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### 1ac – china

#### Shut down nearly decimated investor confidence in Mexican export industry—

Paterson 10-11-13 Kent Paterson, Frontera NorteSur // October 11, 2013 // Business & Technology “U.S. crisis unsettles Mexico” [http://newspapertree.com/articles/2013/10/11/us-crisis-unsettles-mexico] [MG]

The partial shutdown of the U.S. government is unsettling the Mexican economy. As the crisis took shape last week, the Mexican peso dipped to 13.34 units per dollar, an amount which represented the second largest depreciation in 2013. The pending October 17 showdown over the U.S. debt limit is likewise contributing to the jitters, said Gabriela Siller, an analyst for Mexico-based Banco Base. In the Mexico-U.S. border region, Mexican business leaders expressed worry that the political gridlock on the Potomac could deepen and trigger devastating consequences on the assembly-for-export, or maquiladora, industry. In Ciudad Juarez and other border cities, the foreign-owned maquiladora sector constitutes a dominant or major part of the economy. Longer export times, reduced market demand and idled assembly lines are among the concerns voiced by Ciudad Juarez business representatives. “The economy is flowing at the moment, but we don’t know how it is going to behave at the end of the year,” said Rodolfo Martinez Garza, president of the Association of Customs Agents in Ciudad Juarez. Martinez added that the last quarter of the year is the biggest season of import-export activity, and that unstable economic circumstances could result in stagnation. “There is a lot of uncertainty for investment and this is very negative for Ciudad Juarez,” Martinez said. According to Mexico’s National Council of the Maquiladora Industry and Export Manufacturing, any effects of the U.S. shutdown should be measurable in industrial production after October 20. Thomas Fullerton, economist for the University of Texas at El Paso, said the impacts of the U.S. government shutdown on the maquildora industry – which also supports thousands of jobs in his city – could be worse than the previous one in 1995-96 because of the still-incomplete recovery from the 2008 economic crash. The U.S. crisis comes at a time when worries already exist over the state of the Mexican economy and the tax reform looming in the Mexican Congress, including a possible hike in the border region sales tax from its current 11 percent to 16 percent. In Ciudad Juarez, many business, community and political leaders oppose the sales tax hike and warn of an outflow of pesos to neighboring Texas and New Mexico, where sales taxes are much lower, if the Mexican Congress increases the tax this fall under the proposal advanced by the Pena Nieto administration. This week, a coalition of popular organizations, tire and used car industry groups delivered at petition with 12,733 signatures against the sales tax hike to Congresswoman Martha Beatriz Cordoba. A member of the Citizen Movement party, Corboba has emerged as a leader against a higher tax. The political turmoil and debates in both Washington and Mexico City occur at a moment when indicators reveal some adverse trends in the Mexican economy. On October 8, the International Monetary Fund projected that Mexico’s 2013 growth rate would be a mere 1.2 percent – far less than the growth in the 3 percent range widely predicted earlier in the year. In the Latin American and Caribbean group of nations, Mexico’s growth performance puts it in the same general camp this year as Brazil, Venezuela and Jamaica. Agustin de la Torre, chief economist for the World Bank, was surprised by the weak Mexican growth report. “We do not have an easy explanation on why Mexico did not recuperate,” de la Torre said. “Without a doubt, there is an enormous contrast between the perception that investors have of Mexico in light of structural reforms on the one hand and the low growth this year on the other.”

#### Neito tax reform uniquely places sustainability at risk—

Replogle 9-20-13 Jill Replogle, Fronteras Reporter, KPBS “Mexico Fiscal Reform Could Be Bad For Maquiladoras” [<http://www.kpbs.org/news/2013/sep/20/mexico-fiscal-reform-could-be-bad-maquiladoras/>] [MG]

The maquiladora export industry that’s a key component of the U.S.-Mexico border economy could face major changes under proposed reforms to Mexico’s tax system. Mexico currently collects fewer taxes from its citizens and companies than almost any other developed country. Mexico relies heavily on revenues from its state-run oil industry, which is in decline. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto wants to change this. One way he wants to do it is by tightening control over the country’s vast maquiladora export industry. Factories that make and export goods to the U.S. and other foreign markets currently don’t pay taxes on their raw materials and machinery. But that would change under the proposed reform. Maquiladoras would have to pay the normal 16 percent sales tax on their raw materials and then request a refund of that money when they export the final product. That would require exporters to invest a lot more cash up front, said Héctor Vega, a tax partner with Deloitte Mexico. It could erase some of the advantage Mexico has over its manufacturing competitors, Vega said. “Because we are very close to the U.S., it’s very natural doing business,” he said. “However, this 16 percent will impact a lot and maybe determinate where you put your investment, either in China, either in Vietnam, either in Malaysia or keep it in Mexico.” Still, Vega is hopeful that the tax change affecting maquiladoras will ultimately be stripped from the final fiscal reform bill.

#### Collapse threatens national security—altering engagement policy is critical to sustain it

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011 [MG]

The Mexican maquiladora industry is rapidly losing market share to Asian competitors that dramatically undercut them in terms of labor cost. The decline of these assembly-for-export factories will result in instability along the U.S.-Mexico border and will prove to be a serious national security issue for the United States. This paper leverages Design theory to frame the problems surrounding Mexico’s maquiladora industry in order to develop an understanding of this complex adaptive system. It examines the wide range of actors involved in the system, focusing on their goals, motivations and conflicting tendencies. Finally, the paper recommends courses of action for U.S. and Mexican leaders that will mitigate the resulting instability in the Mexican northern border states. The economic stability of Mexico will always be a national security priority for the United States. The two nations share a border of nearly 2,000 miles, and trade between them is worth billions of dollars. To take advantage of this relationship, the Mexican government created a series of customs and trade policies specifically designed to enhance its economic ties to the U.S. For decades, such policies greatly benefited Mexico’s maquiladoras, factories that import raw materials, rapidly combine them into finished products, and export them to the American market. Unfortunately for Mexico, the strong advantages in low-cost labor and speedy delivery are gradually being eroded by similar programs in China and Southeast Asia. As U.S. companies look to Asia for more profitable business relationships, the Mexican government has done little to alter its customs and trade policies in response. A severe economic blow to the maquiladoras along the U.S. border would have dramatic effects on the stability of the area, affecting both Mexican and American national security interests. The governments of Mexico and the United States should therefore take preemptive measures to mitigate the instability that is arising as the maquiladoras lose their viability under new global economic pressures. These measures include altering customs and trade policies, providing economic incentives in order to transform the Mexican export industry, and creating labor opportunities for Mexicans within the United States. In order to support this thesis, the following paper will leverage Design Theory to examine the current situation in the Mexican maquiladora industry, identify problems in terms of potential impacts to U.S. national security, and propose possible courses of action for both American and Mexican decision-makers.

#### This threatens the entire relationship and causes industries to shift toward China—

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011

The Problem Frame highlights the issues that must be addressed in order to transform current conditions into the desired end state.25 In this case, the desired end state is a more stable economy in the northern Mexican states, free from the current stress brought about by the decline in the maquiladora industry. Since 60% of Mexican maquiladoras operate in the border states, this end state is a key factor in the stability of the border area for both the United States and Mexico.26 Additionally, 80% of all Mexican exports are to the United States, making this relationship extremely important.27 It is in the best interest of these nations to take action to reach this end state. In order to develop future courses of action that create conditions conducive for the desired end state, the current challenges that currently exist in this system must be examined. The three major challenges to reaching the desired end state are connected to flaws in the Mexican export industry, specifically its inability to respond to global competition, its overreliance on the American market, and its lack of complexity. A fourth challenge is connected to the free flow of labor in this region. These challenges are obstacles in the path to a stable and secure northern Mexico. First of all, Mexico’s response to increased competition for its maquiladoras has been completely inadequate. Over the past decade, China has presented an attractive alternative to Mexican maquiladoras in terms of labor costs. In 2008, Chinese hourly manufacturing wages were estimated nearly 75% cheaper than those in Mexico.28 For over a decade, Chinese factories have been able to assemble goods of equal quality as the maquiladoras, but now they can provide greater quality control and better physical infrastructure.29 As drug violence continues in Mexico, security has become a greater decision point for businesses as well, and many are concerned that investing in Mexico is a risk.30 Mexico’s two main responses to this situation have been extremely inadequate and have not improved the overall situation. The Mexican government’s first response was to escalate anti-Chinese rhetoric, even working to delay China’s entry into the World Trade Organization.31 This merely delayed the inevitable and resolved nothing. Later, driven by the need to compete with China, Mexican factories laid off personnel and cut worker salaries in order to reduce labor costs.32 Considering the weak global economy, this unfortunate move added pressure to an already-stressed workforce. The resultant increases in unemployment and underemployment, combined with reduced salaries, will increase instability in the region as people are driven to crime, either as victims or participants.33

#### US reliance on Chinese technology for military purposes undermines its capability and allows for Chinese espionage

Snyder 5/29/13 – (Michael, “Why The Next War With China Could Go Very Badly For The United States”, http://www.infowars.com/why-the-next-war-with-china-could-go-very-badly-for-the-united-states/)//javi

Another way that China is gaining a strategic advantage over the U.S. is by getting the U.S. military to become increasingly dependent upon them. According to Forbes, now the U.S. military is even leasing a Chinese satellite for communications purposes… American dependence on China grows by the day. The latestnews is that the United States has been reduced to leasing a Chinese satellite to handle communications with U.S. military bases in Africa. Surprising, isn’t it? The nation that launched the world’s first communications satellite (I remember it well – it was called Telstar) has so lost its manufacturing mojo that it has to rely on its most formidable military adversary to provide the hardware for some of its most sensitive communications. This at a time when underlying unemployment rates among U.S. manufacturing workers remain at near-depression levels. Isn’t that crazy? And a recent Senate report discovered that many of our most advanced weapons systems are absolutely riddled with counterfeit Chinese parts… A recent Senate report, titled Inquiry Into Counterfeit Electronic Parts In The Department Of Defense Supply Chain, “uncovered overwhelming evidence of large numbers of counterfeit parts making their way into critical defense systems.” The investigation found 1,800 cases of counterfeit electronic parts involving over one million suspect parts in 2009-10 alone, thereby exposing “a defense supply chain that relies on hundreds of unveiled independent distributors to supply electronic parts for some of our most sensitive systems.” The report concluded, among other things, that China is the “dominant source” of counterfeit products that enter the DoD supply chain, that the Chinese government does little to stop it and that the DoD doesn’t know the “scope and impact” of these parts on critical defense systems. Who in the world would be stupid enough to allow one of their greatest strategic enemies to supply large numbers of parts for key weapons systems? Apparently we are that stupid. Things are particularly bad when it comes to semiconductors… Senator John McCain commented: “We can’t tolerate the risk of a ballistic missile interceptor failing to hit its target, a helicopter pilot unable to fire his missiles, or any other mission failure because of a counterfeit part.” Calling the issue “a ticking time bomb,” Brian Toohey, president of the Semiconductor Industry Association, commented: “The catastrophic failure risk inherently found in counterfeit semiconductors places our citizens and military personnel in unreasonable peril.” It would be bad enough if we just had to worry about counterfeit parts failing. But what if China has a way to shut some of those parts down in the event of a conflict? What if some of those parts contain “Trojan Horse” computer chips or malware? That may sound crazy, but unfortunately Trojan Horse chips can be extremely difficult to detect. The following is from a recent Forbes article… As the Defense Science Board pointed out, Trojan Horse circuitry is almost impossible to detect even with the most rigorous analysis. This is particularly so if a saboteur can accomplish matching subversions in both software and relevant hardware.

#### Chinese espionage is the biggest internal link to Chinese military modernization

U.S.-China ESRC 7 – U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission[Report to Congress-The Commission was made up of members of the 110th Congress, 1st Session, November, <http://www.uscc.gov/annual_report/2007/report_to_congress.pdf>The pace and success of China’s military modernization continue to exceed U.S. government estimates**.** Indeed, on occasion the U.S. defense and intelligence communities have been taken by surprise, 7 as in the case of the launching of the Jin class submarine by the navy of the People’s Liberation Army. China’s defense industry is producing new generations of weapon platforms with impressive speed and quality, and these advancements are duein partto the highly effective manner in which Chinese defense companies are integrating commercial technologies into military systems. Additionally, industrial espionage provides Chinese companies an added source of new technology without the necessity of investing time or money to perform research. Chinese espionage in the United States, which now comprises the single greatest threat to U.S. technology, is straining the U.S. counterintelligence establishment. This illicit activity significantly contributes to China’s military modernization and acquisition of new capabilities.

#### US can no longer win the war due to Chinese tech advancement through espionage

Snyder 5/29/13 – (Michael, “Why The Next War With China Could Go Very Badly For The United States”, http://www.infowars.com/why-the-next-war-with-china-could-go-very-badly-for-the-united-states/)//javi

Most Americans assume that the U.S. military is so vastly superior to everyone else that no other nation would ever dream of fighting a full-scale war against us. Unfortunately, that assumption is dead wrong. In recent years, the once mammoth technological gap between the U.S. military and the Chinese military has been closing at a frightening pace. China has been accomplishing this by brazenly stealing our technology and hacking into our computer systems. The Pentagon and the Obama administration know all about this, but they don’t do anything about it. Perhaps the fact that China owns about a trillion dollars of our national debt has something to do with that. In any event, today China has the largest military in the world and the second largest military budget in the world. They have stolen plans for our most advanced jets, helicopters, ships and missile systems. It is estimated that stealing our technology has saved China about 25 years of research and development. In addition, China is rapidly developing a new generation of strategic weapons that could potentially enable it to actually win a future war against the United States. At one time such a notion would have been unthinkable, but as you will see below, the next war with China could go very badly for the United States.

#### Chinese military modernization causes nuclear war

Twomey 9, co-directs the Center for Contemporary Conflict and is an assistant professor in the Department of National Security Affairs, both @ the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA, 9 [Christopher, Arms Control Association, “Chinese-U.S. Strategic Affairs: Dangerous Dynamism, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009\_01-02/china\_us\_dangerous\_dynamism#Twomey]

China and the United States are not in a strategic weapons arms race. Nonetheless, their modernization and sizing decisions increasingly are framed with the other in mind. Nuclear weapons are at the core of this interlocking pattern of development. In particular, China is the only permanent member of the UN Security Council expanding its arsenal; it is also enhancing its arsenal. The basic facts of Chinese strategic modernization are well known, if the details remain frustratingly opaque. China is deploying road-mobile, solid-fueled missiles, giving it a heighted degree of security in its second-strike capability. It is beginning to deploy ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs). It is researching a wide range of warhead and delivery systems technologies that will lead to increased accuracy and, more pointedly, increased penetration against ballistic missile defenses. The size of China's deliverable arsenal against the United States will undoubtedly increase beyond the few dozen that it possessed recently.[1] The pace of growth thus far has been moderate, although China has only recently developed reliable, survivable delivery systems. The final endpoint remains mired in opacity and uncertainty, although several score of deliverable warheads seems likely for the near term. These developments on the strategic side are coupled with elements of conventional modernization that impinge on the strategic balance.[2] The relevant issue, however, is not simply an evaluation of the Chinese modernization program, but rather an evaluation of the interaction of that modernization with U.S. capabilities and interests. U.S. capabilities are also changing. Under the provisions of START and SORT, the United States has continued to engage in quantitative reductions of its operational nuclear arsenal. At the same, there is ongoing updating of warhead guidance and fusing systems. Ballistic missile defense systems of a variety of footprints are being deployed. The U.S. SSBN force now leans more toward the Pacific than the Atlantic, reversing the Cold War deployment. Guam's capacity to support heavy bombers and attack submarines has been enhanced. Furthermore, advances in U.S. conventional weaponry have been so substantial that they too promise strategic effects: prompt global strike holds out the promise of a U.S. weapon on target anywhere in the world in less than an hour and B-2s with highly accurate weapons can sustain strategic effects over a campaign. What are the concerns posed by these two programs of dynamic strategic arsenals? Most centrally, the development of the strategic forces detailed above has increasingly assumed an interlocked form. The U.S. revolution in precision guided munitions was followed by an emphasis on mobility in the Chinese missile force. U.S. missile defense systems have clearly spurred an emphasis on countermeasures in China's ICBM force and quantitative buildups in its regional missile arsenals.[3] Beijing's new submarine-based forces further enhance the security of China's second-strike capability in the face of a potential U.S. strike but are likely to lead to increased attention to anti-submarine warfare in the United States. China's recent anti-satellite test provoked a U.S. demonstration of similar capabilities. Such reciprocal responses have the potential to move toward a tightly coupled arms race and certainly have already worsened threat perceptions on each side. The potential for conflict is not simply that of inadvertent escalation; there are conflicts of interests between the two. Heightening threat perceptions in that context greatly complicates diplomacy. Further, the dangers of inadvertent escalation have been exacerbated by some of these moves. Chinese SSBN deployment will stress an untested command-and-control system. Similar dangers in the Cold War were mitigated, although not entirely overcome, over a period of decades of development of personnel and technical solutions. China appears to have few such controls in place today. U.S. deployment of highly accurate nuclear warheads is consistent with a first-strike doctrine and seems sized for threats larger than "rogue" nations. These too would undermine stability in an intense crisis.

