### 1NC – DA

#### China’s influence in Latin America is strong due to diverted U.S attention

IVN 2-13 [The Independent Voter Network (IVN), reporter of political news, How the U.S. is Losing Latin America, Feb. 13, 2014, http://ivn.us/2014/02/12/u-s-losing-latin-america/]

Recently, American foreign policy priorities have been highly focused on the Middle East and Asia-Pacific regions. Between winding down the U.S. military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan and navigating the tumult caused by the Arab Spring, President Obama has spent much of his diplomatic capital in the Middle East.¶ In the Asia-Pacific region, the president has further increased American diplomatic involvement. For the past few years, the U.S. has engaged China on trade and security issues, grappled with the increasingly volatile situation in North Korea, and worked to develop more robust trade partnerships with other countries in the region.¶ Meanwhile, American clout in Latin America is waning. Nick Miroff of the Washington Post wrote in January that “with Washington’s diplomatic attention largely focused elsewhere, on Asia and the Middle East, Latin America’s shift had resulted in declining U.S. influence.” Mark Weisbrot agreed with this analysis when he wrote in The Guardian that “Latin America, and especially South America, has become independent of Washington in the past 15 years…”¶ "China has surpassed the U.S. as leading trade partner in some Latin American countries."¶ This presents a huge challenge to American foreign policy interests. Already, the trade relationship between the United States and Latin America has suffered. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, exports to South and Central America decreased from approximately $183 billion in 2012 to roughly $169 billion in 2013. At the same time, imports from Latin America were approximately $172 billion in 2012, and decreased to roughly $146 billion in 2013.¶ Even as trade between the United States and Latin America has been disappointing, China has moved into the gap left by the lack of U.S. interest in the region. Patricia Rey Mallen of the International Business Times reported in December 2013 that “in some Latin countries, China has even reached the status of top trading partner. For example, with respect to Brazil, China surpassed the U.S. in 2009…”¶ Not only is China working to out-trade the United States in the Latin American region, China is also working to out-invest the United States in the region. Weisbrot writes:¶ “China has already helped Venezuala with tens of billions of dollars of loans–much of which has already been repaid–as well as investment. It has also provided significant lending and investment in Ecuador, Cuba, Brazil and other countries.”¶ The United States has also made critical mistakes with regard to many countries in Latin America. Last July, Anthony Boadle of Reuters reported that several nations in the region were “irate” in response to allegations that the U.S. National Security Agency has been monitoring the Internet.¶ "Exports to South/Central America decreased from about $183B in 2012 to roughly $169B in 2013"¶ Then in September, before the United Nations General Assembly, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff condemned NSA phone eavesdropping. She also cancelled a state visit to the United States.

#### Plan trades off

Dowd ‘12

Alan Dowd, Senior Fellow with the American Security Council Foundation, 2012, “Crisis in the America's,” <http://www.ascfusa.org/content_pages/view/crisisinamericas>

Reengagement also means revitalizing security ties. A good model to follow might be what’s happening in China’s backyard. To deter China and prevent an accidental war, the U.S. is reviving its security partnerships all across the Asia-Pacific region. Perhaps it’s time to do the same in Latin America. We should remember that many Latin American countries—from Mexico and Panama to Colombia and Chile—border the Pacific. Given Beijing’s actions, it makes sense to bring these Latin American partners on the Pacific Rim into the alliance of alliances that is already stabilizing the Asia-Pacific region.¶ Finally, all of this needs to be part of a revived Monroe Doctrine.¶ Focusing on Chinese encroachment in the Americas, this “Monroe Doctrine 2.0” would make it clear to Beijing that the United States welcomes China’s efforts to conduct trade in the Americas but discourages any claims of control—implied or explicit—by China over territories, properties or facilities in the Americas. In addition, Washington should make it clear to Beijing that the American people would look unfavorably upon the sale of Chinese arms or the basing of Chinese advisors or military assets in the Western Hemisphere.¶ In short, what it was true in the 19th and 20th centuries must remain true in the 21st: There is room for only one great power in the Western Hemisphere.

