us at the House Republican retreat, this was inspirational—people back in D.C., plugged into immigration advocacy groups, were beating the people sequestered a quarter-mile from the rooms where congressmen were talking. It's all at the link, but the section on legal status is the lede:¶ **There will be no special path to citizenship for individuals** **who broke** our nation’s **immigration laws** – that would be unfair to those immigrants who have played by the rules and harmful to promoting the rule of law. Rather, **these persons could live legally and without fear** **in the U.S., but only if they were willing to** admit their culpability, **pass rigorous background checks, pay significant fines** and back **taxes, develop proficiency in English** and American civics, **and** be able to **support themselves** and their families (**without** access to **public benefits**).¶ The sidebar is this: "It is time to provide an opportunity for legal residence and citizenship for those who were brought to this country as children through no fault of their own." **That's the DREAM Act**, basically, something controversial enough to be killed in the lame-duck Senate in the winter of 2010, but **something Republicans have** come around to as a **compromise that's** simply **too popular to stop** anymore.¶ Update: Roll Call's Daniel Newhauser has the principles, too, stressing that they're a draft document that could be tweaked. But pro-reform groups were clearly clued in before the leak, and that says volumes.

PC not key—If anything passes, it won’t be because of obama

Jonathan Cohn, The New Republic, 1/28 [“Who You Calling a Lame Duck?” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/116388/state-union-2014-three-ways-obama-can-make-difference]

The prevailing consensus in Washington is that President Obama is done creating public policy. He may have the ambition to do more, the thinking goes, but he doesn’t have the political support. Republicans control the House and have enough votes to block most legislation in the Senate. And at the moment, at least, Obama isn’t popular enough to force them to act.¶ There’s obviously plenty of truth there. Nothing as sweeping as health care reform or the Recovery Act is likely to become law as long as Obama is still president. Given the huge challenges still facing the country—most pressing among them, rising inequality—that's a real tragedy. Obama has some very good ideas. He just can't make Congress pass them**.**¶ But it's not like the president is powerless. He can set the political agenda and, with some careful targeting, he can make some progress. In Tuesday's State of the Union, he highlighted three ways he hopes to do that over the coming year:¶ 1) Pushing legislation that still has a chance. Most Republicans will oppose anything with Obama’s name on it, if only because that’s what their most conservative supporters demand. But there are Republicans who support infrastructure spending in principle, because it benefits their districts and states, and there are Republicans who support immigration reform, because it benefits business and would help repair the GOP’s rift with Latino voters.¶ So far, that support hasn’t been enough to get a law through Congress. But there may yet be opportunities. In the speech, Obama mentioned the need to reauthorize spending on highway and water infrastructure—both easy vehicles for infrastructure spending. He also gave a strong endorsement of immigration reform, an idea that Republican leaders like John Boehner have carefully avoided killing altogether. You wouldn’t want to bet on either one passing, but each has a shot.

Obama’s XO focus has already killed all good will with republicans

Janet Hook, political writer, 1/28 [“Republicans Criticize Obama's Push to Use Executive Power,” http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303553204579349203326044972?mg=reno64-wsj&url=http%3A%2F%2Fonline.wsj.com%2Farticle%2FSB10001424052702303553204579349203326044972.html]