### 1ac – plan

#### The United States federal government ought to offer financial assistance toward the assembly-for-export industry in Mexico.

### 1ac – manufacturing

#### Foreign investment is key to evolve factories technologically—

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011

A third challenge associated with this system concerns the lack of complexity of the production performed by the maquiladoras. The vast majority of maquiladoras conduct simple assembly, so the factories involved are tooled for basic production, and the employees only have basic skills. This drastically limits the ability of both the factories and their employees to adjust to new forms of production as the maquiladoras fall to foreign competitors. This industry is so tightly tied to specific customers in the U.S. that a transition to some other form of production would require massive changes in structure and labor. The Mexican government understands this as a problem and seeks to drive the evolution of so-called “first generation” maquiladoras to second and third generation models. The first generation maquiladoras are the least complex and simply assemble raw materials. Foreign investment brings with it technology, and, with this technology, the maquiladoras evolve into more complex factories that eventually focus less on labor intensity and more on more sophisticated products, R&D and even product design.39 Unfortunately, there are few examples of this trend, and many critics complain that the entire concept of the maquiladora “traps developing countries into the deadend role of providing cheap labor for low value-added assembly operations.”40

#### US financial assistance is key for manufacturing

Villarreal 8/9/12 – (M. Angeles, “U.S.-Mexico Economic Relations: Trends, Issues, and Implications”, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32934.pdf)//javi

Foreign direct investment (FDI) has been an integral part of the economic relationship between the United States and Mexico since NAFTA implementation. FDI consists of investments in real estate, manufacturing plants, and retail facilities, in which the foreign investor owns 10% or more of the entity. The United States is the largest source of FDI in Mexico. The stock of U.S. FDI increased from $17.0 billion in 1994 to $91.4 billion in 2011, a 440% increase (see Table 4). Mexican FDI in the United States is much lower than U.S. investment in Mexico, with levels of Mexican FDI fluctuating over the last 10 years. In 2010, Mexican FDI in the United States totaled $12.6 billion (see Table 4). The sharp rise in U.S. investment in Mexico since NAFTA is also a result of the liberalization of Mexico’s restrictions on foreign investment in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Prior to the mid-1980s, Mexico had a very protective policy that restricted foreign investment and controlled the exchange rate to encourage domestic growth, affecting the entire industrial sector. Mexico’s trade liberalization measures and economic reform in the late 1980s represented a sharp shift in policy and helped bring in a steady increase of FDI flows into Mexico. NAFTA provisions on foreign investment helped to lock in the reforms and increase investor confidence. Under NAFTA, Mexico gave U.S. and Canadian investors nondiscriminatory treatment of their investments as well as investor protection. NAFTA may have encouraged U.S. FDI in Mexico by increasing investor confidence, but much of the growth may have occurred anyway because Mexico likely would have continued to liberalize its foreign investment laws with or without the agreement. Nearly half of total FDI investment in Mexico is in the manufacturing industry, of which the maquiladora industry forms a major part. (See “Mexico’s Export-Oriented Assembly Plants” below.) In Mexico, the industry has helped attract investment from countries such as the United States that have a relatively large amount of capital. For the United States, the industry is important because U.S. companies are able to locate their labor-intensive operations in Mexico and lower their labor costs in the overall production process.

#### Investment is critical for relations —Key to solve border security, trafficking, and the economy

Rapiey ‘11 Stanley Joseph Rapiey, Department of Defense Civilian “Maquiladoras and National Security: Design Theory as a Guide.” 25, October, 2011 [MG]

The relevant policy drivers for the United States government are preserving stability along its border, curbing illegal immigration, maintaining a strong domestic economy, and building productive relationships with Mexico.20 It should be immediately noted that these goals can come into conflict with one another. For example, although maintaining a thriving economy entails ensuring that U.S. businesses have the opportunity to engage in deals that are the most lucrative, abandoning current relationships with Mexican factories could negatively affect relations between the two countries. Current initiatives to secure the Southern border and curb illegal immigration might also affect how the U.S. interacts with Mexico in the economic or anti-drug arenas. Mexico’s goals are extremely similar to those of the United States. Security and stability along its border, a strong domestic economy, and building strong relations with the U.S. are all high priorities for the Mexican government. Illegal immigration, although a contentious issue for the United States, is not bothersome for Mexico.21 Although nearly identical on the surface, the Mexican goals involve different priorities than those of the U.S. For example, a strong domestic economy for Mexico means a continuance of the large amount of remittances from Mexicans in the United States.22 It also concerns focusing its industry on the production of goods for domestic consumption and focusing on high-tech indigenous models.23 For Mexico, “building strong relations” with the United States involves the receipt of assistance, whereas for the U.S., such relations mean increased cooperation on terrorism and illegal immigration.24 The differences in tendencies and goals for the actors in this system will become the center of analysis during the Problem Frame.

#### Mexican manufacturing is critical to address challenges facing the U.S. – picks up the slack for U.S. manufacturing

Bañuelos et al 12 (Carlos Guzmán Bofill, Ana María Rivas Llamas, Carlos Casas Guerrero, Juan Ángel Vargas Plata, Juan Carlos Téllez Girón Barrón, Luis Anthony Olivé Hawley, Sebastián Escalante Bañuelos, Natalia Herrero Martínez, Izael Mijangos González, June, http://www.promexico.gob.mx/work/models/promexico/Resource/1985/1/images/Aerospace\_CHIHUAHUA\_ENG.pdf)

In the last decade, Mexico has proven that it has the capabilities and talent in advanced manufacturing to supply the international market of the aerospace industry. The integration of design and advanced manufacturing capabilities on a national level prove that the Mexican industry has included high technology and engineering in its processes. Through the projects identified in this Road Map, which involves the efforts of academia, industry and government, Chihuahua will become the leading A+D cluster in Latin America in precision manufacturing for the high-tech industry and dual-use goods. This exercise identified projects and factors that will promote Chihuahua’s ability to attract future high technology investments for the aerospace and defense sector by as well as creating the capabilities to optimize the sector’s industrial competitiveness in the region, such as: the creation of a talent management platform; reducing dependency on the importation of molds, dyes and tooling in the sector; and making better use of future investments that have been encouraged by Mexico’s acceptance in the WA. Chihuahua has been able to determine the right path to reach its maximum potential and become one of Mexico´s most competitive regions in the aerospace sector with a medium- and long-term vision. The road to success has been forged, and the coming years will be bursting with opportunities and new challenges for Chihuahua.

#### Mexico is key – the US can’t solve

Bañuelos et al 12 (Carlos Guzmán Bofill, Ana María Rivas Llamas, Carlos Casas Guerrero, Juan Ángel Vargas Plata, Juan Carlos Téllez Girón Barrón, Luis Anthony Olivé Hawley, Sebastián Escalante Bañuelos, Natalia Herrero Martínez, Izael Mijangos González, June, http://www.promexico.gob.mx/work/models/promexico/Resource/1985/1/images/Aerospace\_CHIHUAHUA\_ENG.pdf)

The United States our major commercial partner is going through a talent crisis due to a lack of engineering graduates, added to constant cuts in defense spending, which complicates the upkeep of its current abilities to research, develop and produce defense and high-tech dual-use items. Mexico has more engineering graduates per capita than the United States and skilled and engineering labor costs are more competitive in Mexico; the technological sophistication of its manufactured goods is above that of BRIC countries such as India and Brazil. These three factors make Mexico the best answer to the issues that affect the United States. The creation of the SCE and Mexico’s acceptance into the WA have laid the foundation to guarantee national surveillance during the export of restricted and dual-use technologies and goods. According to conservative estimates, the WA will enable the national industry to access a potential high-technology export market of close to an additional 11.3 billion dollars per year, added to the potential creation of between 30 and 40 thousand highly paid jobs in the next five years.7 Chihuahua’s advanced manufacturing vocation (landing gears, fuselages, engines, harnesses and precision machining) make it the ideal destination for projects in the A+D cluster. Furthermore, the Federal Government is in negotiations with the US Department of Defense to develop a regional aerospace and defense manufacturing block focused on Buy NAFTA. This could be completed with the signing of a MoU between the US Department of State and the Ministry of National Defense (SEDENA)

#### Manufacturing drives innovation and pharmaceuticals

Swezey 11 (Devon Swezey, Project Director for Breakthrough Institute where he works as an energy and climate policy analyst and Ryan McConaghy, pg online @ <http://thebreakthrough.org/blog/BTI_Third_Way_Idea_Brief_-_Manufacturing_Growth_.pdf>)

New manufacturing thrives on and drives innovation. Manufacturing is a core component of the nation’s innovation ecosystem. Firms engaged in manufacturing re-invest a significant portion of revenues in research and development (R&D). Overall, the manufacturing sector comprises two-thirds 9 of industry investment in R&D and employs nearly 64% of the country’s scientists and engineers. 10 Manufacturers also have unique opportunities to apply new technologies for specialized functions and achieve economies of scale at the plant or firm, 11 making the return on manufacturing R&D significant. The transition to advanced manufacturing will enhance the sector’s role in fostering innovation and developing and commercializing new technologies. Advanced manufacturing industries, including semiconductors, computers, pharmaceuticals, clean energy technologies, and nanotechnology, play an outsized role in generating the new technologies, products, and processes that drive economic growth. Advanced manufacturing is also characterized by the rapid transfer of science and technology into manufacturing processes and products, which in and of itself drives innovation. The research-to-manufacturing process is cyclical, with multiple feedbacks between basic R&D, pre-competitive research, prototyping, product development, and manufacturing. This opens new possibilities for product development and manufacturing. 12

#### Tech innovation solves extinction

Zhong 07, CEO at Jade Bird Dashing, 7-31-7 (Roger, “The Effects and Influences of Technology on Society and Humyn Kind,” http://scienceray.com/technology/applied-science/the-effects-and-influences-of-technology-on-society-and-humyn-kind/”)

The question that persists however, is, “Is technology in fact harming our society as a whole?” Albeit the fact that this is a remarkably intricate question of sorts, it can be answered with a simple answer. The actuality of this situation remains that technology is by no means detrimental to our society here in the United States, civilization throughout the world, or to the greater humynity of the humyn race; instead, it is vital to its survival. Nuclear Technology To illustrate this point, let us first examine an exceedingly significant technological advance of our time, nuclear technology. Nuclear technology is research that involves the reactions of atomic nuclei. It has many vital applications in modern society, the most prominent of which are nuclear weapons, nuclear medicine, and nuclear power. The most controversial of these is, without a doubt, nuclear weapons. First created by the United States in 1945 during World War II, they were developed out of the fear that Nazi Germany would first develop them. A weapon of incredible power, a single nuclear weapon has to potential to decimate, level, and destroy an entire city. The first and only times a nuclear weapon has been used are in World War II, when the United States bombed the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with the “Little Boy” and “Fat Myn” bombs, respectively. The usage of these bombs allowed for the near instantaneous end to the destructive World War II. Although two cities were leveled and many lives were lost, the situation involving the usage of these nuclear weapons is not nearly as negative as one may perceive. Had the bombs not been dropped, Japan would not have surrendered, and it would have without a doubt prolonged the war for months or even years. This would have forced an Allied Forces ground invasion of Japan in an effort to end the war, which would have resulted in the loss of many more people than caused by the deployment of the two nuclear weapons. When you look at the usage of nuclear technology, you must look at the situation from the viewpoint of humyn society as a whole, and not from a standpoint of an individual. While the nuclear bombs destroyed two cities and killed many, they ended a horrific World War II and prevented the loss of many other lives. Today, in more modern terms, nuclear weapons play a huge role in our lives. As citizens of the United States, it is common knowledge that we are guaranteed many degrees of freedoms and rights, but have you ever considered who enforces our right to these freedoms in the world? The military might of the United States is the key to us retaining our democratic freedoms. Being in possession of nuclear weapons is not only a positive thing, it allows for us to be free. By holding an arsenal of nuclear weapons, we have a nuclear deterrent. In this sense, we prevent wars and conflicts from escalating into another World War by instituting world order. By having nuclear technology, we are ensuring the well-being, longevity, and freedoms of the humyn race. Internet Technology Another prominent technological innovation that well represents our society today is the Internet. The Internet is the worldwide, publicly accessible network of interconnected computer networks that transmit data between themselves. It is an extremely large network that consists of countless smaller networks. The World Wide Web is accessible only through this Internet infrastructure which allows us our access to websites, email, file sharing, downloads, and media. As well as being an important provider for us common citizens who wish to access the World Wide Web, the internet serves a much greater purpose. It allows for the sharing of information almost instantaneously between scholars, researchers, and others. It allows for information to be shared from the United States to China in less than a second. Before the times of the internet, the other alternatives to transmit information were not nearly as efficient or effective. The Internet allows for us to, in some ways make the world smaller. In the days of today’s stock markets, financial infrastructure, global news organizations, powerful militarizes, strong governments and big corporations, instantaneous communication is an asset we can not afford to lose. The Internet allows for our society in modern day times to interconnect and promote globalization and information sharing. Medical Technology Perhaps one of the most vital technological advances in our society today is in the field of humyn medicine and health sciences. This field deals with the maintenance, prolongment, and restoration of humyn health through the study, diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease and injury. Medicine is an area where knowledge is obtained, then applied to treatment. It has been around at least as far as the beginning of recorded history, perhaps even farther. Today, modern medicine is practiced within a well-developed framework of health-care infrastructure. Research in the field of medicine has allowed for the development of many new treatments, drugs, medicines, and solutions that have allowed for the dramatic prolongment of the humyn lifespan. Today, with the influence of medicine, the lifespan of the average humyn is only increasing. Medicine in today’s world provides the most vital of all services; it ensures the survival of the humyn race as a whole. Review Now, let us review the implications of technology on our civilization here on Earth as a whole. Could the notion of technology possibly have any basis? Simply put, it does not have any credibility of any sort. Technology itself does not signify any concrete object or thing; instead it collectively portrays humyn kind’s achievements as a whole. Any advancements, abilities, creations, undertakings, views, or knowledge of us as humyns are in essence technology. This definition alone refutes the argument that technology is detrimental. Take for instance the three significant technological advances of the humyn race covered in this article: nuclear technology, the internet, and medicine. Nuclear technology, an important advancement for our society, creates a world order, protects the inhabitants of the world, and ensures the longevity, freedoms, and well-being of the entire humyn race. Also, the internet allows for our society to inter-connect and progress further into enlightenment. Perhaps most important of all, medicine, allows for us to ensure our own survival on this planet. These three technologies well represent technology as a whole, and clearly show that technology is extremely beneficial to our society. Only by advocating and advancing technology, can we as humyns, and as humynity, succeed.

#### Mexican manufacturing key to US aerospace

Mecham 7/16 (Michael is apace writer for Gannett News, California Bureau Chief and correspondent for Congress, Aviation Week, 7/16/13, “Mexico’s Welcome Mat Attracts Aerospace Manufacturers”, <http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/AW_04_01_2013_p44-562383.xml>\)

The aerospace influx has not happened overnight. Its roots date to the mid-1970s when U.S. companies, a mix of multinationals and lower-tier suppliers, began sending basic parts manufacturing and assembly tasks across the border, mostly to border towns like Tijuana and Mexicali but also deeper into the country to cities like Monterrey. Service operations followed, as did company research activities. However, it has been in the past decade that Mexico's aerospace manufacturing growth has mushroomed. Political reform led it to pursue a global free trade agenda vigorously and its 1994 signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta) benefitted Mexico greatly. Still, it took about a decade for the aerospace sector to take off. Until 2004, growth was scattered, says Queretaro state Gov. Jose Calzada. Not anymore. “We've seen incredible changes in just the last five years,” he says The boom times are a testament to Mexico's geography, its embrace of free trade and adoption of legal mechanisms that provide a “soft landing” for foreign-owned factories. Local leaders clear red tape and amaze U.S. and European executives at how quickly they can put up factories. A typical response comes from Peter Huij, a senior Fokker Aerostructures executive in Chihuahua, about how quickly the company went from bare earth in May 2011 to a completed 75,000-sq.-ft. factory in November: “It would be impossible in Europe.” Behind all of this is Mexico's Maquiladora factory system for supporting foreign companies, which allows them to control their own destiny, importing raw materials such as aerospace-quality alloys, or wiring and then exporting the finished product tax-free. Foreign manufacturers commonly turn to a large service provider—Intermex and American Industries Group are leaders for the aerospace sector—that lease buildings to their clients and handle their human resources, tax and other business needs under Mexican law. About 80% of the aerospace companies in Mexico use such services. Of the 36 Maquiladoras registered by the Mexican government last year, six were in aerospace, including a GKN Aerospace plant in Mexicali, Latecoere in Hermosillo, coatings specialist Ellison Surface Technologies and Rolls-Royce turbine supplier JJ Churchill in Guaymas and a fourth division for Zodiac in Chihuahua. Under the Maquiladora system, Mexico allows resident foreign companies to control 100% of their businesses. They do not face the “local partner” rules so common elsewhere that limit foreigners to a maximum 49% share “They make it easy for you to do business down here,” says John Gardner, strategic program manager at Kaman Aerostructures, another newcomer in Chihuahua. “They provide a 'soft landing,' to get a quick startup—a good startup. We got a lot of support up front and afterward.”