#### China’s influence in Latin America is key to their soft power

Malik, 06 – PhD in International Relations (Mohan, "China's Growing Involvement in Latin America," 6/12, <http://uyghuramerican.org/old/articles/300/1/info@uyghuramerican.org>)

China's forays into Latin America are part of its grand strategy to acquire "comprehensive national power" to become a "global great power that is second to none." Aiming to secure access to the continent's vast natural resources and markets, China is forging deep economic, political and military ties with most of the Latin American and Caribbean countries. There is more to China's Latin American activism than just fuel for an economic juggernaut. China now provides a major source of leverage against the United States for some Latin American and Caribbean countries. As in many other parts of the developing world, China is redrawing geopolitical alliances in ways that help propel China's rise as a global superpower. Beijing's courtship of Latin American countries to support its plan to subdue Taiwan and enlist them to join a countervailing coalition against U.S. global power under the rubric of strengthening economic interdependence and globalization has begun to attract attention in Washington. Nonetheless, Beijing's relations with the region are neither too cozy nor frictionless. For Latin America and the Caribbean countries, China is an enviable competitor and rival, potential investor, customer, economic partner, a great power friend and counterweight to the United States, and, above all, a global power, much like the United States, that needs to be handled with care. As in Asia and Africa, China is rapidly expanding its economic and diplomatic presence in Latin America -- a region the United States has long considered inside its sphere of influence. China's interest in Latin America is driven by its desire to secure reliable sources of energy and raw materials for its continued economic expansion, compete with Taiwan for diplomatic recognition, pursue defense and intelligence opportunities to define limits to U.S. power in its own backyard, and to showcase China's emergence as a truly global great power at par with the United States. In Latin America, China is viewed differently in different countries. Some Latin American countries see China's staggering economic development as a panacea or bonanza (Argentina, Peru, and Chile view China as an insatiable buyer of commodities and an engine of their economic growth); others see it as a threat (Mexico, Brazil, and the Central American republics fear losing jobs and investment); and a third group of countries consider China their ideological ally (Bolivia, Cuba, and Venezuela). While China's growing presence and interests have changed the regional dynamics, it still cannot replace the United States as a primary benefactor of Latin America. Chinese investment in the region is US$8 billion, compared with $300 billion by U.S. companies, and U.S.-Latin America trade is ten times greater than China-Latin America trade. Nonetheless, China is the new kid on the block that everyone wants to be friendly with, and Beijing cannot resist the temptation to exploit resentment of Washington's domineering presence in the region to its own advantage. For Washington, China's forays into the region have significant political, security and economic implications because Beijing's grand strategy has made Latin America and Africa a frontline in its pursuit of global influence. China's Grand Strategy: Placing Latin America in the Proper Context China's activities in Latin America are part and parcel of its long-term grand strategy. The key elements of Beijing's grand strategy can be identified as follows: Focus on "comprehensive national power" essential to achieving the status of a "global great power that is second to none" by 2049; Seek energy security and gain access to natural resources, raw materials and overseas markets to sustain China's economic expansion; Pursue the "three Ms": military build-up (including military presence along the vital sea lanes of communication and maritime chokepoints), multilateralism, and multipolarity so as to counter the containment of China's regional and global aspirations by the United States and its friends and allies; Build a network of Beijing's friends and allies through China's "soft power" and diplomatic charm offensive, trade and economic dependencies via closer economic integration (free trade agreements), and mutual security pacts, intelligence cooperation and arms sales.

pacts, intelligence cooperation and arms sales.

#### Chinese international influence is an existential impact – it controls every scenario for extinction

Zhang 2012 (Prof of Diplomacy and IR at the Geneva School of Diplomacy. “The Rise of China’s Political Softpower” 9/4/12 http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2012-09/04/content\_26421330.htm)

As China plays an increasingly significant role in the world, its soft power must be attractive both domestically as well as internationally. The world faces many difficulties, including widespread poverty, international conflict, the clash of civilizations and environmental protection. Thus far, the Western model has not been able to decisively address these issues; the China model therefore brings hope that we can make progress in conquering these dilemmas. Poverty and development The Western-dominated global economic order has worsened poverty in developing countries. Per-capita consumption of resources in developed countries is 32 times as large as that in developing countries. Almost half of the population in the world still lives in poverty. Western countries nevertheless still are striving to consolidate their wealth using any and all necessary means. In contrast, China forged a new path of development for its citizens in spite of this unfair international order which enabled it to virtually eliminate extreme poverty at home. This extensive experience would indeed be helpful in the fight against global poverty. War and peace In the past few years, the American model of "exporting democracy'" has produced a more turbulent world, as the increased risk of terrorism threatens global security. In contrast, China insists that "harmony is most precious". It is more practical, the Chinese system argues, to strengthen international cooperation while addressing both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism. The clash of civilizations Conflict between Western countries and the Islamic world is intensifying. "In a world, which is diversified and where multiple civilizations coexist, the obligation of Western countries is to protect their own benefits yet promote benefits of other nations," wrote Harvard University professor Samuel P. Huntington in his seminal 1993 essay "The Clash of Civilizations?". China strives for "being harmonious yet remaining different", which means to respect other nations, and learn from each other. This philosophy is, in fact, wiser than that of Huntington, and it's also the reason why few religious conflicts have broken out in China. China's stance in regards to reconciling cultural conflicts, therefore, is more preferable than its "self-centered" Western counterargument. Environmental protection Poorer countries and their people are the most obvious victims of global warming, yet they are the least responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases. Although Europeans and Americans have a strong awareness of environmental protection, it is still hard to change their extravagant lifestyles. Chinese environmental protection standards are not yet ideal, but some effective environmental ideas can be extracted from the China model. Perfecting the China model The China model is still being perfected, but its unique influence in dealing with the above four issues grows as China becomes stronger. China's experiences in eliminating poverty, prioritizing modernization while maintaining traditional values, and creating core values for its citizens demonstrate our insight and sense of human consciousness. Indeed, the success of the China model has not only brought about China's rise, but also a new trend that can't be explained by Western theory. In essence, the rise of China is the rise of China's political soft power, which has significantly helped China deal with challenges, assist developing countries in reducing poverty, and manage global issues. As the China model improves, it will continue to surprise the world.