WASHINGTON—President Barack Obama's declaration in Tuesday's State of the Union address that he will resort to using executive power to advance his policy goals drew fire from Republicans who believe he is overreaching his authority.¶ Republican Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers delivers the GOP response the president's State of the Union address. Photo: AP.¶ Mr. Obama's promise to use executive orders to get around a gridlocked Congress exacerbated mounting GOP frustration with previous administrative actionsin areas such as immigration and the health law.¶ "President Obama has this fantasy that he can just use his pen to write laws," said Rep. Steve Scalise (R., La.), chairman of the conservative Republican Study Committee. "We don't have a monarchy in this country—there's an executive branch and the legislative branch, and the president has to work with Congress to get things done."¶ In their official response to the State of the Union, however, Republicans tried to move beyond simply criticizing Mr. Obama, aiming to do more to present voters an alternative policy vision that relies less on government and more on individual initiative.¶ "Tonight I'd like to share a more hopeful, Republican vision—one that empowers you, not the government," Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R., Wash.) said in the official Republican response.¶ Ms. McMorris Rodgers avoided harsh rhetoric, but said, "Tonight the president made more promises that sound good, but won't solve the problems actually facing Americans.¶ "The president talks a lot about income inequality,'' she said. "But the real gap we face today is one of opportunity inequality."¶ Ms. McMorris Rodgers is the highest-ranking woman in the House GOP leadership, chosen for the nationally televised speaking role at a time when the GOP is trying to bolster its standing among women. She is less prominent than other Republicans chosen for the response in recent years, including presidential hopefuls like Rep. Paul Ryan (R., Wis.) and Sen. Marco Rubio (R., Fla.).¶ Her comments come one day after Republican lawmakers made an effort to present a clear policy alternative on a key issue. Senate Republicans on Monday unveiled a comprehensive bill to replace Mr. Obama's health law with a more market-oriented health-care system. After years of trying to repeal the law, Republicans have offered few such detailed proposals to describe how they would replace it.¶ "Republicans believe health-care choices should be yours, not the government's," said Ms. McMorris Rodgers, who is the mother of three young children, including one with Down syndrome.¶ Ms. McMorris Rodgers wasn't the only Republican given a microphone to respond to the president. Sen. Mike Lee (R., Utah) was invited to respond by the Tea Party Express, a group that presses conservative causes that for several years has offered a State of the Union response separately from the official GOP.¶ "The test of any political movement is not what that movement is against, but what it is for,'' Mr. Lee said in remarks prepared for broadcast after Mr. Obama's speech. Mr. Lee argued that Mr. Obama's policies have exacerbated income inequalities that the president now decries.¶ Another tea-party hero, Sen. Rand Paul (R., Ky.) gave a separate webcast response. Meanwhile, yet another GOP response was given—in Spanish—by Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Florida, which was set to air on Spanish-language channels and the GOP website after the official GOP response in English.¶ Congressional Democrats welcomed Mr. Obama's willingness to find ways to circumvent Republican opposition to his policy goals.¶ "He's not going to be constrained by the gridlock, inaction and negativity of the Congress of the United States, particularly the Republicans, who have had a very negative agenda," House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D., Md.) said.¶ Some Republicans who welcomed policy prescriptions in Mr. Obama's speech were put off by his talk of acting unilaterally.¶ "While I'm pleased the president supports immigration reform and is finally focusing on trade, circumventing Congress won't foster job creation and won't result in economic growth," said Sen. Jeff Flake (R., Ariz.).¶ Mr. Obama's promise to counter congressional gridlock by using his "pen and phone" to advance policies through administrative action isn't new.¶ Faced with gridlock on immigration legislation, Mr. Obama in 2012 took executive action to block deportation of many young immigrants who were brought to the U.S. as children. Over the last year, he has acted unilaterally to delay implementation of elements of the health law—including a decision to allow insurance companies to continue, rather than cancel, individual policies that didn't meet the law's minimum-coverage standards.¶ Those moves outraged Republicans who saw them as illegitimate moves to circumvent opposition of Congress. "The abuse of power by the administration has only become more brazen," Sen. Ted Cruz (R., Texas) said.

No links – GSA gots the aff

Combs 1 Window on State Government - Susan Combs, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts 2001 State Functions at the Texas-Mexico Border and Cross-Border Transportation http://www.window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/border/sfatb2.html

II. Responsibilities of Governmental Agencies and Private Entities at the Texas-Mexico Border Crossings Several U.S. and Mexican federal, state, and local governmental and non-governmental agencies have direct and indirect roles in the Texas-Mexico border crossing process. These agencies regulate the process, enforce laws and regulations, or facilitate the safe movement of cargo and people into the United States. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) provides and maintains the port of entry facilities used by the federal inspection agencies and state and local agencies. GSA owns all the border stations—except for the Starr-Camargo International Bridge—and is responsible for their design and operation. The federal and state agencies operating in the border station pay rent to GSA based on the amount of space they require.[18] U.S. Federal Agencies The U.S. Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Services are the primary federal agencies controlling the northbound, from Mexico into the U.S., border crossing process. They conduct primary and secondary inspections of drivers, passengers, vehicles, and cargo. Inspectors from both agencies have been authorized to perform primary inspections for both customs and immigration purposes. Primary inspections are always conducted at the border crossing. A primary inspection includes quick reviews of personal identification and citizenship, cargo documentation, and vehicle inspection. Secondary inspections are conducted at border crossing lots. Secondary inspections include more detailed reviews of cargo documentation, cargo, and drivers.