#### Aerospace key to hegemony

Lexington Institute 13

[Public policy think tank, “America Is A Superpower Because It Is An Air Power”, 1/24, <http://www.defense-aerospace.com/article-view/release/142016/air-power-makes-america-a-superpower.html>] \*we don’t defend the gendered discourse of this evidence

There is no question that the United States has the best military in the world. The United States is unique in its ability to project military power to multiple regions of the world simultaneously, conduct multiple major combined and joint operations at a time and both defend the homeland and provide ongoing support to civil agencies. Europe, which spends about sixty percent of the U.S. defense budget and actually has more man and woman in uniform, was unable without significant U.S. support to conduct a single, modest campaign in Libya. The U.S. military continues to set the world standard with respect to most major military systems: nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, large deck amphibious warfare ships, nuclear attack submarines, strategic bombers, fifth-generation fighters, air and missile defenses, tanks and armored fighting vehicles and space and airborne ISR. Even though we don’t talk much about it the military’s cyber warfare capabilities are truly impressive. While the U.S. has the best ground, naval and amphibious forces in the world, one thing makes it a 21st Century superpower: its dominance as an air power. The United States alone is capable of deploying its aerial assets anywhere in the world. U.S. air power can hold at risk any target set in any country and can do so from multiple directions. The U.S. Air Force is the only one capable of delivering specially-designed conventional bombs large enough to destroy deeply buried and hardened structures.  Over the past two decades, the U.S. military has repeatedly demonstrated that it can destroy an adversary’s air force and air defenses in a matter of weeks. After that, hostile ground units were toast. The ability to rapidly seize control of the air means that no soldier has died in an air attack since 1953. Over a decade of wars, American air power from the land and sea provided continual responsive fire support for tactical units on the ground. Other nations have fighters and bombers, although America’s are the best. The U.S. also has the largest and most capable fleets of air transports, refueling aircraft and airborne ISR assets in the world. During Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Air Force flew soldiers and heavy armor deep into Iraq to seize a critical target, the Haditha Dam. Since 2001, the Air Force has maintained a continuous air bridge to Afghanistan, more than 8,000 miles from CONUS. U.S. C-17 transports are today flying French troops and equipment into Mali. The U.S. Navy has a fleet of fixed wing transports, the C-2 Greyhounds, specifically for the purpose of moving parts and people to and from its aircraft carriers. The United States has crafted an ISR and strategic warning capability based on a sophisticated array of satellites, manned platforms and unmanned aerial systems.  Dominant air power is about much more than just platforms and weapons. It requires also the trained people and processes to plan and manage air operations, process, exploit and disseminate intelligence, identify targets and plan attacks, move supplies and route transports and repair and maintain complex systems. The U.S. had to send hundreds of targeteers to NATO to support the Libyan operation. Over decades, the U.S. military has developed an unequalled training establishment and set of ranges that ensure the highest quality pilots and other personnel. Finally, the U.S. is the dominant air power in the world because of its aerospace industrial base. Whether it is designing and producing fifth-generation fighters such as the F-22 and F-35, providing an advanced tanker like the new KC-46 or inventing high-flying unmanned aerial systems like the Global Hawk, the U.S. aerospace industry continues to set the bar. In addition, the private and public parts of the aerospace industrial base, often working together based on collaborative arrangements such as performance-based logistics contracts, is able to move aircraft, weapons and systems through the nationwide system of depots, Air Logistics Centers and other facilities at a rate unmatched by any other nation. The ability to rapidly repair or overhaul aircraft is itself a force multiplier, providing more aircraft on the flight line to support the warfighters. The U.S. military can go where it is ordered, respond rapidly to the crisis of the moment, move men, equipment and supplies around the world and dominate any place on the face of the earth as long as it desires because it is dominant in the air. As the Pentagon, Congress and the White House struggle with budget issues that could well require deep cuts to the military, they would be well advised to remember that it is air dominance that enables this country to remain a superpower.

#### The pursuit of hegemony is inevitable, sustainable, and prevents great power war

**Ikenberry, Brooks, and Wohlforth 13** – \*Stephen G. Brooks is Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, \*\*John Ikenberry is Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and Global Eminence Scholar at Kyung Hee University in Seoul, \*\*William C. Wohlforth is Daniel Webster Professor of Government at Dartmouth College (“Lean Forward: In Defense of American Engagement”, January/February 2013, Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138468/stephen-g-brooks-g-john-ikenberry-and-william-c-wohlforth/lean-forward)

Of course, even if it is true that the costs of deep engagement fall far below what advocates of retrenchment claim, they would not be worth bearing unless they yielded greater benefits. In fact, they do. The most obvious benefit of the current strategy is that it reduces the risk of a dangerous conflict. The United States' security commitments deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and dissuade U.S. partners from trying to solve security problems on their own in ways that would end up threatening other states. Skeptics discount this benefit by arguing that U.S. security guarantees aren't necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries from erupting. They maintain that the high costs of territorial conquest and the many tools countries can use to signal their benign intentions are enough to prevent conflict. In other words, major powers could peacefully manage regional multipolarity without the American pacifier. But that outlook is too sanguine. If Washington got out of East Asia, Japan and South Korea would likely expand their military capabilities and go nuclear, which could provoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It's worth noting that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan tried to obtain nuclear weapons; the only thing that stopped them was the United States, which used its security commitments to restrain their nuclear temptations. Similarly, were the United States to leave the Middle East, the countries currently backed by Washington--notably, Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia--might act in ways that would intensify the region's security dilemmas. There would even be reason to worry about Europe. Although it's hard to imagine the return of great-power military competition in a post-American Europe, it's not difficult to foresee governments there refusing to pay the budgetary costs of higher military outlays and the political costs of increasing EU defense cooperation. The result might be a continent incapable of securing itself from threats on its periphery, unable to join foreign interventions on which U.S. leaders might want European help, and vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. Given how easily a U.S. withdrawal from key regions could lead to dangerous competition, advocates of retrenchment tend to put forth another argument: that such rivalries wouldn't actually hurt the United States. To be sure, few doubt that the United States could survive the return of conflict among powers in Asia or the Middle East--but at what cost? Were states in one or both of these regions to start competing against one another, they would likely boost their military budgets, arm client states, and perhaps even start regional proxy wars, all of which should concern the United States, in part because its lead in military capabilities would narrow. Greater regional insecurity could also produce cascades of nuclear proliferation as powers such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan built nuclear forces of their own. Those countries' regional competitors might then also seek nuclear arsenals. Although nuclear deterrence can promote stability between two states with the kinds of nuclear forces that the Soviet Union and the United States possessed, things get shakier when there are multiple nuclear rivals with less robust arsenals. As the number of nuclear powers increases, the probability of illicit transfers, irrational decisions, accidents, and unforeseen crises goes up. The case for abandoning the United States' global role misses the underlying security logic of the current approach. By reassuring allies and actively managing regional relations, Washington dampens competition in the world s key areas, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse in which countries would grow new military capabilities. For proof that this strategy is working, one need look no further than the defense budgets of the current great powers: on average, since 1991 they have kept their military expenditures as A percentage of GDP to historic lows, and they have not attempted to match the United States' top-end military capabilities. Moreover, all of the world's most modern militaries are U.S. allies, and the United States' military lead over its potential rivals .is by many measures growing. On top of all this, the current grand strategy acts as a hedge against the emergence regional hegemons. Some supporters of retrenchment argue that the U.S. military should keep its forces over the horizon and pass the buck to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing rising regional powers. Washington, they contend, should deploy forces abroad only when a truly credible contender for regional hegemony arises, as in the cases of Germany and Japan during World War II and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Yet there is already a potential contender for regional hegemony--China--and to balance it, the United States will need to maintain its key alliances in Asia and the military capacity to intervene there. The implication is that the United States should get out of Afghanistan and Iraq, reduce its military presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia. Yet that is exactly what the Obama administration is doing. MILITARY DOMINANCE, ECONOMIC PREEMINENCE Preoccupied with security issues, critics of the current grand strategy miss one of its most important benefits: sustaining an open global economy and a favorable place for the United States within it. To be sure, the sheer size of its output would guarantee the United States a major role in the global economy whatever grand strategy it adopted. Yet the country's military dominance undergirds its economic leadership. In addition to protecting the world economy from instability, its military commitments and naval superiority help secure the sea-lanes and other shipping corridors that allow trade to flow freely and cheaply. Were the United States to pull back from the world, the task of securing the global commons would get much harder. Washington would have less leverage with which it could convince countries to cooperate on economic matters and less access to the military bases throughout the world needed to keep the seas open. A global role also lets the United States structure the world economy in ways that serve its particular economic interests. During the Cold War, Washington used its overseas security commitments to get allies to embrace the economic policies it preferred--convincing West Germany in the 1960s, for example, to take costly steps to support the U.S. dollar as a reserve currency. U.S. defense agreements work the same way today. For example, when negotiating the 2011 free-trade agreement with South Korea, U.S. officials took advantage of Seoul's desire to use the agreement as a means of tightening its security relations with Washington. As one diplomat explained to us privately, "We asked for changes in labor and environment clauses, in auto clauses, and the Koreans took it all." Why? Because they feared a failed agreement would be "a setback to the political and security relationship." More broadly, the United States wields its security leverage to shape the overall structure of the global economy. Much of what the United States wants from the economic order is more of the same: for instance, it likes the current structure of the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund and prefers that free trade continue. Washington wins when U.S. allies favor this status quo, and one reason they are inclined to support the existing system is because they value their military alliances. Japan, to name one example, has shown interest in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Obama administration's most important free-trade initiative in the region, less because its economic interests compel it to do so than because Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda believes that his support will strengthen Japan's security ties with the United States. The United States' geopolitical dominance also helps keep the U.S. dollar in place as the world's reserve currency, which confers enormous benefits on the country, such as a greater ability to borrow money. This is perhaps clearest with Europe: the EU'S dependence on the United States for its security precludes the EU from having the kind of political leverage to support the euro that the United States has with the dollar. As with other aspects of the global economy, the United States does not provide its leadership for free: it extracts disproportionate gains. Shirking that responsibility would place those benefits at risk. CREATING COOPERATION What goes for the global economy goes for other forms of international cooperation. Here, too, American leadership benefits many countries but disproportionately helps the United States. In order to counter transnational threats, such as terrorism, piracy, organized crime, climate change, and pandemics, states have to work together and take collective action. But cooperation does not come about effortlessly, especially when national interests diverge. The United States' military efforts to promote stability and its broader leadership make it easier for Washington to launch joint initiatives and shape them in ways that reflect U.S. interests. After all, cooperation is hard to come by in regions where chaos reigns, and it flourishes where leaders can anticipate lasting stability. U.S. alliances are about security first, but they also provide the political framework and channels of communication for cooperation on nonmilitary issues. NATO, for example, has spawned new institutions, such as the Atlantic Council, a think tank, that make it easier for Americans and Europeans to talk to one another and do business. Likewise, consultations with allies in East Asia spill over into other policy issues; for example, when American diplomats travel to Seoul to manage the military alliance, they also end up discussing the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Thanks to conduits such as this, the United States can use bargaining chips in one issue area to make progress in others. The benefits of these communication channels are especially pronounced when it comes to fighting the kinds of threats that require new forms of cooperation, such as terrorism and pandemics. With its alliance system in place, the United States is in a stronger position than it would otherwise be to advance cooperation and share burdens. For example, the intelligence-sharing network within NATO, which was originally designed to gather information on the Soviet Union, has been adapted to deal with terrorism. Similarly, after a tsunami in the Indian Ocean devastated surrounding countries in 2004, Washington had a much easier time orchestrating a fast humanitarian response with Australia, India, and Japan, since their militaries were already comfortable working with one another. The operation did wonders for the United States' image in the region. The United States' global role also has the more direct effect of facilitating the bargains among governments that get cooperation going in the first place. As the scholar Joseph Nye has written, "The American military role in deterring threats to allies, or of assuring access to a crucial resource such as oil in the Persian Gulf, means that the provision of protective force can be used in bargaining situations. Sometimes the linkage may be direct; more often it is a factor not mentioned openly but present in the back of statesmen's minds." THE DEVIL WE KNOW Should America come home? For many prominent scholars of international relations, the answer is yes--a view that seems even wiser in the wake of the disaster in Iraq and the Great Recession. Yet their arguments simply don't hold up. There is little evidence that the United States would save much money switching to a smaller global posture. Nor is the current strategy self-defeating: it has not provoked the formation of counterbalancing coalitions or caused the country to spend itself into economic decline. Nor will it condemn the United States to foolhardy wars in the future. What the strategy does do is help prevent the outbreak of conflict in the world's most important regions, keep the global economy humming, and make international cooperation easier. Charting a different course would threaten all these benefits. This is not to say that the United States' current foreign policy can't be adapted to new circumstances and challenges. Washington does not need to retain every commitment at all costs, and there is nothing wrong with rejiggering its strategy in response to new opportunities or setbacks. That is what the Nixon administration did by winding down the Vietnam War and increasing the United States' reliance on regional partners to contain Soviet power, and it is what the Obama administration has been doing after the Iraq war by pivoting to Asia. These episodes of rebalancing belie the argument that a powerful and internationally engaged America cannot tailor its policies to a changing world. A grand strategy of actively managing global security and promoting the liberal economic order has served the United States exceptionally well for the past six decades, and there is no reason to give it up now. The country's globe-spanning posture is the devil we know, and a world with a disengaged America is the devil we don't know. Were American leaders to choose retrenchment, they would in essence be running a massive experiment to test how the world would work without an engaged and liberal leading power. The results could well be disastrous.

#### Instability rising now in Palestine due to failure of bilateral negotiations with Israel

Kouttab 10/10/13 [Alexander Kouttab – reporter for European Council on Foreign Relations; he was an adviser to the Palestinian negotiating team on permanent status negotiations with Israel between 2009 to 2011, “A New Strategy for the Palestinians?”, accessed: 11/3/13, ML]

The last two decades of bilateral negotiations absent a final peace agreement have placed an enormous strain on Palestinian politics and society. If it is still possible to speak of a Palestinian national consensus in support of negotiations, it is fast disappearing. More and more Palestinians are instead calling for a change in strategy and approach. Such calls have a direct bearing on the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP), which neither the Palestinian leadership nor the European Union as a key sponsor and supporter of the MEPP can afford to ignore. Despite all the interim agreements and promises made over the last 20 years, Palestinians are little closer to achieving their core strategic objectives, loosely defined as an end to Israel's occupation, self-determination, and a "just solution" for Palestinian refugees. Nor has the situation on the ground in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs) substantially improved. For many Palestinians, life has become harder - a far cry from the promised dividends of peace. Movement restrictions and closure have become the norm. Social inequalities have grown, poverty rates remain high, and dependency on aid has soared. The strong social bonds that once supported Palestinians through the harshest periods of occupation have largely disappeared, replaced by a rampant individualism at odds with the fragile economic situation most now find themselves in. Many now warn of the diminishing prospects for Palestinian statehood given the pace of Israeli settlement construction over the last two decades, while the bitter political divide between Fatah and Hamas continues to weaken the ability of either party to mount an effective political response to the many challenges Palestinians face. The failure of bilateral negotiations has not only eroded public faith in the MEPP but has also hurt the credibility of the Palestinian leadership, which has consistently aligned itself with them. While a slim majority of Palestinians living in the OPTs continue to support a two-state solution, recent polls conducted by the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research show that most believe it is no longer practical given the extensive presence of Israeli settlements. Less than a third view the Palestinian Authority (PA) positively, while only 31 percent in the West Bank, and 36 percent in the Gaza Strip evaluate their current conditions favourably. Fewer still are optimistic about the future, or Israel's long-term intentions. More than a loss of faith in negotiations, these statistics speak to a crisis of confidence in the very institutions and decision-making most closely associated with them. They highlight the extent to which Palestinian disenchantment goes beyond criticism of any individual or particular decision to include the political status quo in place since 1993. The progressive marginalisation of Palestinians living outside of the OPTs from any meaningful form of engagement in political decision-making over the last 20 years has only exacerbated the sense of disconnect that increasingly exists between ordinary Palestinians and the political structures that represent them. Since 1993, decision-making has progressively become concentrated in the hands of a few, with de facto political power shifting from the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) to the PA, and more recently, to the president's office. This has significantly eroded whatever avenues were once open for Palestinians to influence key political decisions, particularly within the PLO. In concert with this, Palestinian political demands have narrowed to an almost exclusive focus on state building and the more immediate challenges associated with "self-rule" under occupation (with all other issues indefinitely deferred until permanent status negotiations). The signs of a growing crisis of confidence in the political status quo are hard to miss. Across the various forums, websites, and publications that are a staple of Palestinian political life both inside and outside the OPTs, many Palestinians are calling for a return to the drawing board and a reassessment of national strategies and goals. Options being promoted include far reaching reforms to the PLO, new elections for the Palestine National Council, and even the dismantlement of the PA. These are not cosmetic changes. Nor were the demands of protestors involved in anti-government demonstrations held in Ramallah last September, which included calls for senior political figures to resign and for the PLO to walk away from the Oslo Accords altogether.