### 1NC – CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should offer Mexico to facilitate a substantial increase in the importation over algae ethanol.

#### The United States federal government should reinstate a version of the Federal Assault Weapons Ban modeled on similar legislation in California.

#### Algae biofuel solves emissions and is cleaner and 3 times as efficient as sugar ethanol

Phys.org 9/19/13 “Algae biofuel cuts CO2 emissions more than 50 percent compared to petroleum fuels.” http://phys.org/news/2013-09-algae-biofuel-co2-emissions-percent.html

Algae-derived biofuel can reduce life cycle CO2 emissions by 50 to 70 percent compared to petroleum fuels, and is approaching a similar Energy Return on Investment (EROI) as conventional petroleum according to a new peer-reviewed paper published in Bioresource Technology. The study, which is the first to analyze real-world data from an existing algae-to-energy demonstration scale farm, shows that the environmental and energy benefits of algae biofuel are at least on par, and likely better, than first generation biofuels. "This study affirms that algae-based fuels provide results without compromise," said Mary Rosenthal, ABO's executive director. "With significant emissions reductions, a positive energy balance, nutrient recycling and CO2 reuse, algae-based fuels will be a long-term, sustainable source of fuels for our nation." The study, "Pilot-scale data provide enhanced estimates of the life cycle energy and emissions profile of algae biofuels produced via hydrothermal liquefaction (HTL)," is a life cycle analysis of an algae cultivation and fuel production process currently employed at pre-commercial scales. The authors examined field data from two facilities operated by Sapphire Energy in Las Cruces and Columbus, New Mexico that grow and process algae into Green Crude oil. Sapphire Energy's Green Crude can be refined into drop-in fuels such as gasoline, diesel and jet fuel. The study concluded that algae technologies at commercial scale are projected to produce biofuels with lower greenhouse gas emissions and EROI values that are comparable to first generation biofuels. Additionally, algae based biofuels produced through this pathway at commercial scale will have a significant energy return on investment (EROI), close to petroleum and three times higher than cellulosic ethanol. The system that was evaluated recycles nutrients, can accept an algae feed that is up to 90 percent water in the processing phase, and the final product can be blended with refinery intermediates for refining into finished gasoline or diesel product, resulting in significant energy savings throughout the process. "These real-world data from demonstration scale facilities gave us new insight and allowed us to understand how scale will impact the benefits and costs of algae-to-energy deployment." said lead author Andres F. Clarens, Assistant Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville. "These results suggest that algae-based fuels made using HTL have an environmental profile that is comparable to conventional biofuels." The authors also write that expected improvements in the industry mean that algae-based biofuels are set to surpass advanced biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol in terms of both energy returns and greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Modeling California’s assault weapons ban solves drug violence

WUEGER 2011 (DIANA, writes on international and domestic small-arms topics at Gunpowder and Lead). July 6, 2011. “How American Guns Proliferate in Mexico and Fuel Drug Violence” The Atlantic. http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/07/how-american-guns-proliferate-in-mexico-and-fuel-drug-violence/241387/?single\_page=true

A new, better-designed assault weapon ban, while neither a perfect nor a complete solution, may be the best hope for curtailing the illegal gun trade to Mexico. [Two recent surveys](http://articles.sfgate.com/2011-05-29/news/29596154_1_gun-purchases-gun-laws-firearm-transactions), though not conclusive, suggest that California's relatively strict laws -- which ban rifles with military-style characteristics, .50-caliber sniper rifles, and high-capacity ammunition magazines -- have made that state a less appealing purchase point for drug traffickers, though it does remain a transport corridor. A 10-day waiting period and mandatory background checks for all gun purchases have also driven [some gun sellers](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/gunrunners-mexico/phoenix/straw-buyers.html#0) away from California, as happened with Iknadosian. Unfortunately, given the laxer laws in surrounding states, they can simply set up shop elsewhere.