Winners win and PC not key

Michael Hirsch 2/7 chief correspondent for National Journal. He also contributes to 2012 Decoded. Hirsh previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau. He was also Newsweek’s Washington web editor and authored a weekly column for Newsweek.com, “The World from Washington.” Earlier on, he was Newsweek’s foreign editor, guiding its award-winning coverage of the September 11 attacks and the war on terror. He has done on-the-ground reporting in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other places around the world, and served as the Tokyo-based Asia Bureau Chief for Institutional Investor from 1992 to 1994. <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will have no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.” ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.) And then there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either. At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country. Bush failed utterly, of course. But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital. Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. The problem was that whatever credibility or stature Bush thought he had earned as a newly reelected president did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it. The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls. THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said. Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington. Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories. In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction. Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.” Obama himself learned some hard lessons over the past four years about the falsity of the political-capital concept. Despite his decisive victory over John McCain in 2008, he fumbled the selling of his $787 billion stimulus plan by portraying himself naively as a “post-partisan” president who somehow had been given the electoral mandate to be all things to all people. So Obama tried to sell his stimulus as a long-term restructuring plan that would “lay the groundwork for long-term economic growth.” The president thus fed GOP suspicions that he was just another big-government liberal. Had he understood better that the country was digging in against yet more government intervention and had sold the stimulus as what it mainly was—a giant shot of adrenalin to an economy with a stopped heart, a pure emergency measure—he might well have escaped the worst of the backlash. But by laying on ambitious programs, and following up quickly with his health care plan, he only sealed his reputation on the right as a closet socialist. After that, Obama’s public posturing provoked automatic opposition from the GOP, no matter what he said. If the president put his personal imprimatur on any plan—from deficit reduction, to health care, to immigration reform—Republicans were virtually guaranteed to come out against it. But this year, when he sought to exploit the chastened GOP’s newfound willingness to compromise on immigration, his approach was different. He seemed to understand that the Republicans needed to reclaim immigration reform as their own issue, and he was willing to let them have some credit. When he mounted his bully pulpit in Nevada, he delivered another new message as well: You Republicans don’t have to listen to what I say anymore. And don’t worry about who’s got the political capital. Just take a hard look at where I’m saying this: in a state you were supposed to have won but lost because of the rising Hispanic vote. Obama was cleverly pointing the GOP toward conclusions that he knows it is already reaching on its own: If you, the Republicans, want to have any kind of a future in a vastly changed electoral map, you have no choice but to move. It’s your choice.

Improving POE’s has bipartisan agreement

Ramos 13 Kristian Ramos is New Democracy Network’s Policy Director of the 21st Century Border Initiative, “Realizing the Strategic National Value of our Trade, Tourism and Ports of Entry with Mexico” The New Policy Institute is the educational affiliate of the NDN, a think tank based in Washington, DC. May 2013 http://ndn.org/sites/default/files/blog\_files/NPI%20U%20S%20-Mexico%20Trade%20Tourism%20POE%20Report\_0.pdf

Key policies and infrastructure can either help or hinder this enormous economic exchange. Forty-seven U.S.-Mexico land ports of entry facilitate several hundreds of billions dollars in U.S.-Mexico trade every year. Ideally, ports of entry should act as membranes, facilitating healthy interactions (such as legitimate trade and travel) and preventing unhealthy ones (such as illicit drugs, firearms and human smuggling). And ideally much of the actual inspection and clearance should occur “upstream” from the ports. Broad bipartisan agreement has developed on the need to improve our land ports of entry with Mexico. This is because over seventy percent of NAFTA trade flows through these ports of entry as well as an enormous flow of visitors who have a major economic impact on the United States. Twenty-three states have Mexico as their number one or number two trading partner, multiplying jobs in both countries.

## Shunning

#### Weigh consequences—moral absolutism reproduces evil

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

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

#### Hypocrisy Disad - U.S. human rights violations undermines its credibility to push for rights internationally

Halperin 7(Morton H., Testimony to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, “Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy,” 7-12-2007, www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/07/halperin\_testimony.html)

The United States should also actively work with the United Nations and especially the Human Rights Council to help to advance human rights and to protect human rights activists. Here, as elsewhere, we need to recognize that by failing to observe internationally recognized human rights ourselves we reduce American credibility to champion human rights for others. I understand that many in the Congress and elsewhere are troubled by the first year of operations of the new Council. I share those concerns. However, it is far too soon to give up on the Council or to cut its funding. I am confident that human rights activists in Cuba, Egypt, and Azerbaijan share this view.