#### US hegemony makes Arab-Israeli negotiations effective – multilat approaches empirically fail

Kuttab 7/31/13 [Daoud Kuttab - contributing writer for Al-Monitor's Palestine Pulse; Palestinian journalist and media activist, he is a former Ferris Professor of journalism at Princeton University and is currently the director general of Community Media Network, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to advancing independent media in the Arab region. Active in media-freedom efforts in the Middle East, Kuttab is a columnist for The Jordan Times, The Jerusalem Post and The Daily Star in Lebanon, and has co-produced a number of award-winning documentaries and children’s television programs. He has received numerous international awards, including the CPJ Freedom of Expression Award, the Leipzig Courage in Freedom Award and the Next Foundation (UK) Peace through Media Award, “The Kerry Talks: Why the US Needs to Be in the Room”, <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/07/israel-palestine-peace-talks-americans.html>, accessed: 11/3/13, ML]

One of the most abused and repeated claims made in Washington is that the Americans cannot want peace more than the parties in the Middle East. The reason why this statement is so false is that the Americans have had a long history of involvement in the Middle East conflict, almost exclusively on behalf of the Israelis. Whether they want to admit it or not, the United States has for decades sided privately with the Israelis while publicly claiming to be neutral. Serious investigation into the motivation for this bias always points to domestic politics as the major, but not exclusive reason for it. Yet despite the Palestinians' knowledge of the Americans' true position, they have generally wanted the United States to be involved. In fact, they have demanded it. When the Quartet — the European Union, Russia, the United Nations and the United States — proved incapable of making headway against Israeli obstinacy, the Palestinians turned to Washington as the party that could, if it chose to, apply direct or indirect pressure on the Israelis. Having reached this point, the Palestinian leadership decided to maximize use of the United States and insist that American negotiators be present at all levels of the current talks. For the Palestinian side, the idea of trilateral, rather than bilateral, talks changes the dynamics of the negotiations for the better. By getting the United States into the negotiation room, the Palestinians are hoping that Washington will square its public posture — which has been rather fair and in sync with the international position on Palestine — and its real position in shielding Israel from the rest of the world. Palestinian thinking is that through their Arab and Muslim allies, they can help ensure that the Americans remain honest in the talks or bear the fruits of overt bias in the already boiling Middle East. Having US negotiators in the room also provides a sense of continuity that might help ensure that the basic issues of the sovereignty of the Palestinian state, equality of the land swaps (in size and quality) **and** genuine **sharing of Jerusalem** (especially the Old City) are reached. While Palestinians are not expecting absolute fairness from the Americans, they are hoping that the cost of failure, that is, its ramifications on foreign policy and the strategic interests of the United States, is such that it will help produce a fairer US role in these talks. Students of the Arab-Israeli conflict know generally the contours of any viable peace agreement that the majority of Israelis and Palestinians would agree to in a public referendum. Most neutral observers agree that such a result should include a viable, contiguous Palestinian state more or less along the 1967 borders, with small land swaps, primarily exchanging three Israeli settlement blocks and creating a link between Gaza and the West Bank; sharing Jerusalem’s holy places; and a fair and agreed upon (i.e., by Israel) resolution of the Palestinian refugee problem. The Arab Peace Initiative, approved by the Arab League and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, is seen as a reasonable offer, exchanging Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders for normalization of relations with 56 Arab and Islamic countries. The difficulty then is less the actual results of the talks and more how to get the participants to accept these broadly accepted compromises that both people can live with. Having American officials at every step of the way will go a long way toward helping ease the parties (primarily the Israelis) toward a position of accepting these basically foregone conclusions that are widely accepted as the price for peace. As the Israeli occupation continues, and Israeli occupiers show little sign of nearing the end of the 46-year-long nightmare they have caused the Palestinians, increasing numbers of countries are no longer buying the old Israeli excuses. The only remaining superpower has stood by Israel while publicly refusing to abandon the accepted international requirements for peace. Having US officials in the negotiating room will present the Israelis with the difficult choice of accepting the requirements of peace or risk losing their last international friend and ally.

#### That Escalates to Global Nuclear War

Herbert I. London, 10 - President of the Hudson Institute, a New York University based political think tank, and professor of Humanities at New York University, Hudson New York, 6/28/10, http://www.hudson-ny.org/1387/coming-crisis-in-the-middle-east

The coming storm in the Middle East is gaining momentum; like conditions prior to World War I, all it takes for explosive action to commence is a trigger. Turkey's provocative flotilla, often described in Orwellian terms as a humanitarian mission, has set in motion a gust of diplomatic activity: if the Iranians send escort vessels for the next round of Turkish ships, which they have apparently decided not to do in favor of land operations, it could have presented a casus belli. [cause for war] Syria, too, has been playing a dangerous game, with both missile deployment and rearming Hezbollah. According to most public accounts, Hezbollah is sitting on 40,000 long-, medium- and short-range missiles, and Syrian territory has been serving as a conduit for military materiel from Iran since the end of the 2006 Lebanon War. Should Syria move its own scuds to Lebanon or deploy its troops as reinforcement for Hezbollah, a wider regional war with Israel could not be contained. In the backdrop is an Iran, with sufficient fissionable material to produce a couple of nuclear weapons. It will take some time to weaponize the missiles, but the road to that goal is synchronized in green lights since neither diplomacy nor diluted sanctions can convince Iran to change course. From Qatar to Afghanistan all political eyes are on Iran, poised to be "the hegemon" in the Middle East; it is increasingly considered the "strong horse" as American forces incrementally retreat from the region. Even Iraq, ironically, may depend on Iranian ties in order to maintain internal stability. For Sunni nations like Egypt and Saudi Arabia, regional strategic vision is a combination of deal-making to offset the Iranian Shia advantage, and attempting to buy or develop nuclear weapons as a counterweight to Iranian ambition. However, both of these governments are in a precarious state; should either fall, all bets are off in the Middle East neighborhood. It has long been said that the Sunni "tent" must stand on two legs: if one, falls, the tent collapses. Should this tent collapse, and should Iran take advantage of that calamity, it could incite a Sunni-Shia war. Or feeling empowered, and no longer dissuaded by an escalation scenario, Iran, with nuclear weapons in tow, might decide that a war against Israel is a distinct possibility. However implausible it may seem at the moment, the possible annihilation of Israel and the prospect of a second holocaust could lead to a nuclear exchange. The only wild card that can change this slide into warfare is an active United States' policy. Yet, curiously, the U.S. is engaged in both an emotional and physical retreat from the region. Despite rhetoric which suggests an Iran with nuclear weapons is intolerable, the U.S. has done nothing to forestall this eventual outcome. Despite the investment in blood and treasure to allow a stable government to emerge in Iraq, the anticipated withdrawal of U.S. forces has prompted President Maliki to travel to Tehran on a regular basis. Further, despite historic links to Israel that gave the U.S. leverage in the region as well a democratic ally, the Obama administration treats Israel as a national security albatross that must be disposed of as soon as possible. As a consequence, the U.S. is perceived in the region as the "weak horse," the one dangerous to ride. In every Middle East capital the words "unreliable and United States" are linked. Those individuals seeking a moderate course of action are now in a distinct minority. A political vacuum is emerging, one that is not sustainable and one the Iranian leadership looks to with imperial exhilaration.
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### 2ac – apoc

#### The Role of the Ballot is to simulate the enactment of the plan—effective choices regarding Latin American foreign policy require the ability to test the real world outcomes of our scholarship and advocacies.

Baxter 10 (Jorge, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Culture in the Organization of American States, Former Coordinator of the Inter-American Program on Education for Democratic Values and Practices at the OAS, PHD in International Comparative Education and Policy from University of Maryland College Park, “Towards a Deliberative and Democratic Model of International Cooperation in Education in Latin America”, Inter-American Journal of Education for Democracy, 3(2), 224-254, <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/viewFile/1016/1307>, Accessed: 7/30/13)OG

In the context of international¶ education cooperation and international¶ development in Latin America, where¶ there are great asymmetries in power and¶ resources, it seems that this critique could¶ have some validity. However, rather than¶ concluding that deliberation and participation¶ should be reduced, one could conclude (as¶ is argued in this paper) that they should¶ be enhanced and expanded. Those that¶ advocate for a “thicker” democratization in¶ the region would likely advocate for a more¶ substantive approach to deliberation in policy¶ which establishes certain parameters such¶ as “education is an intrinsic human right,”¶ and which would place an emphasis on¶ achieving quality education outcomes¶ for all as the goal. This does not mean that¶ they would not advocate for deliberation but¶ rather would set parameters for deliberation¶ in order to ensure that the outcomes do not¶ lead to “unjust” policy (e.g., a policy that¶ might promote more inequity in education).¶ Those that advocate for a “thinner” approach¶ to democratization would tend to advocate¶ for a procedural approach to deliberation in¶ education policy and would most likely place¶ emphasis on equal opportunity of access¶ to quality education.¶ Instability critique: Education in Latin¶ America suffers from too much instability and¶ is too politicized. Increasing participation and¶ deliberation would only further politicize the¶ situation and polarize those who advocate for¶ educational reform and those who block it.¶ The average term of a minister of education¶ is one-and-a-half years; each time a new¶ minister comes to office, new policies are¶ passed which, according to deliberative¶ democratic theory, would need to be reasoned¶ and debated with citizens. Deliberation in this¶ context would promote even more instability¶ and would lead to further politicization of¶ education reform.¶ Response: Political instability and¶ lack of continuity in policy reform are serious¶ limitations that to some degree are inherent¶ in democratic institutions and processes. The¶ reality is that if any education reform is to¶ succeed in the long term, it needs more than¶ the efforts of governments or international¶ organizations. It needs the sustained support¶ of stakeholders across sectors (public,¶ private, and civil society) and over time. It¶ has been argued that the main problem in¶ basic education in Latin America is the lack¶ of a broad social consensus, recognizing¶ that there is a problem of equity and quality¶ in the provision of education (Schiefelbein,¶ 1997). This lack of broad social consensus¶ is especially challenging where there is, as¶ noted in the critique, a lack of continuity¶ in education reform. Reform in education¶ takes time, sometimes decades. Ensuring¶ continuity in education reform policies is¶ therefore crucial, and this requires public¶ consensus. Deliberative forums convening¶ government, private sector, and civil society¶ groups can contribute to developing this public¶ consensus and to providing more continuity¶ in policy. Deliberative forums combined¶ with collaborative projects can help promote¶ learning, distribute institutional memory,¶ support capacity-building efforts, and bring¶ more resources to bear on the education¶ reform process. Creating a space for citizens¶ to deliberate on the role of education is¶ fundamental for promoting broad social¶ consensus around education reforms. In Latin¶ America, the most innovative and successful¶ reforms have all created multiple and¶ continuous opportunities for diverse groups¶ across the education sector and society to¶ provide input and to have opportunities for¶ meaningful collaborative action. International¶ organizations, leveraging their regional and¶ international position, can contribute by¶ promoting policy dialogue and collaborative¶ actions among ministries and also with key¶ stakeholders across sectors. The challenge¶ is to develop a better understanding of how¶ deliberation can be used to promote more¶ collaborative as opposed to more adversarial¶ and partisan forms of politics. This is perhaps¶ one area which deliberative theorists need to¶ explore more.¶ 5. Power critique: The final critique relates¶ the possibility that increasing deliberation¶ and participation can lead to increased¶ inequality. Fung and Wright (2003) note¶ that deliberation can turn into domination¶ in a context where “participants in these¶ processes usually face each other from¶ unequal positions of power.” Every reform¶ in education creates winners and losers, and¶ very few create “win-win” situations. Those¶ in power would have to submit to the rules of¶ deliberation and relinquish “control” over the¶ various dimensions of democratic decisionmaking.¶ This is naïve and not politically¶ feasible.¶ Response: This is a valid critique¶ worth considering. Structural inequalities¶ and asymmetries of power in governments¶ and international institutions in Latin America¶ have facilitated domination by elites in terms¶ of authority, power, and control in politics.¶ Asymmetries of power in international¶ cooperation in education are also clear,¶ especially when powerful financial (World¶ Bank, IDB, IMF) or political (OAS, UNESCO)¶ organizations engage with local stakeholders¶ and condition policy options with funding¶ or political support. What this paper has¶ argued is relevant again here: that instead of¶ rejecting further democratization in the face¶ of these challenges, including the challenge¶ of elite “domination,” what is needed is more¶ and better democracy, defined in terms of its¶ breadth, depth, range, and control. Finally,¶ dealing with elite domination in international¶ deliberative forums will require conscious and¶ skilled facilitation on the part of international¶ organizations, which themselves are often¶ elitist and hegemonic.¶ Final Thoughts: So What?¶ Perhaps the most critical question¶ that emerges in the argument for increased¶ democratization and deliberation is simply:¶ So what? Does increased democratization and¶ deliberation actually lead to better outcomes¶ in education? More empirical research on this¶ critical question is needed. However, experiments¶ in deliberative democracy in education reform¶ in Brazil through the UNESCO and Ministry of¶ Education Coordinated Action Plan and Porto¶ Alegre‘s Citizen School, and also to some degree¶ at the international level with the OAS pilot¶ experiment in developing a more democratic¶ model of international cooperation from 2001-¶ 2005, have shown that deliberative processes¶ can enhance learning on the part of those¶ participating. Fung and Wright (2003) refer to¶ these experiments in deliberation as “schools¶ of democracy” because participants exercise¶ their capacities of argument, planning, and¶ evaluation. Deliberation promotes joint reflection¶ and consideration of others’ views. Citizens¶ who participate in deliberative forums develop¶ competencies that are important not only for¶ active citizenship (listening, communication,¶ problem-solving, conflict resolution, selfregulation skills) but also crucial for managing¶ change and school reform. Many of the same¶ skills that are developed through citizen¶ deliberation and participation are also essential¶ for transforming school cultures, promoting¶ “learning organizations” (Senge, 2000), fostering¶ communities of reflective practitioners (Schon,¶ 1991) and developing communities of practice¶ (Wenger, 2001). There is evidence from some¶ research that democratic interactions can create¶ knowledge that is more rigorous, precise, and¶ relevant than that produced in authoritarian¶ environments (Jaramillo, 2005). Another¶ important aspect of enhancing deliberative¶ democracy and democratization is that it moves¶ from a focus on individuals and their own¶ preferences towards more collective forms of¶ learning and collaboration.¶ Up to now, international organizations¶ have endorsed a “thin” version of democratization¶ that is content with formal and centralized¶ mechanisms of “representation” and “policy¶ dialogue.” If a new, more deliberative and¶ democratic model of cooperation in education in¶ the region were to emerge, what would it look¶ like?¶ First of all, a more deliberative and¶ democratic model of international cooperation in¶ education would involve more direct and deeper¶ forms of participation from everyday citizens,¶ including teachers, school directors, families,¶ school communities, students, and mesolevel¶ actors such as civil society organizations.¶ This participation would move beyond simple¶ consultation to more authentic forms of joint¶ decision-making and deliberation. The model¶ would involve more accountability on the¶ part of international organizations in terms¶ of transparency, and would require injecting¶ ethical reasoning into policies and programming.¶ In addition, a new more democratic model of¶ international cooperation would expand the¶ range of policy options available to countries¶ through devolution of authority, power, and¶ control, combined with oversight and horizontal¶ accountability mechanisms. A more democratic¶ model of international cooperation would stress¶ valuing, systematizing, and disseminating¶ local knowledge and innovation. Finally,¶ democratization and deliberation in international¶ cooperation in education would lead to enhanced¶ learning and agency on the part of participating¶ countries, groups, and individuals, and thus¶ contribute to better outcomes in terms of quality¶ and equity in education at national and local¶ levels.