### 1NC – DA

#### Telecom reform coming now

Reuters 3/13/14

Veronica Gomez “Mexico likely to present telecoms reform fine print Friday: lawmaker”, Mar 13, 2014

http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/03/13/us-mexico-reforms-idUSBREA2C2BO20140313

MEXICO CITY (Reuters) - Mexico's government may send to the Senate as soon as Friday so-called secondary laws that lay out the fine print of a reform aimed at boosting competition in the telecommunications sector, a top lawmaker said on Thursday. The secondary laws will flesh out a constitutional overhaul approved last year to open up the country's phone and TV industries, which are dominated by billionaire Carlos Slim's America Movil and the country's No. 1 broadcaster, Televisa. "It's very likely tomorrow the telecommunications secondary laws reach the Senate," Emilio Gamboa, Senate leader for the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party told local radio. A draft of the secondary laws obtained by Reuters shows Mexico will give its new telecoms regulator sweeping powers to police dominant telecommunications companies, right down to their prices and discounts. Televisa controls more than 60 percent of the TV market while America Movil controls about 80 percent of Mexico's fixed-line business via its Telmex unit and some 70 percent of the mobile sector through its Telcel unit.

#### Nieto push key

Financial Times 3/11/14

Jude Webber, “Mexico president takes on vested interests,” March 11, 2014, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/d24e14e4-a795-11e3-baa8-00144feab7de.html#axzz2vtOdmUKS

Enrique Peña Nieto, Mexico’s president, has made short shrift of some towering challenges in just over a year in office. Not only has he pushed through half a dozen far-reaching structural reforms in the space of a fortnight, his security forces put the world’s most wanted drug lord back behind bars and killed another. But now comes the hard part: tackling corruption and vested interests in a country where they have become widely accepted as the Mexican way. Recent days have brought reminders of the need to curb both. First came a snowballing scandal involving Oceanografía, a contractor to the Mexican state oil company, Pemex. Despite a history of investigation and lingering questions over its accountability, Oceanografía appears to have continued to rack up juicy state contracts and is now accused of defrauding Citibank’s Mexican unit, Banamex. Then came a landmark ruling by the Federal Telecommunications Institute last week. It ordered telecoms tycoon Carlos Slim, and Televisa, the world’s biggest source of Spanish-language television content, to share infrastructure with rivals, and stripped them of the ability to nab exclusive rights to major events, such as the Olympics. Mr Slim controls a staggering 80 per cent of the fixed-line phone market and 70 per cent of Mexican cellphones, while Televisa, long seen as a powerful friend to Mr Peña Nieto’s Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), has about 70 per cent of the free-to-air TV market and half of the country’s pay TV. “I do think this government is willing to take on special interests,” says Shannon O’Neill at the Council on Foreign Relations. “But that begs the nagging question, which interests – all of them, or particular ones?” In Transparency International’s 2013 corruption perceptions index, in which the lower the score, the higher the perceived level of corruption, Mexico scored 34 out 100, ranking it joint 106th least corrupt out of 177 countries. The government has won praise for writing transparency clauses into many of its reforms, which have been passed in the energy, telecoms, education, labour, financial and tax sectors, but changing the prevailing culture of impunity is “going to be a generational issue”, says Duncan Wood of the Woodrow Wilson Center. “You need to implement the rule of law in every area of society and the economy. You can say they are doing it with organised crime,” added Mr Wood, alluding to the recent capture of Joaquín Guzmán, seen as Mexico’s top drug smuggler, and successful operations to crack down on iron ore smuggling to China by another cartel. “The single most important thing this government can do to show its commitment is to make sure that judicial reform is implemented before [a deadline in] 2016,” he added.

#### Plan triggers backlash- kills agenda

Archibold et al., 13, the New York Times bureau chief for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, based in Mexico City; graduate at Rutgers University; studied history and Spanish in Panama (Randall C. Archibold, Damien Cave, and Ginger Thomson, April 30th 2013, The New York Time “Mexico’s Curbs on U.S. Role in Drug Fight Spark Friction” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/01/world/americas/friction-between-us-and-mexico-threatens-efforts-on-drugs.html?pagewanted=all>)//JES

But shortly after Mexico’s new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December, American agents got a clear message that the dynamics, with Washington holding the clear upper hand, were about to change. “So do we get to polygraph you?” one incoming Mexican official asked his American counterparts, alarming United States security officials who consider the vetting of the Mexicans central to tracking down drug kingpins. The Mexican government briefly stopped its vetted officials from cooperating in sensitive investigations. The Americans are waiting to see if Mexico allows polygraphs when assigning new members to units, a senior Obama administration official said. In another clash, American security officials were recently asked to leave an important intelligence center in Monterrey, where they had worked side by side with an array of Mexican military and police commanders collecting and analyzing tips and intelligence on drug gangs. The Mexicans, scoffing at the notion of Americans’ having so much contact with different agencies, questioned the value of the center and made clear that they would put tighter reins on the sharing of drug intelligence. There have long been political sensitivities in Mexico over allowing too much American involvement. But the recent policy changes have rattled American officials used to far fewer restrictions than they have faced in years.