#### Other obligations come before shunning—your author

Beversluis 89 (Eric H. April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2)

What kinds of obligations can override the duty to shun? A clear example is the obligation of self-preservation. If to shun the only grocer in town means to starve, then my duty of self-preservation overrides the duty to shun. On the level of relations between states the essential interests of the state have a similar claim. If there are such essential interests of a state (for example, preservation of borders and internal security), then the duty to protect those interests may well override a duty to shun. An argument that too much United States pressure on the Soviet Union regarding human rights would undermine the relationship between these countries necessary for would peace would be of this kind. Another example might be an argument that a nation ought not to alienate a trading partner who is the only source of a vital import. While these arguments might surely be used in bad faith to avoid an inconvenient duty to shun, that does not render them invalid. Thus there may be, but need not be any hypocrisy or inconsistency in shunning one nation for a certain attack on the moral order but not shunning another for an equally serious attack
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#### No turns case

Gelb, 11 – (Leslie H. Gelb, president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, a former senior official in the State and Defense Departments,10/25/11, We Bow to the God Bipartisanship, nationalinterest.org/print/article/we-bow-the-god-bipartisanship-6048

Contrary to Gates’s Holy Grail sentiments and to most homilies to bipartisanship, Dean Acheson tagged the practice a “magnificent fraud.” As President Truman’s secretary of state and thus one of its earliest practitioners, he knew of what he spoke. In a 1971 interview at the Truman Library, Acheson offered a taste of his usual rough-and-tumble candor: The question, who is it bad for, and who is it good for, is what you ought to put your mind on. . . . No, I wouldn’t be too serious about bipartisanship. It’s a great myth that ought to be fostered. And don’t bring too damn much scholarship to bear on it. You’ll prove it out of existence if you’re not careful. The intent here is not to slaughter the sacred cow, but to reduce its high-flying levitation, thereby giving its Washington worshippers a better view of when bipartisanship might be useful and harmful—and to whom. Presidents seek bipartisanship to tamp down domestic critics and to convince foreign leaders that they cannot outlast or undermine presidential policies—as happened with Hanoi during the Vietnam War, Moscow during arms-control talks of the Cold War and the Taliban in the current war in Afghanistan. But in these and many other cases, bipartisan backing at home has too often been purchased at the price of good policy abroad. When worrying too much about bipartisanship, presidents also would do well to reflect on their vast powers to make foreign policy, powers to act as they think best—even in the face of serious political attacks. My concern is that Gates and many others have so inflated bipartisanship’s centrality that it has become a distraction from, and detriment to, making good policy. And if it is greater political support presidents are seeking, they’d find it better in the results of smart thinking than in compromised positions. Good policy enhances the chances of success abroad, which in the end is good politics as well.

#### Politics DA isn’t true

**Matthews, 12 –** (Jason Matthews, Director of Congressional and Public Affairs at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. November 9, 2012. “Interview with Jason Matthews,” http://debateandtherealworld.com/article.php?id=6)//SDL

D+TRW: Is it possible that the passage of legislation unrelated to the fiscal cliff negotiations during the lame duck session might disrupt efforts to avoid the fiscal cliff?¶ Matthews: That is virtually impossible. The discussions on fiscal cliff will be occurring at the leadership level. Only a very narrow element of the Congress will be involved in the discussions and negotiations. The Congress routinely is working on two or three major pieces of legislation for floor consideration within its various standing committees or conference committees with the other chamber. The whole committee structure of the Congress was created to allow legislation in a variety of areas to be considered and disposed of simultaneously.

#### Aff isn’t noticed by Obama and costs NO political capital

**Ham, 11 –** (Shane Ham, former senior analyst at the Progressive Policy Institute, November 9, 2011. “Interview with Shane Ham” http://debateandtherealworld.com/article.php?id=7)//SDL

Ham: Political capital is not an amount in a savings account; it is better thought of as the limits of a president's time and attention. When Obama was fighting for his health care plan, it used virtually all of his capital, but there are thousands of initiatives pushed by the White House each year that go unnoticed by the president, the press, and most members of Congress. A small-scale diplomatic initiative would probably only be noticed by the relevant committee chairs, if at all. As long as the chairs get a piece of the pie, most likely in the form of naming some of the participants in the exchange program themselves, Obama would not waste a minute of his time on the issue. It wouldn't cost Obama any political capital, because almost nobody would know the program exists.