#### We get to weigh the aff against an alternative – key to cost benefit analysis and plan focus key to in-depth research

#### Judge choice – we get to weigh advantages that are a good idea

#### Apocalyptic imagery is key to genuine resistance

**Schatz 12** (JL, Binghamton U, "The Importance of Apocalypse: The Value of End-­‐Of-­‐ The-­‐World Politics While Advancing Ecocriticism," The Journal of Ecocriticism: Vol 4, No 2 (2012)

Any **hesitancy to deploy images of apocalypse** out of the risk of acting in a biopolitical manner **ignores** how any particular metaphor—apocalyptic or not—**always risks getting co--‐opted**. *It does not excuse inaction*. Clearly hegemonic forces have already assumed control of determining environmental practices when one looks at the debates surrounding off--‐shore drilling, climate change, and biodiversity within the halls of Congress. “As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems … will go unsolved … only to fester more ominously into the future. … [E]cological crisis … cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context … of internationalized markets, finance, and communications” (Boggs 774). If it weren’t for people such as Watson connecting things like whaling to the end of the world it wouldn’t get the needed coverage to enter into public discourse. It takes big news to make headlines and hold attention spans in the electronic age. Sometimes it even takes a reality TV show on Animal Planet. As Luke reminds us, “Those who dominate the world exploit their positions to their advantage **by defining how the world is known**. Unless they also face resistance, questioning, and challenge from those who are dominated, **they** certainly **will remain the dominant forces**” (2003: 413). Merely sitting back and theorizing over metaphorical deployments does a **grave injustice** to the gains activists are making on the ground. It also **allows hegemonic institutions to continually define the debate** over the environment by framing out any attempt for significant change, whether it be radical or reformist. Only by jumping on every opportunity for resistance can ecocriticism have the hopes of combatting the current ecological reality. This means we must recognize that **we cannot fully escape the master’s house** since the surrounding environment always shapes any form of resistance. Therefore, **we ought to act even if we may get co--‐opted.** As Foucault himself reminds us, “instead of radial ruptures more often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance, producing cleavages in a society that shift about[.] … And it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible, somewhat similar to the way in which the state relies on the institutional integration of power relationships. It is in this sphere of force relations that we must try to analyze the mechanisms of power” (96--‐97). Here Foucault “asks us to think about resistance differently, as not anterior to power, but a component of it. If we take seriously these notions on the exercise and circulation of power, then we … open … up the field of possibility to talk about particular kinds of environmentalism” (Rutherford 296). This is not to say that all actions are resistant. Rather, the revolutionary actions that are truly resistant oftentimes appear mundane since it is more about altering the intelligibility that frames discussions around the environment than any specific policy change. Again, this is why people like Watson use one issue as a jumping off point to talk about wider politics of ecological awareness. Campaigns that look to the government or a single policy but for a moment, and then go on to challenge hegemonic interactions with the environment through other tactics, allows us to codify strategic points of resistance in numerous places at once. Again, this does not mean we must agree with every tactic. It does mean that even failed attempts are meaningful. For example, while PETA’s ad campaigns have drawn criticism for comparing factory farms to the Holocaust, and featuring naked women who’d rather go naked than wear fur, their importance extends beyond the ads alone6. By bringing the issues to the forefront they draw upon known metaphors and reframe the way people talk about animals despite their potentially anti--‐Semitic and misogynist underpinnings. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s theorization of the multitude serves as an excellent illustration of how **utilizing the power of the master’s biopolitical tools can** become powerful enough to **deconstruct** its house **despite the risk of co--‐optation or backlash**. For them, the multitude is defined by the growing global force of people around the world who are linked together by their common struggles without being formally organized in a hierarchal way. While Hardt and Negri mostly talk about the multitude in relation to global capitalism, their understanding of the commons and analysis of resistance is useful for any ecocritic. They explain, [T]he multitude has matured to such an extent that it is becoming able, through its networks of communication and cooperation … [and] its production of the common, to sustain an alternative democratic society on its own. … Revolutionary politics must grasp, in the movement of the multitudes and through the accumulation of common and cooperative decisions, the moment of rupture … that can create a new world. In the face of the destructive state of exception of biopower, then, there is also a constituent state of exception of democratic biopolitics[,] … creating … a new constitutive temporality. (357) Once one understands the world as interconnected—instead of constructed by different nation--‐states and single environments—conditions in one area of the globe couldn’t be conceptually severed from any other. In short, we’d all have a stake in the global commons. Ecocritics can then **utilize biopolitics** to shape discourse and fight against governmental biopower by waking people up to the pressing need to inaugurate a new future for there to be any future. Influencing other people through argument and end--‐of--‐the--‐world tactics is not the same biopower of the state so long as it doesn’t singularize itself but for temporary moments. Therefore, “it is not unreasonable to hope that in a biopolitical future (after the defeat of biopower) war will no longer be possible, and the intensity of the cooperation and communication among singularities … will destroy its [very] possibility” (Hardt & Negri 347). In The context of capitalism, when wealth fails to trickle down it would be seen as a problem for the top since it would stand testament to their failure to equitably distribute wealth. In the context of environmentalism, not--‐in--‐my--‐backyard reasoning that displaces ecological destruction elsewhere would be exposed for the failure that it is. There is no backyard that is not one’s own. Ultimately, **images of planetary doom** demonstrate how we are all **interconnected** and in doing so inaugurate a **new world** where multitudes, and not governments, guide the fate of the planet.

#### Reality outweighs representations and discourse

**Wendt 99**

Alexander Wendt, Professor of International Security at Ohio State University, 1999, “Social theory of international politics,” gbooks

The effects of holding a relational theory of meaning on theorizing about world politics are apparent in David Campbell's provocative study of US foreign policy, which shows how the threats posed by the Soviets, immigration, drugs, and so on, were constructed out of US national security discourse.29 The book clearly shows that material things in the world did not force US decision-makers to have particular representations of them - the picture theory of reference does not hold. In so doing it highlights the discursive aspects of truth and reference, the sense in which objects are relationally "constructed."30 On the other hand, while emphasizing several times that he is not denying the reality of, for example, Soviet actions, he specifically eschews (p. 4) any attempt to assess the extent to which they caused US representations. Thus he cannot address the extent to which US representations of the Soviet threat were accurate or true (questions of correspondence). He can only focus on the nature and consequences of the representations.31 Of course, there is nothing in the social science rule book which requires an interest in causal questions, and the nature and consequences of representations are important questions. In the terms discussed below he is engaging in a constitutive rather than causal inquiry. However, I suspect Campbell thinks that any attempt to assess the correspondence of discourse to reality is inherently pointless. According to the relational theory of reference we simply have no access to what the Soviet threat "really" was, and as such its truth is established entirely within discourse, not by the latter's correspondence to an extra-discursive reality 32 The main problem with the relational theory of reference is that it cannot account for the resistance of the world to certain representations, and thus for representational failures or m/'sinterpretations. Worldly resistance is most obvious in nature: whether our discourse says so or not, pigs can't fly. But examples abound in society too. In 1519 Montezuma faced the same kind of epistemological problem facing social scientists today: how to refer to people who, in his case, called themselves Spaniards. Many representations were conceivable, and no doubt the one he chose - that they were gods - drew on the discursive materials available to him. So why was he killed and his empire destroyed by an army hundreds of times smaller than his own? The realist answer is that Montezuma was simply wrong: the Spaniards were not gods, and had come instead to conquer his empire. Had Montezuma adopted this alternative representation of what the Spanish were, he might have prevented this outcome because that representation would have corresponded more to reality. The reality of the conquistadores did not force him to have a true representation, as the picture theory of reference would claim, but it did have certain effects - whether his discourse allowed them or not. The external world to which we ostensibly lack access, in other words. often frustrates or penalizes representations. Postmodernism gives us no insight into why this is so, and indeed, rejects the question altogether.33 The description theory of reference favored by empiricists focuses on sense-data in the mind while the relational theory of the postmoderns emphasizes relations among words, but they are similar in at least one crucial respect: neither grounds meaning and truth in an external world that regulates their content.34 Both privilege epistemology over ontology. What is needed is a theory of reference that takes account of the contribution of mind and language yet is anchored to external reality. The realist answer is the causal theory of reference. According to the causal theory the meaning of terms is determined by a two-stage process.35 First there is a "baptism/' in which some new referent in the environment (say, a previously unknown animal) is given a name; then this connection of thing-to-term is handed down a chain of speakers to contemporary speakers. Both stages are causal, the first because the referent impressed itself upon someone's senses in such a way that they were induced to give it a name, the second because the handing down of meanings is a causal process of imitation and social learning. Both stages allow discourse to affect meaning, and as such do not preclude a role for "difference" as posited by the relational theory. Theory is underdetermined by reality, and as such the causal theory is not a picture theory of reference. However, conceding these points does not mean that meaning is entirely socially or mentally constructed. In the realist view beliefs are determined by discourse and nature.36 This solves the key problems of the description and relational theories: our ability to refer to the same object even if our descriptions are different or change, and the resistance of the world to certain representations. Mind and language help determine meaning, but meaning is also regulated by a mind-independent, extra-linguistic world.

#### Images of catastrophe cause an empathic shift – this is crucial in policy debate

Recuber 11 Timothy Recuber is a doctoral candidate in sociology at the Graduate Center of the City. University of New York. He has taught at Hunter College in Manhattan "CONSUMING CATASTROPHE: AUTHENTICITY AND EMOTION IN MASS-MEDIATED DISASTER" gradworks.umi.com/3477831.pdf \*\*we rejected any gendered or offensive language used in this evidence

Perhaps, then, what distant consumers express when they sit glued to the television watching a disaster replayed over and over, when they buy t-shirts or snow globes, when they mail teddy bears to a memorial, or when they tour a disaster site, is a deep, maybe subconscious, longing for those age-old forms of community and real human(SIC) compassion that emerge in a place when disaster has struck. It is a longing in some ways so alien to the world we currently live in that it requires catastrophe to call it forth, even in our imaginations. Nevertheless, the actions of unadulterated goodwill that become commonplace in harrowing conditions represent the truly authentic form of humanity(SIC) that all of us, to one degree or another, chase after in contemporary consumer culture every day. And while it is certainly a bit foolhardy to seek authentic humanity through disaster-related media and culture, the sheer strength of that desire has been evident in the public’s response to all the disasters, crises and catastrophes to hit the United States in the past decade. The millions of television viewers who cried on September 11, or during Hurricane Katrina and the Virginia Tech shootings, and the thousands upon thousands who volunteered their time, labor, money, and even their blood, as well as the countless others who created art, contributed to memorials, or adorned their cars or bodies with disaster-related paraphernalia— despite the fact that many knew no one who had been personally affected by any of these disasters—all attest to a desire for real human(SIC) community and compassion that is woefully unfulfilled by American life under normal conditions today. In the end, the consumption of disaster doesn’t make us unable or unwilling to engage with disasters on a communal level, or towards progressive political ends—it makes us feel as if we already have, simply by consuming. It is ultimately less a form of political anesthesia than a simulation of politics, a Potemkin village of communal sentiment, that fills our longing for a more just and humane world with disparate acts of cathartic consumption. Still, the positive political potential underlying such consumption—the desire for real forms of connection and community—remains the most redeeming feature of disaster consumerism. Though that desire is frequently warped when various media lenses refract it, diffuse it, or reframe it to fit a political agenda, its overwhelming strength should nonetheless serve notice that people want a different world than the one in which we currently live, with a different way of understanding and responding to disasters. They want a world where risk is not leveraged for profit or political gain, but sensibly planned for with the needs of all socio-economic groups in mind. They want a world where preemptive strategies are used to anticipate the real threats posed by global climate change and global inequality, rather than to invent fears of ethnic others and justify unnecessary wars. They want a world where people can come together not simply as a market, but as a public, to exert real agency over the policies made in the name of their safety and security. And, when disaster does strike, they want a world where the goodwill and compassion shown by their neighbors, by strangers in their communities, and even by distant spectators and consumers, will be matched by their own government. Though this vision of the world is utopian, it is not unreasonable, and if contemporary American culture is ever to give us more than just an illusion of safety, or empathy, or authenticity, then it is this vision that we must advocate on a daily basis, not only when disaster strikes.

#### Mexico is key to the navy – copper nickel tubing

General Adams, 13 – Brigadier General for the U.S. Army (Retired) (John, “REMAKING AMERICAN SECURITY: SUPPLY CHAIN VULNERABILITIES & NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS ACROSS THE U.S. DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE” http://americanmanufacturing.org/files/RemakingAmericanSecurityMay2013.pdf)

In addition to these domestic companies, the European conglomerate KME and several companies in Mexico also produce Cu-Ni tubing for the U.S. Navy. However, other than Ansonia Brass & Copper, KME is the only company capable of producing this larger diameter tubing according to U.S. military specifications. As a result, the U.S. domestic production capability of Cu-Ni tubing is at risk, potentially leaving the U.S. Navy solely dependent on foreign manufacturers for this important supply chain.

#### More naval ships solve missile interception and delivery

\*improves c3I operations

**AFCEA 11–** Unclassified report released by The Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association that serves the US military (“Information Dominance Industry Day Questions and Answers”, 4/5/11, Available Online @ http://www.afcea.org/mission/intel/documents/MasterAnswerDocument05APR11.pdf)//MM

C3I provides the backbone of command and control (C2) in all warfare areas, including BMD. The BMD mission is inherently Information Dominance-centric, and can be divided between “Left of Launch” and “Right of Launch.” In “Left of Launch”, effective cyber warfare and penetrating knowledge of the adversary are critical to shaping the battlespace. “Right of Launch” is focused on network support to the warfighter. Navy BMD C3I enables C2 to make rapid decisions inside the adversary’s decision cycle. The Navy is currently leveraging a proven and fully functioning BMD C3I architecture. Navy ships with BMD capability and key Fleet Command and Control nodes are part of the BMD system. This includes mission planning systems, sensors, fire control, and command and control centers from the tactical edge connected to the National level. In BMD, the Navy closely works with the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), STRATCOM, and other services on C3I matters to ensure effective BMD is delivered from BMD-capable ships and the future Aegis Ashore, via the Regional and Fleet Commanders, to BMDS at the National level. While we have a working structure, we clearly see growing adversary threats which necessitate better performance and capacity on the part of our networks. **More ships are needed** to intercept more ballistic missiles in a complex tactical/operational environment. To this end, we are improving network capabilities and access through the addition of Advanced Time Division Multiple Access Interface Processor (ATIP) and improved integration of Maritime Operations Centers (MOCs) with Joint Tactical Terminal (JTT) and Navy Multiband Terminal. We are improving BMD Mission Planning across the theater by integrating Aegis Mission Planner, MIPS-Maritime IAMD Planning System, and C2BMC. Starting in FY12 we have proposed adding 15 TF-IAMD Navy personnel with BMD expertise in each MOC.

**That’s key to solve Chinese ASBM threats**

**AFCEA 11–** Unclassified report released by The Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association that serves the US military (“Information Dominance Industry Day Questions and Answers”, 4/5/11, Available Online @ http://www.afcea.org/mission/intel/documents/MasterAnswerDocument05APR11.pdf)//MM

Adversary ballistic missiles threaten our allies worldwide and our homeland- Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, and CONUS itself. Chinese development of so-called ‘carrier killer’ ASBMs compounds the Navy BMD challenge as our afloat forces become targets of exoatmospheric ballistic missiles in addition to the variety of cruise missiles and other threats we face. The Navy must integrate BMD into an effective, broader Integrated Air and Missile (IAMD) capability. The Navy Air and Missile Defense Command (NAMDC) at Dahlgren has the task to promote rapid delivery of new IAMD technologies; support development and validation of IAMD requirements for Joint and Navy processes; lead Navy IAMS concept, doctrine, and tactics development, and experimentation; and, advocate Navy positions and capabilities in Joint forums. We are closely aligned with NAMDC through the BMD roadmap as a part of the Navy Ballistic Missile Defense Enterprise. These alignments provide us the opportunities to play vital roles in IAMD, bringing important capabilities from across N2/N6. These include, on the right side of the kill chain, **improved C3I and network integration and operational coordination**. On the left side of the kill chain, this means development of constant and penetrating knowledge of the adversary and cyber skills to provide persistent access to adversary networks. Across the full kill chain, it means supporting the ability to synchronize kinetic and non-kinetic responses to give our afloat forces the confidence to operate effectively in the face of a full range of threats.