#### Mexican telecom reforms solve US manufacturing

O'Neill 13

(Shannon K., Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies, Council on Foreign Relations, "Economic Change on Mexico's Horizon", March 25 2013, www.cfr.org/mexico/economic-change-mexicos-horizon/p30311)

President Peña Nieto's economic reforms are targeting the big empires of the country's [telecommunications sector](http://news.yahoo.com/mexicos-planned-telecoms-shake-threatens-slim-televisa-010627653--finance.html). Can you give some background on the industry? What is his goal in this sector?¶ For the last twenty plus years, **Mexico's telecommunications industry has been** basically **in the hands** **of** Carlos **Slim**. Whether it's Telmex, which is fixed line, or Telcel, which is mobile, **his companies have controlled** 70 to **80 percent of the market**. By all independent accounts, this has had huge costs for Mexico's economy, **particularly for consumers and businesses, which pay much higher rates for their telephone needs**.¶ **The other big cost is** underinvestment in the telecoms sector**.** **When you look at Mexico vis-à-vis other OECD countries**, as well as its emerging market peers—China or Korea or Brazil—**Mexico falls behind in telecom infrastructure investment**. This **includes new types of connections**, such as Internet and broadband. Indeed, by some measures, **the country even falls behind places likes Zimbabwe and Serbia**. That **lack of access to the digital age has real costs for businesses and innovation**.¶ The Televisa broadcaster is another one of the empires being targeted by these reforms. Broadcast is another sector that Mexicans in general have been worried about. There is a duopoly in broadcast between Televisa, which has about 70 percent of the market, and TV Azteca, which takes the remaining 30 percent. Like many countries, the vast majority of Mexicans get their news from television, not from print media or radio, where you see more competition and plurality. So what [officials] say they're going to do is auction off at least two new networks on the spectrum; in those auctions, neither of these existing companies can bid. So this is another opening up. There's also been talk of creating another public channel, i.e., a government channel. The head of Mexico's teachers' union, Elba Esther Gordillo, was recently arrested on embezzlement charges. What's the significance of this in light of these other reforms? Gordillo's arrest also sends out a warning to other people that might oppose Peña Nieto's reform project. It's a little bit of a shot across the bow. Before her arrest, the congress passed a constitutional measure that would reform the education system and do things like subject teachers to performance tests. She had been politically opposed to that and some of these other proposed accountability measures. Additionally, most people believed she was corrupt--she's been photographed for years wearing very, very nice clothes, and has houses that people have talked about. There was always a question about how she could afford all these Hermes bags on a supposed $80,000-90,000 a year salary. But there's also a question here about the timing: Why did [Peña Nieto] go after her now? One answer is that [the government] finally got its act together and collected incriminating evidence. They've become much better at financial tracking. But another answer is that she had become a political adversary opposed to the government's reform project. And [her arrest] is a way to diminish her power, if not remove her altogether from the political scene. Gordillo's arrest also sends out a warning to other people that might oppose Peña Nieto's reform project. It's a little bit of a shot across the bow—that "not only are we going to push this reform, but if you do not negotiate with us or work with us in some way, we might be willing to use other tactics." Energy and tax reform are also on the horizon. What's in development right now? In some ways, [energy and tax reform] may need to go together, because revenues from energy are such a big part of the federal budget. If you don't reform the tax system and increase revenue, it's hard to change the structure of energy, because you need this money to pay for day-to-day operations. Officials have been talking about energy reform since the beginning of the campaign. It's part of the Pact for Mexico, which is an agreement between the three parties [Peña Nieto's Institutional Revolutionary Party, the National Action Party, and the Party of the Democratic Revolution] to push things forward. It sounds like the administration will push for a constitutional reform that will open up the energy sector, mostly for new developments and particularly the type of exploration and production that requires high levels of expertise and technology that Pemex does not necessarily have. This applies to deep-water drilling in the Gulf, to shale oil and shale gas, and to potentially other fields where Mexico doesn't really have a developed expertise. When the Pact for Mexico was signed, it was heralded as a historic moment of cooperation. Do you expect that esprit de corps to persist with these reform measures? Three different political parties with different ideological leanings may agree on the principles of reform, but as more of these negotiations get down to the details, there have been tensions, and there will continue to be tensions. The pact has survived so far through education reform; and it seems to have survived through the telecommunications reform—but I would say that it would be harder to keep this coalition together for energy and tax reform. It may survive, but it may be that just two parties come out together rather than all three. That's a distinct possibility. And if that happens, and if only some reforms are passed, which would be too bad, it's still worth it because these are changes that Mexico's economy desperately needs. The drug war is still happening in the background of all this. To what degree is that affecting Mexico's economy? Mexico has been doing fairly well over the last few years, but it could be doing so much better. Some impediments are the uncompetitive parts of the economy, but another drag is security. When foreign companies think about investing in Mexico, they all have a discussion about security. It doesn't mean that they don't invest, but they may not go in as fast or as big. And many may not go in at all. It's a big cost for day-to-day operations, particularly for small- and medium-sized companies where security costs are much higher as a percentage of revenues than, say, a big multinational company. It's very hard to measure, but people say it might cost anywhere between 1 and 2 percent of GDP per year. So if Mexico's economy is growing at 3 or 4 percent now, it could be growing at 4 or 5. Is the United States paying attention to these reforms? There are a lot of U.S. businesses watching to see what happens—is there enough economic opportunity for them in these new, more open sectors? Definitely. There have been meetings about it already between economic liaisons. It was part of the discussion when Peña Nieto met with Obama back in November. It's also on the agenda of manufacturers and the finance world. Indeed, there are a lot of U.S. businesses watching to see what happens—is there enough economic opportunity for them in these new, more open sectors? But also, particularly in the financial world, people are asking: is Mexico for real this time? Are they really going to make the structural changes that would open the economy and let it grow faster? Successfully pushing through these reforms would have a much larger impact: people will look to Mexico and say, "Mexico's really open for business and making the kind of changes necessary to be a big player." And we've already seen a lot of investment, particularly with U.S. manufacturers in Mexico, despite many of the country's problems. Many factories in the United States depend on those in Mexico—there are pieces and parts that are crossing the border every day that allow a company, in the end, to create a globally competitive product. This is already the reality, but the question going forward is: Can the United States make the most of this and make it even easier for these companies to grow by facilitating trade with Mexico? Rather than thinking about cutting back this trade, we should recognize that Mexico helps support U.S. workers because trade grows the overall pie for these companies. A rising tide on both sides of the border lifts all boats.