**China uses ASBM’s – causes escalation**

**Chimerica 11 –** (“Attack by an ASBM”, 2011, Chimerica War, Online @ <http://www.chimericawar.org/carrier_killer.html>)

Although it is entirely credible that China would unexpectedly strike a carrier without any warning or notable increase in regional tension this would actually be very out of character for the PLA China has a predictable history of giving many warnings before striking an opponent. Of course, this doesn’t discount commanders being so blinkered to the signs, like McCarthur and blundering on regardless, but characteristically, China can usually be counted on to give clear warning signs of an attack. In the modern age, it is more than likely that tensions would have significantly risen or actual conflict taking place before the ASBM is considered as a strike option. James Kraska’s story of a single, untraceable ASBM sinking the USS George Washington out of the blue is unrealistic and the global atmosphere is more likely to resemble Harper’s piece on Chinese Missiles and the Walmart Factor. As offensive operations rarely take place in isolation, we can confidently surmise that the US and China will have already gone through a significant ratcheting up of tensions, both economically and militarily, and any decision to hit a carrier will not be made in a bubble. Therefore, on the verge of war, the PLA will be doing everything it can to find carrier battle groups while the battle groups will be doing everything they can to slip into favorable positions un-noticed. It should be noted here that the concept of an ASBM first came about from a study where they claimed the over-the-horizon radar could differentiate between different ships by comparing, over time, the frequent air activity around the carrier. Due to this, in a heightened war-situation we can reasonably assume that the carrier will not be flying multitudes of planes if it’s moving into a potential battle position and forward air cover could easily come from fighters flying from any number of global bases and using air-refueling. The carrier will be in a high alert, probably moving at a good pace to out run subs and in complete communication silence. There are any number of war scenarios existing on what the carrier would be doing, but let’s say, for the sake of this narrative, that the carrier is moving at 28knots with only a small escort, including some Aegis, and aiming to join up with a larger group to move forward as an overwhelming battle fleet into a hot zone off China’s coast. To any over-the-horizon radar a silent, cruising carrier would be almost undistinguishable from other ships, so the PLA would need multiple positive IDs to launch an attack. On top of this, any number of carrier battle groups could be coming from a multitude of directions. The Pacific Ocean is purportedly 166million square kilometers. The Indian Ocean is 44million square kilometers. The South China Sea alone is over 3.5million square kilometers. So the analogy of, “looking for a needle in a haystack,” doesn’t even do it justice. Carriers maybe big, but on the scale of things they are infinitesimally small in a huge mass of monotone sea. Let’s say for arguments sake that the PLA detection systems and more importantly the guys working them are totally on the money and manage to nail down a battle group to a certain area. The overhead satellites are then able to pick out ships moving in a specific direction. The satellites then need to keep a track on the ships movement in real time. Not as easy as it sounds. Don’t forget, GPS works by a device actively calling out to the satellites to find it. This will not happen in a war situation, it will be a completely passive search. It will be up to the controllers, probably based somewhere deep in China’s interior, to manually control the satellites guidance system to first locate, then precisely follow and plot the battle group's direction. Let’s say that the modern Chinese satellites can lock onto the carrier and follow it automatically once it is located. This still isn’t good enough to target though. The next step is to get an over-the-horizon radar signal and preferably drones on target. At this point it is just not credible to assume that the PLA would target a carrier based on just satellite co-ordinates alone, even if numerous satellites were triangulating it. They will need some other kind of terminal guidance system to help the missiles hit the target. The margin of error on a fast moving, possibly erratic target would be too great, even for a suite of missiles. Bear in mind, conventional DF-21s missiles carrying only a 1000lb warhead and traveling at Mach 10 are going to need to hit, otherwise they’ll just make a very, very fast splash into the sea. (see here for some perspective) It would certainly put the fear of God into the sailors who saw it, but it wouldn’t stop the ships. On top of this, carriers are designed to get hit, or have planes crash into them so are incredibly durable and tough. Even a direct hit by a DF-21 with it's huge wave of kinetic energy is not guaranteed to terminally incapacitate a carrier. It would probably need multiple direct hits, then followed by sustained submarine attacks to sink it. The analogy comes to mind of getting a hand-full of glass marbles and trying to throw them into a plastic cup from a few feet away. Chances are you might get one or two in the cup if you're really good, but it's not guaranteed, and the ones that miss just don't count at all. Firing a missile from 2000km away and getting it witih 20-30metres is a fantastic shot - but it just doesn't count. It has to be a bull everytime. Let’s assume that things are going great for the PLA and it is able to get a confirmed “eyeball” sighting by a paramilitary fishing boat of the carrier. So the satellite data can now be corroborated with a first hand account that it is definitely a US carrier in the area that they're concentrating on. This of course assumes that the US Navy wouldn’t be neutralizing or jamming any boats in the vicinity, but let’s say the information gets through to the 2nd Artillery. On top of this, another lucky break happens, a PLA sub sights the carrier and also gives a confirmed sighting, but does not engage because the carrier is going too fast. The carrier could be zipping along at 30knots, with the max speed of the Jin around 20knots, if it wasn’t already cued for an attack it could only watch as it rushed by. A message is sent to other Chinese subs to rendezvous at a certain point along the carriers proposed course and lie in wait. The subs will be used in a second tier attack on the carrier after it has received a volley from the DF-21s. With two confirmed sightings and a satellite track the PLA controllers are confident that they are zeroing in on a carrier kill and send word to the Central Military Commission, 套机构两块牌子(CMC) The CMC is already in session in its war room and begins to seriously consider making a strike on the battle group given the positive identification and reliable satelite track. Word is now sent to the countless mobile DF-21s launchers across the country to get ready for a launch. Mathematicians and strategists in the PLA begin to try and predict the carrier’s route and decide upon the best place to try and launch a strike and cue up the subs for the definitive kill. Other attack platforms are readied to complement the attack once it is underway. UAVs are launched from Chinese ships and the mainland to directly locate the carrier. As the US ships draw closer, Chinese over-the-horizon radars begin to try and distinguish the carrier from the escorts. Meanwhile, off the coast of China, the multiple over-the-horizon radars light up like bonfires for the numerous US subs that are lying quietly in position, cued to strike on command at Chinese ground targets and subs. The carrier is not blindly, blundering into a Chinese trap but is part of a larger, counter trap being set by the US submarine fleet. The CMC, gets on to the Emergency Hotline to Washington and warns them that, “they can not be held responsible if any US warships enter Chinese Territorial Waters”. For Washington, this is “game-on”. They were expecting the CCP to give a final warning and they characteristically do, right on cue. All US ships in the region are put on alert that a missile attack is imminent and aimed at the incoming carrier battle groups. Minutes drain by like hours. The carrier group moves forward and despite the US Air Force shooting down a number of PLAAF stealth, UAVs, two of them slip through the net and lock onto the carrier. The carrier is now painted with exact, real-time coordinates streaming from two undetected UAVs, the over-the-horizon radar and satellite tracking. This is enough data to complete the ASBM terminal guidance system. The 2nd Artillery quickly informs the CMC that they have all the data they need to launch an attack on the incoming battle group. Time is of the essence now. The carrier needs to be neutralized before it can get in range of the Chinese mainland with its F-18s. An effective battle group can punch 600 attacks on target in just one day and repeat that for days if not weeks. It is essential that if the strike takes place it happens as soon a possible while the carrier is still far out to sea. The 2nd Artillery commanders urge their superiors that they have been incredibly lucky to have quickly amassed such reliable data and the time is now to strike hard, so as to knock the Americans onto their back foot. With a carrier sunk, or at least incapacitated, this will forestall any greater push by the Allied forces and could possibly weaken the 'fickle' US public’s will to fight. This is enough for the CMC and they order the strike. After receiving the orders, the 2nd Artillery begins to transmit the target data to the 100 DF-21s that will launch. Note: this is not a static target with fixed coordinates that they’re aiming to hit. So, the data can’t be finalized. The DF-21s will be launched into the air without the final co-ordinates in their guidance system. This will have to come later, while it’s flying at Mach 10. Which is not to be underestimated as an incredibly difficult thing to do. Fortunately, Chinese scientists have already cracked this incredibly difficult task. The 2nd Artillery’s C4ISR are confident that they can transmit to the terminal guidance system on board the warhead at the critical time using the over-the-horizon radar data, UAVs and their new, advanced satellite communications streaming. The DF-21 will launch into one orbit, then change direction and zero in on the carrier. The speed at which this is done will out maneuver the Aegis and Patriot tracking systems, that traditionally rely on predictable trajectories of missiles to intercept. The DF-21s begin to fire-up. Meanwhile, the eyes and ears of the US military are scouring China for signs of a missile launches. Just like in Iraq they have a window of detection as the missiles are readied for firing. Only this time, the US can’t strike them as they prepare, as they’re on the Chinese Mainland in protected airspace and this would be crossing a significant ‘red-line’ at this stage in the conflict. However, as soon as the birds are airborne, all bets will be off. As the mobile launchers prepare to launch all US subs in the region, including a suite of Ohio class (SSBNs) nuclear warhead carrying subs are put on high alert for imminent launch. As the Chinese missiles begin to fire up squadrons of B-52s and B1s take off from Guam, Diego Garcia and Barksdale packing conventional and nuclear weapons. Within minutes the US has hundreds of bombers in the sky. Nuclear Silos across the US go to high alert for imminent launch. Russian listening posts pick up the Chinese actions and also all the US activity and engage in similar counter measures, readying its army for a possible nuclear exchange. The minutes now quickly drain down and all the 21s are ready to fly. Final word goes out to the 2nd Artillery commander who relays this to the CMC one last time. Convinced that sinking a carrier will put the US on the back foot they decisively give the go ahead, and 50 of the 100 missiles are sent skyward. STOP… Take a second to contemplate the gravity of this scenario… At this exact moment China has launched 50, unknown sub-orbital ballistic missiles into the air. The type and destination are unknown. It could be part of an ASBM package, or it could be a preemptive nuclear strike on an unspecified country? The US, Russia, India, UK and France would all go to DEFCON One and could all release an instant nuclear counter strike on China. The world has evolved to avoid using ballistic missiles as the preferred weapon of choice in war as they could easily provoke a full blown nuclear exchange. This is why the ASBM system is so out of whack with current weapon systems. It can not be differentiated from a preemptive nuclear strike. The US is now faced with two choices, are these airborne missiles conventional or nuclear? If they believe they are nuclear then China will be on the receiving end of an unprecedented nuclear retaliatory strike by the The Allies and possibly Russia, even India. The US may also assume that these missiles are part of an ASBM package but may still be nuclear, so again it would launch nuclear weapons to counter. The US has almost no way of knowing what kind of missiles have just been launched from the mobile carriers. So much for **the ASBM** keeping the US at arms length. Instead it **has the potential to cause a nuclear exchange.** The only way China could guarantee that it wouldn’t receive a nuclear counter-strike from launching so many DF-21s into the sky is if they pre-arranged some signal to inform the US, Russia, India, France and Britain that they were only using conventional weapons. Such a system would be inherently flawed because why would anyone believe them, and if it did work it would be giving away too much intelligence. “Oh, hi, yeah, so this is Xi Xinping, yeah, um, you know those missiles we just launched well they’re conventional, not nuclear ok, so can you make your response appropriate?” A funny joke, but really, how else would you suggest China, a nuclear armed country, convince the other nuclear nations of the world that the launching of multiple, sub-orbital ballistic missiles is not a nuclear preemptive strike but is only aimed at ships? This not so very small point aside, let’s assume for the sake of the story, that the US doesn’t carry out a massive retaliatory, nuclear strike but is confident that it's only a bunch of conventional DF-21s flying at Mach 10 aimed at its carrier battle groups. Only? As soon as the birds are airborne, US subs and possibly stealth bombers off the coast will begin targeting the Chinese over-the-horizon radars, which will have two choices, keep transmitting data or risk getting hit. If they power down and relocate quickly, they may live, but the DF-21s will be left flying blind. As China has launched missiles from the mainland at the US Navy, it will no longer be considered a naval battle and the numerous subs and stealth bombers will begin attacking relevant C4ISR on the Chinese mainland. With a billion dollar carrier at stake and the lives of thousands of Americans it’s a “no brainer” now and a race against time as the US tries to take out critical Chinese infrastructure on the coast. The DF-21s, which will probably be launched from further inland will take around 12minutes to reach their target as they will first need to leave the atmosphere, and then come back down at Mach 10. Plus their target is a 1000kms out. The question will be, can the US cruise missiles take out enough critical assets to break the delicate information chain needed to bring the DF-21s down on target? Remember, only a bull counts. Near misses count for nothing, no matter how close. In unison to this missile exchange, military assets right across the Pacific Rim will go on to a maximum war footing. Militaries in Japan, Korea, Australia, Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, Indonesia, India, Vietnam and Russia will go to their highest alerts. More than likely, there will be air-combat in the areas around Japan as twitchy pilots from US and the JMSDF engage the PLAAF in dog fights. Across Japan, Patriot batteries stir into life and a string of 35 Aegis Cruisers from the US, Japan, Korea, and Australia brace for missile intercepts. Japan would assume that any number of these missiles could be aimed at her and would immediately begin to mobilize a counter attack.

### 2ac – china cp

#### US-Mexico trade key to resolve Mexican instability and manufacturing sector

O’Neill 3/18/13 – (Shannon, “Mexico and the United States are linked closer than ever through trade”, Voxxi, http://www.voxxi.com/mexico-united-states-linked-trade/)//javi

When it comes to Mexico, people usually think about the security issue, and that’s what much of the news coverage has been. But underneath that, behind the headlines, we have seen a transformation of Mexico’s economy over the last couple of decades: It has moved from a very closed, inward-looking economy, one whose exports were dominated by oil, to an economy that is one of the most open and increasingly competitive in the world. In measures like trade to GDP, Mexico outpaces not just the United States or places like Brazil, but it outpaces China. It is quite an open and competitive economy now. A big part of that is due to its deepening ties to the United States. Since the North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta) was signed almost 20 years ago, we have seen the creation of regional supply chains for a myriad of different types of industries and companies. For every product that is imported from Mexico in the US, on average 40 percent of it would actually have been made in the U.S. It has become a very symbiotic relationship, and it has become an integrated economy in many ways and in many sectors, particularly in manufacturing. There, we see almost seamless integration in some companies, where production happens on both sides of the border. What it means is these economies, companies and industries are now not only intimately tied, but permanently tied at this point. Mexico’s positive future tied to the United States Mexico’s positive future is closely tied to the United States, in part because of this integration of production. If it does extend beyond the United States, it would most likely be through an expansion of what is already this North American production platform, through agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which would expand Nafta beyond Canada and Mexico, to include other Latin American countries and many Asia Pacific countries. It is quite a deep and comprehensive free trade agreement, and one could see it expanding in production chains in many other countries that are participants, and sales would be going up. The U.S., for all of its hiccups in recent years, is still the largest market in the world, so being tied to the U.S. is not a bad thing at all.

#### Mexican economic collapse causes instability

**Barnes 11** – (4/29/11, Joe, Bonner Means Baker Fellow James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy Rice University, “Oil and U.S.-Mexico Bilateral Relations,” <http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-BarnesBilateral-04292011.pdf>)

There is already a short- to medium-term risk of substantial instability in Mexico.  As noted, the country is enduring extremely high levels of drug-related violence.  Even if the Mexican government eventually succeeds in its efforts to suppress this violence, the process is likely to be expensive, bloody, and corrosive in terms of human rights.  A period of feeble economic growth, combined with a fiscal crisis associated with a drop in revenues from Pemex, could create a “perfect storm” south of the border.   If this were to occur, Washington would have no choice but to respond.  In the longer-term, the United States has a clear interest in robust economic growth and fiscal sustainability in Mexico.  There is at least one major example of the U.S. coming to Mexico’s aid in an economic emergency.  In 1994, the United States extended US$20 billion in loan guarantees to Mexico when the peso collapsed, in large part to make U.S. creditors whole.  Not least, a healthy Mexican economy would reduce the flow of illegal immigration to the United States.  To the extent that prospects for such growth and sustainability are enhanced by reform of Pemex, the United States should be supportive.  It might be best, in terms of U.S. economic and commercial interests, were Pemex to be fully privatized, but even partial reforms would be welcome.  Not all national oil companies are created equal: Pemex’s development into something like Norway’s Statol would mark an important improvement.

#### Mexico’s economy is critical to the US – collapse causes decline of US economy and competitiveness

O’Neal ’13 - Shannon K. O’Neil is a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization, (“Two Nations Indivisible”, it’s a book)

Mexico has come a long way in the last three decades, shifting from a closed to an open economy, from booms and busts to macroeconomic stability, and from a poor to a middle class nation. But it has yet to unlock its true growth potential, or to match the economic gains and growth rates seen in many of its emerging market peers—China, South Korea, Brazil, and Peru. One might sum up U.S. interest as friendly concern for a neighbor, and it is indeed that. But the U.S. economic future is also increasingly tied to Mexico. A real economic partnership between the two neighbors can be more than just an engine for Mexico’s economic middle; it can help protect and expand America’s middle class. The United States’ economic reliance on Mexico is no less real just because it is overlooked. Already twenty-two of the fifty U.S. states claim Mexico as their first or second destination for exports. Leading the pack are the border states. Each month Texan companies send over US$7 billion and their Californian counterparts almost US$2 billion in goods to their neigh bor.82 But this bonanza isn’t limited just to the border. ‘The economies of states such as South Dakota, Nebraska, and New Hampshire now depend on exports to Mexico as well. U.S. companies in industries as diverse as elec tronic equipment, household appliances, paper products, red meat, pears, and grapes rely today on Mexican industry and consumers for their livelihoods. Because of these ties, economic expansion to the south will boost growth to the north. The opposite is also true; future downturns in Puebla will mean layoffs in Peoria. This dependence through economic integration with Mexico is only deepening as companies worldwide transform the way they make things. American businesses such as Ford, General Electric, Honeywell, Intel, and Hewlett-Packard have rebounded by “near-shoring” or opening fac tories in nearby Mexico. Less recognized, this has saved many U.S. jobs in the process.83 Studies estimate that roughly 40 percent of Mexican-made products value is actually “made in the U.S.A.”—ten times that of Chinese-made goods.84 In this age of inexorable globalization, U.S. eco nomic cooperation with Mexico holds out the hope—and indeed the promise—of stopping the wholesale decampment of manufacturing firms to trans-Pacific locales. Misunderstood by U.S. politicians and pundits alike, NAFTA, and Mexican outsourcing more generally, can he a good thing for U.S. work ers and the U.S. middle class. With a different mindset and approach, U.S.-Mexico economic ties can help boost America’s chances in the global economic race. Using raw data collected confidentially from thousands of large U.S. multinational manufacturing firms, two Harvard Business School professors, along with a colleague from the University of Michigan, upend the conventional wisdom, finding that as companies ramp up investment and employment abroad they also invest and hire more people at home.8 Companies become more productive—and more competitive—and with their better products, lower prices, and higher sales, they create new jobs all around.86 The study shows that, on average, when a firm hires ten employees abroad, it will actually hire, not lay off at least two employees at home. This means that efforts to stop “oftshoring” might actually have the reverse and perverse effect of undermining U.S. jobs.