#### US manufacturing leadership averts global war

O’Hanlon et al 12(Mackenzie Eaglen, American Enterprise Institute Rebecca Grant, IRIS Research Robert P. Haffa, Haffa Defense Consulting Michael O'Hanlon, The Brookings Institution Peter W. Singer, The Brookings Institution Martin Sullivan, Commonwealth Consulting Barry Watts, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments “The Arsenal of Democracy and How to Preserve It: Key Issues in Defense Industrial Policy January 2012,” pg online @ <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/1/26%20defense%20industrial%20base/0126_defense_industrial_base_ohanlon> //um-ef)

The current wave of defense cuts is also different than past defense budget reductions in their likely industrial impact, as the U.S. d**efense** i**ndustrial** b**ase** is in a **much** different place **than it was in the past**. Defense industrial issues are too often viewed through the lens of jobs and pet projects to protect in congressional districts. But the overall health of the firms that supply the technologies our armed forces utilize does have national security resonance. Qualitative superiority in weaponry and other key military technology has become an essential element of American military power in the modern era—not only for winning wars but for deterring them. That requires world-class scientific and manufacturing capabilities—which in turn can also generate civilian and military export opportunities for the United States in a globalized marketplace.

### 1NC – QPQ

#### Interpretation—economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a quid pro quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.

The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.

The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.

The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Plan isn’t --- voting issue:

#### Limits --- our interp functionally narrows the topic because few cases can defend conditioning

#### Ground --- QPQ locks in core generics like soft power and foreign politics DAs, counterplans to add or remove a condition, and “say no” and backlash arguments

### Advantage 1: Mexico

#### The plan is insufficient to solve all of the barriers to Mexican biofuels like poor agricultural conditions, technology, and weak infrastructure

#### Poor investment environment blocks development

Castillo, CNN, 11

(Mariano, 8-13-11, “Mexico sees future with biofuels,” http://www.cnn.com/2011/WORLD/americas/08/12/mexico.biofuels/, accessed 12-29-13, CMM)

But James Row, CEO of Houston-based Producers Energy and part owner of a Mexican-based biodiesel company, told CNN that Mexico is still far from being an ideal place to produce biofuels.¶ "Mexico is absolutely a perfect country for biodiesel, especially if it can be domestically grown," he said, but the country's ejido system -- collectively-held land in rural areas -- creates hurdles for private investment. The result is difficulty in finding continuous large areas of rural land that can be negotiated for use for cultivation, or high prices that make it cost prohibitive.¶ Without land reform, issues with land availability will continue, and Mexico will fall a decade or more behind other countries in the biofuels sector, Row said.¶ The demand is there, the land is there, but there is no way to get it, he said.