### 2ac – nieto

#### Won’t pass –

#### a. teacher unions and tax extension

Kavanagh 9/8/13 – (“Mexico: Public hostility threatens Pemex reforms”, FT, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/99d3422a-13ce-11e3-9289-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2jhXpxbPC)//javi

Plans by Mexico’s president to open up its oil and gas industry to private and foreign investment have provoked calls for mass demonstrations in the country this weekend. Enrique Peña Nieto’s agenda for reforming Mexico’s nationalised energy sector is just one of a number of “transformational” reforms proposed to stimulate the country’s stalling economic growth that have provoked a backlash from his political opponents. Andrés Manuel López Obrador, the former mayor of Mexico City and a narrowly defeated presidential candidate in 2006, is among those who have vowed to oppose Mr Nieto’s unravelling of the monopoly that state-owned operator Pemex has enjoyed over country’s hydrocarbon resources for three quarters of a century. Though foreign and privately owned oil companies have welcomed the bold move, proponents and opponents of Mr Peña Nieto’s drive to reform Mexico’s energy sector still await full details of how, in practice, outsiders will be invited to partner Pemex in attempt to increase the country’s oil and gas production. Pablo Medina, Latin America oil industry analyst at consultancy Wood Mackenzie, predicts it could be well into next year before the full shape of reforms and opportunities on offer to outside companies becomes clear. “The devil is in the detail – let’s see what happens,” he says. And mounting opposition to a basket of measures – including radical changes to Mexico’s union-dominated education system and possible extension of taxes under fiscal reforms – could yet damage plans to loosen the grip of Pemex over the country’s oil and gas sector. Article 27 of Mexico’s constitution enshrines national ownership of hydrocarbons. And Mr Peña Nieto has insisted that this constitutional underpinning of the 1938 nationalisation of Mexico’s oil sector by then president Lázaro Cárdenas will remain in place. But he has also insisted that this is not incompatible with Mexico encouraging collaboration with private and foreign companies to exploit its resources. Ruaraidh Montgomery, based at Wood Mackenzie’s Houston office, notes many majors have already established a presence in Mexico over recent years in the expectation of an opening up of the sector and with a view to building relationships with Pemex. Chevron, the US major, is thought to be particularly keen to invest in Mexico and last month publicly welcomed Mr Peña Nieto’s announced reforms as clear sign the country was finally “opening the door” to outside operators. Senior management at Pemex have welcomed the liberalisation plans. Emilio Lozoya, chief executive, told the FT last month that he expects Mexico’s oil and gas sector to attract $10bn of extra investment a year over the next decade to meet its ambition of expanding production. That extra funding would come from a combination of foreign companies and Pemex itself. In reality, Mexico has already dabbled in opening up its oil industry by offering a limited number of production enhancement contracts to outside oil services companies such as Petrofac of the UK and Schlumberger of the US. Improving the efficiency of Mexico’s existing oilfields though offering deals to outside oil services groups is one method by which Mr Peña Nieto may reach his goal of raising the country’s output from 2.5m to his stated ambition of 3m barrels of oil a day by 2018. But Mr Montgomery suggests the real prize for foreign companies could be winning lucrative work in the relatively unexplored deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

#### b. PRI won’t make necessary concessions

Jude Webber, 10-31-13 (“Mexico gears up for energy reform”, Financial Times)

Passing energy reform may not, though, prove as simple as securing the Senate sums, warns Alfonso Zárate, a political analyst.¶ He says popular and leftist opposition to opening up a sector seen as one of the country’s crown jewels may yet force the PRI into concessions – maybe even on some of its core elements, such as plans to rewrite article 28 of the constitution, which defines energy as a strategic sector under state control.¶ “I think the debate in Congress, in the streets and in the media will be very intense,” he said.¶ But any climbdown could be disastrous for a government which rode into office with a telegenic new president, and a can-do attitude that investors adored. It has since had to admit that economic growth this year will be less than one-third of its original estimates.¶ “We’re seeing a government that began with a great deal of determination that is now, 11 months on, unable to push through some of its proposals,” Mr Zárate said.

#### Reform doesn’t solve –

#### a. lack of investments

Kavanagh 9/8/13 – (“Mexico: Public hostility threatens Pemex reforms”, FT, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/99d3422a-13ce-11e3-9289-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2jhXpxbPC)//javi

The US section of the gulf has continued to deliver prolific discoveries and hopes are high that this can be replicated in Mexican waters. “Geology does not stop at an artificial straight line,” he says. Mr Medina, meanwhile, argues it will be several years before any deepwater projects backed by private investment will contribute to Mexico’s output. “I would said it a major problem getting to 3m barrels a day by 2018 – it is hard to see that there will be any results from deep water in short term, though it offers lots of opportunities,” he says. The country is also thought to have large shale and other unconventional gas and oil reserves similar to those that have fuelled the US fracking boom. Meeting the Mexican government’s 2018 production goals will be challenging, yet possible, if there is a significant increase in overall investment, argues the consultancy. But production growth will primarily depending on developing existing assets.

#### b. private sector inefficiencies

**Rozantal 13** (Andrés Rozental, former deputy foreign minister of Mexico, works primarily on global governance issues, U.S.-Mexico relations and international migration, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/08/19-pena-nieto-energy-reform-rozental>

President Peña Nieto's proposed energy reform is a big step in the right direction, but unfortunately an incomplete one. There are two key missing elements: 1) excluding a regime of concessions to private sector investors, both Mexican and foreign, who would like to participate in future hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation in deep water reserves and shale; and 2) not having explicitly allowed private-sector companies to book any reserves they find. Including both of these options would have made the proposal much more acceptable to major new investors. That said, the proposal still marks a sea change from the existing exclusionary regime. **There are still many details to be worked out** and publicized, many of which will be discussed when Congress takes up the reform package starting next month. Allowing profit sharing and giving the state oil company, Pemex, an early advantage through a 'zero round' should satisfy most, but not all, of the reform's strongest critics from the left. These will oppose any change to the current state of affairs, no matter how minor or major, so the government rightly decided to make this a 'transformational' effort, opening the door to further changes in the future. There are also important changes planned to the way Pemex operates and is managed, which should allow the company to compete on a more even footing with private-sector players, some of whom may choose to associate with the state-owned company rather than strike out on their own. It remains to be seen how many changes the draft legislation undergoes as it wends its way through both houses of Congress. However, it appears likely that a PRI-PAN coalition has the necessary votes to pass the constitutional changes, and that would be a major victory indeed for Peña Nieto and his government.

### 2ac – cir

**Wont Pass – House GOP Wont Take a Comprehensive Bill, Piecemeal Will Delay Long Enough That the Election Kills Key Reforms, and Rubio Bailed**

By Ashley **Lopez** Florida Center for Investigative Reporting **10/29**/2013 Diaz Balart Casts Doubt On President’s New Immigration Reform Strategy Published on October 29, 2013 http://fcir.org/2013/10/29/immigration-reform-obama-house/

President Obama said in a speech at the White House last week that he would be open to the U.S. House’s approach to voting on immigration bills one by one, which could either be immigration reform’s savior or its demise. Rep. Mario Diaz Balart, R-Miami, who has been instrumental in getting immigration reform passed in the House, has been telling reporters that this change in tone is by no means a guarantee that reform will pass during this Congress.¶ A group of Republican House members are now working to get a series of bills together that most of their caucus would vote for. In order for the president to sign those bills, though, one of them would have to provide a path to citizenship for some of the million undocumented immigrants here in the U.S.¶ **But the issue of legalization remains one of the most contentious issues in the House**. It would even more contentious if a vote is taken close to the 2014 election.¶ And as The Miami Herald notes, the House’s strategy of passing bills one-by-one might prolong the process well into the upcoming election, thus **dooming immigration reform:**¶ And while Obama called for the House to pass a large bill that could then be reconciled with the Senate version, House Republicans want to approach any changes in piecemeal fashion, a process that at best would push any significant progress into next year.¶ Boehner spokesman Brendan Buck said Thursday that the House “will not consider any massive, Obamacare-style legislation that no one understands.” He said the House is committed to a deliberate, “step-by-step approach.”¶ “Obviously, there is no appetite for one big bill,” Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart told a group of reporters Wednesday night. The Florida Republican, who had been a member of the unsuccessful bipartisan “gang of eight,” is working with other Republicans on a set of bills that would allow undocumented immigrants to “get right with the law.”¶ Diaz-Balart avoided using the word “legalization” because it has become so politically fraught.¶ Most recently, Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Florida, endorsed the House’s strategy. For a while, he had been behind an effort to pass comprehensive reform. Rubio was part of a bipartisan group in the Senate that wrote and helped move a comprehensive immigration reform bill through to final passage.¶ However, Rubio’s office now says he supports taking a piecemeal approach. Talking Points Memo reports:¶ The most prominent conservative supporter of sweeping immigration reform is calling on Congress to dial back the effort and instead focus on making incremental changes, delivering a significant blow to the prospects of reform. ¶ Sen. Marco Rubio (R-FL) now opposes a bicameral conference committee to reach a final resolution to the Senate-passed bill, his spokesman said, which anxious pro-reform advocates believe is the only feasible way to salvage the comprehensive overhaul.

#### Boehner Wont Introduce a Bill in the House

By Russell **Berman** - **10/29**/13 06:00 AM ET ObamaCare steals spotlight from push on immigration reformhttp://thehill.com/homenews/administration/331063-obamacare-steals-spotlight-from-push-on-immigration#ixzz2jIkSw3ML

Denham said he hopes other Republicans will announce their support in the coming days, which could give fresh momentum to the legislative push that is central to Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has yet to bring an immigration bill to the floor, and **there is no indication** he would do so in the five legislative weeks that remain on the House schedule in 2013. A bipartisan immigration group in the House collapsed in September when two Republicans left, citing a lack of trust in the Obama administration.¶ “We lost some time because of the shutdown,” said Randy Johnson, senior vice president at the Chamber of Commerce, which is participating in Tuesday’s “fly-in” lobbying visit.

**Obamacare Thumps the Disad**

By Russell **Berman** - **10/29**/13 06:00 AM ET ObamaCare steals spotlight from push on immigration reformhttp://thehill.com/homenews/administration/331063-obamacare-steals-spotlight-from-push-on-immigration#ixzz2jIkSw3ML

The troubled rollout of the healthcare law has **thrown a wrench** into President Obama’s push for immigration reform.¶ The White House and reform advocates in both parties have sought to refocus attention back to immigration following the 16-day government shutdown, but the problems plaguing the new federal insurance exchange website have **dominated** headlines.¶ The White House is getting a boost from a coalition of 600 faith, law enforcement and business leaders that plan to descend Tuesday on Capitol Hill to urge the House to take up immigration legislation before the end of the year.¶ “We’ve got to get Congress and the American public to focus on immigration because **we’ve got such a short time to get it on the floor**,” said Rep. Jeff Denham (Calif.), who over the weekend became the first Republican to sign on to a comprehensive immigration bill similar to the measure that passed the Senate in June.¶ Denham said he hopes other Republicans will announce their support in the coming days, which could give fresh momentum to the legislative push that is central to Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has yet to bring an immigration bill to the floor, and there is no indication he would do so in the five legislative weeks that remain on the House schedule in 2013. A bipartisan immigration group in the House collapsed in September when two Republicans left, citing a lack of trust in the Obama administration.¶ “We lost some time because of the shutdown,” said Randy Johnson, senior vice president at the Chamber of Commerce, which is participating in Tuesday’s “fly-in” lobbying visit. “There still is time on the House’s schedule to take up some immigration bills,” he said.¶ Yet **the administration’s attention** — and message — **is clearly divided**.¶ The White House has been inundated with questions about the buggy HealthCare.gov, the House has begun investigations, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has launched a daily press briefing to update the public on efforts to fix the website.¶ The setback is a familiar one for **immigration reform** advocates, who have seen the issue be upended by three separate crises in recent months: the debate over military intervention in Syria, the government shutdown and now the implementation of the healthcare law.¶ “It **is getting overshadowed**,” said Julian Zelizer, a political scientist at Princeton University. “It’s taking up time, and **it is consuming the president’s attention**,” he said of **the healthcare rollout.**

#### Security innovation is spun by the Pentagon to conceal controversial portions in Congress

Burghardt 4/4/11 – researcher and activist based in the San Francisco Bay Area, his articles are published in many venues. He is the editor of Police State America: U.S. Military "Civil Disturbance" Planning, distributed by AK Press (“With Obama and Congress Poised to Gut Social Spending, Pentagon Demands Billions in ‘Cybersecurity’ Handouts”, Dissident Voice, http://dissidentvoice.org/2011/04/with-obama-and-congress-poised-to-gut-social-spending-pentagon-demands-billions-in-cybersecurity-handouts/)//javi

For their part, the “Army and Defense Information Systems Agency referred inquiries about their proposed cyber spending to department-level officials.” And “Navy officials said they could not provide a top-line budget figure, since funding that supports Navy cybersecurity activities is scattered across several line items, as well as multiple programs, organizations and commands.” As Sternstein points out, while “the area surrounding ‘cybersecurity’ funding is gray … the various interpretations of cybersecurity spending translate into real-world financial and national security costs, budget and technology.” Defense Department spokeswoman April Cunningham told NextGov, that the Air Force “included things that we, [at the department's office of the chief information officer] categorize as IT infrastructure, or other activities–not directly information assurance.” “According to the department,” Sternstein writes, “information assurance consists of five programs, including public key infrastructure, or digital certificates, as well as defense industrial base cybersecurity for private sector assets that support the military.” Cunningham said that “activities at the Air Force and other services that Defense considers to be ‘information assurance-cybersecurity’ are captured in the total $3.2 billion figure.” And “based on this formula” the Army is seeking $432 million and the Navy are lusting after $347 million in FY2012. However, other Defense agencies “including DISA, the National Security Agency and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency–are asking for a cumulative $1.6 billion. Details on proposed cyber spending at all Pentagon components are shared with Congress in a classified budget book, she said.” Which means, given the Pentagon’s propensity to quietly hide their most controversial programs within the dark folds of the black budget, Congress, let alone the American people, really have no idea what such programs entail, who benefits from black contract outlays and ultimately, how they’ll be deployed. NextGov reported that the revised budget request “also includes funding for noninformation assurance activities” that the Pentagon claims “are integral to the military’s cyber posture, specifically cyber operations, security innovations and forensics.”

#### Immigration reform doesn’t solve economy – worker influx

Sujeet Raja, 4-16-13 (“Is influx of skilled immigrants good when US jobs growth not good enough?”, The Economic Times)

Is influx of skilled immigrants good when US jobs growth not good enough? ¶ The US Congress seems determined to come together in a rare show of bipartisanship to undertake the biggest reform of immigration laws since 1986. The country is set to spread its arms wide to welcome new skilled immigrants, unskilled guest workers, students and rich entrepreneurs, with the promise of a humane approach to their lives in a new land and the guarantee of a fast route to permanent residency for those already there and disillusioned to the point of thinking it might be easier to go to space instead. But new statistics suggest that the end result may not be pretty for everybody concerned.¶ ¶ Take this conundrum: for the first time since 2008, US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) reached the statutory H-1B cap of 65,000 for the fiscal year 2014 within the first week of the filing period.¶ ¶ USCIS also received more than 20,000 H-1B petitions from those exempt from the cap under the advanced degree category, those who have graduate degrees from US universities and have received job offers. In total, USCIS received more than 1,24,000 H-1B petitions. And finally a lottery system was used to select applicants earlier this month.¶ ¶ Hold on, not so fast¶ ¶ Alright, so there is a big rush to head to the US, by both skilled immigrants and students. Hold on, though. Not so fast.¶ ¶ Take a look at a report from the Council of Graduate Schools (CGS). The number of international students applying to graduate schools in the US increased just 1% this year, after a 9% rise last year and an 11% gain in 2011. The increase was the smallest in eight years, the report said.¶ ¶ There is a 5% decline in student applications from China this year. However applications from India, which sends the second largest number of students, increased by 20%. Alright, who's surprised?¶ ¶ Let's now look at another set of numbers that definitely says more people want to come to the US. The Customs and Border Protection says there is a significant increase in illegal immigrants crossing along the southwest border: arrests are actually up 13% compared with the same time last year. It was 170,223 in 2012, and is 192,298 this year. According to the Government Accountability Office, up to 40% of those who make it over the southwest border never get caught.¶ ¶ But this conforms to pattern, because as legislation on immigration reforms near, the immigration from the South to the North intensifies. In 1986, when the US passed a reform that granted amnesty to 3 million illegal immigrants, the Border Patrol arrested 630,000 people crossing into San Diego area alone. Last year, fewer than 360,000 people were detained across the entire 2,000-mile border between the US and Mexico, and only 28,500 in San Diego.¶ ¶ Going by these numbers, one can argue that the number of students applying to US universities declined this year because of the dismal jobs scenario. Since the application process takes six months to a year, they would not have been able to take advantage of the new zest at Capitol Hill.