#### No Korean war-provocations are the norm

**Lankov, ANU adjunct research fellow, 2013**

(Andrei, “Serious armed clash on the Korean Peninsula unlikely”, 3-28, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/03/28/a-serious-armed-clash-on-the-korean-peninsula-is-unlikely/>, ldg)

The international community is worried, to be sure, and some media outlets have begun to dispatch their correspondents to Seoul on the assumption that a conflict might break out very soon. But these media companies are likely to be wasting their money. The likelihood of any confrontation, let alone war, in Korea remains pretty low. What we are seeing now is just another round of political manipulation by Pyongyang. The DPRK’s show of menacing bellicosity is a performance aimed at both foreign and domestic audiences. This is well understood in Seoul — not only by the government but also by the public at large. While the South Korean media dutifully report the gothic threats that emanate from Pyongyang, the general public pays surprisingly little attention to these outbursts and seeming signs of danger. It is also telling that the South Korean stock market has not reacted in any noticeably negative way to the ‘crisis’. The reason for this calm is simple: South Koreans have seen this many, many times. As a matter of fact, they see such histrionics as often as once every year or two. North Korea has claimed that the 1953 armistice is null and void on a number of occasions in the past — the last time such statements were made was in May 2009, as part of a reaction against an earlier UN resolution, which, like the recent one, condemned a nuclear test. As for the recent promise to transform Seoul into a ‘sea of fire’, it has been repeated a number of times. It was first used in 1994 and repeated in 2003. Sometimes, the North Korean media has not limited itself to such general threats, but has become very specific about their supposed targets. For example, in July 2012, the North Korean official media threatened to blow up the headquarters of a major South Korean newspaper, which had published articles and materials not to Pyongyang’s liking. But nothing has happened to the newspaper’s headquarters or, for that matter, to the South Korean capital itself. North Korea has never made good on its threats, so the South Korean public is probably right to take another Pyongyang broadside very lightly. So why does North Korea behave this way? There seem to be at least two reasons behind Pyongyang’s noisy behaviour. First, this rhetoric seems to have become a standard reaction to UN Security Council resolutions that condemn nuclear and missile tests in the North. In spite of its high pitch this is a diplomatic gesture, a way to express North Korea’s dissatisfaction with the resolution and its resolute unwillingness to bow to outside pressure. But there is another reason for the DPRK’s verbal bellicosity. The North Korean populace has to be regularly reminded that their country is surrounded by scheming enemies. Otherwise, they might start asking politically dangerous questions — for example, they might wonder why their country, once the most industrially advanced in all of continental East Asia, is increasingly lagging behind China and, especially, South Korea. Outside threats are the best way to explain away never-ending economic difficulties, and an air raid drill or two does wonders when it comes to keeping people afraid and stopping them from having heretical thoughts. It will also remind North Koreans of the need to maintain discipline and unite around the current leader and his ‘glorious’ family. It therefore appears that the world has overreacted somewhat to North Korean rhetoric. This does not mean that the Korean Peninsula is a peaceful place. On the contrary, as decades of experience teaches us, we can be pretty sure that from time to time some clashes (of relatively small scale) are bound to happen on the land and sea borders between the two Koreas. But right now the chances of such clashes are low. The noise emanating from Pyongyang is, well, just noise.

#### Mexican economy resilient and sustainable-ag makes it worse

O'NEIL, Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 14

(Shannon, “Mexico,” Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb2014, Vol. 93 Issue 1, p11-16, ebsco, accessed 12-29-13, CMM)