#### Can’t solve- reform overwhelms the USCIS and causes a massive backlog

RSN 10 (Right Side News, “U.S. Legislative Immigration Update April 5, 2010”, 4-5, http://www.rightsidenews .com/201004059409/us/homeland-security/us-legislative-immigration-update-april-5-2010.html)

*DHS Official: Amnesty Would Cause "the Mother of All Backlogs"¶* Testifying before the House Judiciary Immigration Subcommittee on March 23rd, the DHS Assistant Inspector General told lawmakers that granting amnesty would create "the mother of all backlogs" in the Bureau of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). USCIS, the federal agency tasked with adjudicating applications and petitions for visas, employment authorization, green cards, etc., has incurred a formidable backlog since its inception in 2003. ([Statement of Frank W. Deffer](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Deffer100323.pdf), March 23, 2010). The March 23 hearing was meant to shed light on the steps USCIS is taking to address this backlog, as well as a possible increase in petition and application fees.¶ Assistant Inspector General Deffer's testimony described how the existing backlog at USCIS was closely connected to the agency's poor information technology and the program already underway to modernize it. (Statement, March 23, 2010). The modernization began in 2005, when USCIS embarked on an enterprise-wide transformation program to transition its fragmented, paper-based system to a centralized and consolidated electronic system. At that time, the DHS Inspector General reported that USCIS' processes were primarily manual, paper-based and duplicative, resulting in "ineffective use of human and financial resources" and described USCIS' information technology for processing immigration benefits as "inefficient, hindering its ability to carry out its mission." (Id.).¶ At the hearing, Deffer noted that USCIS's modernization efforts are particularly important, because of "a significant backlog of cases." Each year, Deffer stated, USCIS receives more than 7.5 million immigration applications and petitions. To adjudicate and process these applications, USCIS has more than 15,000 employees and contractor personnel in more than 250 offices worldwide. Deffer noted, however, that despite progress made to improve information technology management, "significant challenges remain." ([Statement](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/pdf/Deffer100323.pdf), March 23, 2010).¶ Subcommittee Chairwoman Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) clearly agreed. "The agency still continues to use a filing system that is predominantly paper-based," she said. "[W]ith approximately 55 million files spread out over numerous offices across the country...it's hard to believe that any federal agency dealing with millions of files has not yet developed a primarily digital filing system." Lofgren noted that despite USCIS's transformation" program to modernize its IT system, a July 2009 report from the DHS Inspector General found "that the transformation efforts were ineffective and plagued with problems." (Hearing Information, March 23, 2010; See also [DHS Inspector General Repor](http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/assets/mgmtrpts/OIG_09-90_Jul09.pdf)t, July 2009).¶ Rep. Sheila Jackson-Lee (D-TX), a notorious proponent of amnesty for illegal aliens, pressed USCIS Director Alejandro Mayorkas and Assistant Inspector General Deffer on whether USCIS was prepared to handle the processing of millions of amnesty applications should Congress pass a so-called "comprehensive immigration reform" bill. "I cannot imagine," Jackson-Lee declared, "if we pass comprehensive immigration reform, what a paper-based system will do." While Mayorkas attempted to argue that USCIS would be able to successfully implement an amnesty program, Deffer offered a much less optimistic assessment: "In effect, adding twelve million more people to the system would be the mother of all backlogs." Deffer continued: "Clearly, to us, the systems could not handle it now." (Hearing Information, March 23, 2010).

#### Political capital doesn’t exist and isn’t key to their DA- more likely winners win

Michael Hirsch 5/30/13 – 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.

### 2ac – service sector

#### Plan ensures Mexico production is checked – prevents negative effects

US COTA 91 – Congress Office of Technology Assessment (“Redesigning Defense: Planning the Transition to the Future U.S. Defense Industrial Base”, OTA-ISC-500, July 1991, http://ota-cdn.fas.org/reports/9134.pdf)//javi

As a practical matter, however, the shift of some defense manufacturing and assembly work to plants based in Mexico would probably have little adverse effect on the ability of the U.S. defense industry to mobilize in a crisis. Because of stringent military specifications and restrictions on classified work manufacturing and assembly in Mexico is likely to remain limited to labor-intensive production of noncritical dual-use items, such as subassemblies and subcomponents.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett 07, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### Recent temperatures show no increase in warming

**Happer 12** (William is a professor of physics at Princeton. “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again”, Wall Street Journal, 3/27/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979
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**It won’t pass—House won’t accept CR and piecemeal approach fails**

**AP 10-28**-13. AP ABC News “Immigration reform: Obama urges Congress again to take action before end of year” [http://www.wjla.com/articles/2013/10/immigration-reform-obama-urges-congress-again-to-take-action-before-end-of-year-96071.html] **[MG]**

WASHINGTON (AP) - Prospects for comprehensive immigration legislation this year **grew murkier** on the eve of an all-out push by a coalition of business, religious and law enforcement to convince the House to overhaul the decades-old system. Proponents seized on two developments as a Senate-passed measure remains stalled in the House - President Barack Obama's meeting at the White House on Tuesday with a House Republican working on legislation and a California GOP lawmaker's willingness to back a House Democratic plan. But in a blow to their effort, Sen. Marco Rubio signaled support for the piecemeal approach in the House despite his months of work and vote for the comprehensive Senate bill that would provide a path to citizenship for the 11 million immigrants living here illegally and tighten border security. The Florida Republican - son of Cuban immigrants and a potential presidential candidate in 2016 - had **provided crucial support for the bipartisan Senate bill**. "Sen. Rubio has always preferred solving immigration reform with piecemeal legislation. The Senate opted to pursue a comprehensive bill, and he joined that effort because he wanted to influence the policy that passed the Senate," Rubio's spokesman, Alex Conant, said Monday in explaining Rubio's backing for limited measures. Since 68 Democrats and Republicans joined together to pass the Senate bill in June, opponents and many conservatives have stepped up their pressure against any immigration legislation, based not only on their principle opposition but their unwillingness to deliver on Obama's top second-term domestic agenda issue. The recent budget fight only **inflamed conservative GOP feelings toward Obama.** Obama on Monday reiterated his call for Congress to complete action on an immigration overhaul before the end of the year. He said that represented the only way to end the record deportations of immigrants undertaken by his administration, actions he has tried to curtail by allowing young people who immigrated illegally into the United States - so-called Dreamers - to remain in the country under certain conditions. "That's why my top priority has been let's make sure that we comprehensively reform the whole system so that we're not just dealing with Dreamers, we're also dealing with anybody who's here and is undocumented," he said in an interview with Fusion, a cable channel that is a collaboration of ABC News and Univision. Most House Republicans reject a comprehensive approach and many question offering citizenship to people who broke U.S. immigration laws to be in this country. The House Judiciary Committee has moved forward with individual, single-issue immigration bills. Although House Republican leaders say they want to solve the issue, which has become a political drag for the GOP, many rank-and-file House Republicans have shown little inclination to deal with it. With just a few legislative weeks left in the House, **it's unclear whether lawmakers will vote on any measure before the year is out.**

#### CIR isn’t close – prefer vote counts

USA Today 10/30/13 (Alan Gomez, "Three Republicans Back Democratic Immigration Bill in House")

Rep. David Valadao, R-Calif., on Wednesday became the third Republican to co-sponsor the bill, which includes a pathway to citizenship for the nation's 12 million undocumented immigrants.¶ Valadao, the son of Portuguese immigrants whose family runs a dairy farm, said in an interview with USA TODAY that his background, and that of his district, which is 72% Hispanic, was a big factor in his decision.¶ "I grew up in an immigrant family, I grew up in an immigrant community and I work in an immigrant-dependent industry. So it's not like this is a stretch for me," he said.¶ Valadao said the slow pace of immigration legislation in the House also contributed to his decision.¶ "This isn't really a shot at leadership, but more, 'Guys, this is important to me, we have to move and we have to be part of this solution,'" he said. "It doesn't matter how conservative of a district you come from - we have a system that we need to fix."¶ Valado's decision to join Reps. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., and Jeff Denham, R-Calif., in co-sponsoring the bill comes at a critical time for immigration reform in Congress.¶ There are 231 Republicans in the House and the GOP leadership has overseen hearings on separate bills tackling individual immigration issues. It has not favored a single bill to handle all issues.¶ A bill needs 218 votes to pass the House and the Democratic bill has 186 Democratic co-sponsors. Adding three GOP votes still falls well short of a majority for passage.¶ The Senate passed a sweeping overhaul to the nation's immigration laws in June that provides a pathway to citizenship for the country's undocumented immigrants, doubles the size of the Border Patrol and revamps the legal immigration system to bring in more high-tech and low-skilled workers.¶ But even Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., one of the architects of that bill, has questioned whether that bill is the best way forward. Rubio said Rubio's spokesman, Alex Conant, said the "all or nothing" approach they took in the Senate "would result in nothing."¶ Rubio and House Republican leaders say they would rather move forward with the "piecemeal" approach in which Congress considers smaller bills that tackle individual pieces of the nation's immigration laws.

#### They’re taking the blame

Star-Telegram 10/26/13 ("First, The Obamacare Computers Must Work")

Then there was the part of the testimony when the computer experts said there wasn’t enough time devoted to testing the new system. Full-scale tryouts of the integrated parts didn’t start until two weeks before the launch date.¶ Even the most basic experience with putting together a new computer program shows that sufficient time for testing the finished product is essential.¶ At least, Obama administration officials aren’t trying to escape blame for the rollout debacle.¶ “This is on us,” said White House Press Secretary Jay Carney. “And that goes from the president on down.”¶ Still, accepting responsibility is not the same as making everything OK. What has made the Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) controversial is its goal of offering so much, nothing less than “affordable” health care for millions of people who have not had full access to the miracles of modern medicine because they cost so much.¶ That’s not to mention all the political capital President Obama’s team has poured into the ACA. It stands to be his most important legacy, but first it has to work.

#### Health.gov costs capital – issue has staying power

Pace and Benac 10/26/13 (Julie and Nancy, Huffington Post Politics, "Obama's Health Care Woes May Have Staying Power")

For nearly five years, Republicans have struggled to make a scandal stick to President Barack Obama's White House. One by one, the controversies — with shorthand names such as Solyndra, Benghazi, and Fast and Furious — hit a fever pitch, then faded away.¶ But some Republicans see the disastrous rollout of Obama's health law as a problem with the kind of staying power they have sought.¶ The health care failures are tangible for millions of Americans and can be experienced by anyone with Internet access. The law itself is more closely associated with Obama personally and long has been unpopular with the majority of the American people.¶ The longer the technical problems persist, the more likely they are to affect the delicate balance of enrollees needed in the insurance marketplace in order to keep costs down.

#### saps political capital and kills the agenda

**Dovere, 10/25** (Edward-Isaac Dovere, Politico, 25 October 2013, “Democrats' united front cracks,” http://www.politico.com/story/2013/10/the-democratic-crackup-98832.html)//CC

The problems with the Obamacare website have transformed the president from a man who seemed to have gotten a sudden infusion of political capital to a man who’s been pushed back on his heels. He was firm, and he was setting the agenda. Now he’s back to trying to beating back the latest frame Republicans have forced on him, inadvertently providing evidence to support the doubts they’ve been trying to sow from the beginning. He spent last week against the backdrop of a shutdown that made people appreciate all the things government can do for them. Now he has a website which shows how little it can. (PHOTOS: Obamacare online glitches: 25 great quotes) And Democrats have scattered, raising the question of whether the president will be able to preserve any of the new cohesion he inspired earlier in the month, or whether the rift is going to widen again. With every day, there was more impatience and dismay with the botched rollout of the website. Meanwhile, the White House spent much of the week dealing with a bizarre episode with Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) over whether an unnamed Republican insulted the president, forced to support Speaker John Boehner’s denial over the insistent statement of one of its closest allies on the Hill. Privately, certain Republicans express concern with the party’s decision to focus so much attention on a website that could very well be fixed over the next few months, instead of calling attention to other potentially problematic aspects of the law. And polls show support for Republicans remains way down, while support for Obamacare is still ticking up. (PHOTOS: 10 Sebelius quotes about the Obamacare website) But instead of spending the week beating up on Republican overreach, or promoting all the aspects of the law that don’t involve uninsured people spending hours trying to sign up, Democrats have had to confront undeniable problems that have even core liberals worried.

#### Obama is getting dragged in – comes before immigration/farm bill

The Wall Street Journal 10/17/13 (Peter Nichols and Carol Lee,"Obama's Agenda Faces Rocky Road")

Yet as much as he wants to shift the focus to immigration and the farm bill, Mr. Obama will have trouble pulling it off. His administration is under pressure to fix the operational problems that have bedeviled the new health-care exchanges.

### 1ar – nieto

**Studies prove no impact**

Perumal 11, business reporter – Gulf Times, 9/14/’11 (Santhosh, <http://www.gulf-times.com/site/topics/article.asp?cu_no=2&item_no=458158&version=1&template_id=48&parent_id=28>)

Oil price shocks are not always costly for oil-importing countries as a 25% increase in oil prices causes their GDP (gross domestic product) to fall by about half of 1% or less, according to an International Monetary Fund (IMF) working paper. “Across the world, oil **price shock episodes have** generally **not been associated with** a contemporaneous **decline in output** but, rather, with increases in both imports and exports,” the paper said. There is evidence of lagged negative effects on output, particularly for the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) economies, but the magnitude has typically been small, said the paper, authored by Tobias N Rasmussen and Agustín Roitman. For a given level of world GDP, the paper found that oil prices have a negative effect on oil-importing countries and also that cross-country differences in the magnitude of the impact depend to a large extent on the relative magnitude of oil imports.  “The effect is still not particularly large, however, with our estimates suggesting that a 25% increase in oil prices will cause a loss of real GDP in oil-importing countries of **less than half of 1%, spread over 2–3 years**,” the authors said. One likely explanation for this relatively modest impact is that part of the greater revenue accruing to oil exporters will be recycled in the form of imports or other international flows, thus contributing to keep up demand in oil-importing economies, the paper said. “The negative impact of oil price shocks on oil-importing countries is partly offset by concurrent increases in exports and other income flows,” it said.

#### Even with Pemex reforms it’s too risky to do business with Mexico

Casillas 13- Juan Casillas, based in Mexico City, provides consulting services to international corporations regarding their activities in Mexico as well as to Mexican businesses on their operations and initiatives overseas. He is a seasoned participant in the Mexican market who has worked in both Mexico and the United States and has substantial experience in business development, strategic planning and analysis, government public affairs, and consulting in both countries. He has worked with companies in the financial, energy, manufacturing, infrastructure, hospitality, pharmaceutical, transportation, security, technology, and mining industries amongst others. He is fluent in Spanish and English. Prior to joining ManattJones, Mr. Casillas was the General Manager of STR SA de CV, a software development company. In 2000, Mr. Casillas founded Colegioweb SA de CV, an Internet company dedicated to providing Extranet services to schools and medium-size companies and organizations. From 1993 to 1999, Mr. Casillas was the Assistant General Director of a hologram manufacturing company in Mexico. Prior to the above, Mr. Casillas worked at Andersen Consulting in the Chicago office and at Servicios de Fomento Industrial, a Mexican consulting firm.

[Juan Casillas](http://www.manatt.com/JuanCasillas.aspx), Michael Melamed, Mexico's upcoming energy reform: Opportunities, limitations, and challenges, Lexology, January 25 2013, <http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=65b2a55c-4e63-44d5-bfb5-c90113fdf287>, Accessed 10/7/13

Of course, there are and will continue to be risks associated with doing business in Mexico. Despite Peña Nieto's reform-minded agenda, numerous competing civic and political factions in Mexico—labor unions; local, state, and national politicians; environmental groups; etc.—can make doing business a challenge, especially for extractive industries. When working with Pemex, contracts (with some exceptions) are granted through a bid system rather than negotiations—a process that is not necessarily difficult, but requires knowledge of the system. Security continues to be an issue, though threats are declining and are by no means prohibitive to doing business in Mexico. Inflexibility in current labor laws and union negotiations can increase the cost of doing business; however, labor reform was the final legislative victory of the prior Calderon Administration. Yet more is needed, and further efforts as well as implementation of the reform are on the current Administration's agenda.