Viva las Reformas¶ Just over a year ago, as President Enrique Peña Nieto started his administration, the domestic and international press were touting "Mexico's moment" and the rise of "the Aztec tiger." Now, the naysayers have returned. Their pessimism stems in part from disappointing economic results: Mexico's GDP growth has fallen, from nearly four percent in 2012 to around an estimated one percent in 2013. The negativity also reflects the impatience of pundits and markets, as the economic dividends from Peña Nieto's ambitious economic reform agenda have yet to appear.¶ Today's vocal disappointment discounts the positive changes Mexico has undergone and continues to make. Over the last three decades, Mexico has made the transition from a commodity-and agricultural-based economy to one dominated by manufacturing and services. It is also finally moving forward on a host of overdue domestic reforms. Internationally, the country is firmly situated within North American supply chains, augmenting its global competitiveness. And these advantages should only grow with Mexico's involvement in both the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Pacific Alliance, two of the most dynamic free-trade negotiations of this century. If Mexico is able to make its legislative changes stick and harness its geostrategic potential, the country will excel over the next five years, benefiting its people and making it a good bet for investors.¶ ONCE UPON A TIME IN MEXICO¶ As the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) celebrates its 20th anniversary, many forget just how much Mexico has changed in the last two decades. Once hidden behind high tariffs, quotas, subsidies, and hundreds of state-owned enterprises, Mexico's economy is now one of the most open in the world. Mexico boasts free-trade agreements with over 40 countries and a trade-to-GDP ratio -- a common measure of economic openness -- above 60 percent, surpassing the United States, Brazil, and even China. And whereas oil once represented over 75 percent of Mexico's exports, today it is manufactured goods that produce three out of every four export dollars.¶ This transition has not been easy. In fact, Mexico's openness was for many years seen as a weakness. Relentless international competition threatened new companies and otherwise promising industries, giving them little time to climb the learning curve. Particularly after China's 2001 entrance into the World Trade Organization, the search by CEOS and their boards for lower-cost and more flexible producers led many east, decimating several of Mexico's manufacturing sectors, including textiles and apparel.¶ This trend is now reversing. The low-skilled, low-paid jobs are likely gone from Mexico for good. But rising wages in China, combined with higher Mexican productivity; increasing energy costs, which make shipping more expensive; the proximity of Mexican factories to the United States, reducing delivery times; and worries about intellectual property rights, have led a number of manufacturers to choose Mexico over China. Others have brought back production once sent across the Pacific. In advanced manufacturing industries such as aerospace and automotive, Bombardier, Embraer, Honda, Nissan, and Volkswagen have invested billions of dollars in Mexico and made the country a vital leg of their global supply chains.¶ As Mexico's economy has changed, so, too, has its society. Alongside a few of the world's wealthiest individuals and tens of millions who are still poor, a growing middle class has arisen. Depending on how one measures this group, it now comprises anywhere from 40 million to over 60 million Mexicans -- either way, a large percentage of a population of 116 million. These individuals and their families own cars, houses, and every modern appliance, as well as new cell phones. A growing number use their newfound disposable incomes to send their children to private schools.¶ Such increased consumption shows up in aggregate GDP numbers and on companies' balance sheets. Providers of electronics (Elektra), air travel (Interjet, Volaris), basic goods (OfficeMax, Walmart), cars (Ford, GM), credit cards (American Express), and high-end coffee (Starbucks) are just some of the firms that have seen their sales and profits rise.¶ THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN¶ The current government under Peña Nieto has kicked off its six-year term with an ambitious reform agenda. Working with Congress even before he donned the presidential sash, Peña Nieto helped pass a labor reform to reduce the size of the informal sector by making it easier for businesses to hire and fire employees (among many other changes). Once in office, his administration, working with all three major political parties, passed an educational reform to make the system more transparent and merit-based, introducing evaluations and performance tests. Next came telecommunications and the media, with new legislation creating a more powerful regulator and opening up the broadcast spectrum in an attempt to break up the current monopolies. Recent fiscal reforms should increase government revenue while also redistributing the tax burden, raising rates on the wealthiest, taxing capital gains and dividends, and creating universal pensions and unemployment insurance for those in the formal sector.¶ Peña Nieto's administration has focused on major political and energy reforms, which are intended to take on two of Mexico's most sacred political cows: the reelection of politicians and foreign investment in energy, both of which have long been banned. The government has also pursued financial reforms that would encourage lenders to extend credit beyond just a fortunate few. Although all the reforms entail compromises, many represent real changes. If fully implemented, they have the potential to chip away at Mexico's many barriers to broader, more inclusive growth.

### Advantage 2: Ethanol

#### Multiple barriers to Mexican ethanol

Cuellar, freelance bioenergy professional, Energias Renovables, 12

(Noor-Hal, August 28th, “ Biofuels in Mexico: the foundations for an unborn industry,” http://www.energias-renovables.com/articulo/biofuels-in-mexico-the-foundations-for-an-20120828, accessed 12-29-13, CMM)

In 2007 the Law for the Promotion and Development of Bioenergetics was approved and finally launched in 2008. Finally the policy framework was established to work as the required foundations to develop further the biofuels industry in Mexico. This law also made provisions on how the Mexican oil company, PEMEX, was expected to release tenders for private companies to start producing ethanol from biomass, preferably sugarcane-based, to achieve the goal by 2012.¶ However, this was not achieved. Why? As stated by Ganz (2012), there are several factors involved. First one, the instability of the agricultural supply for the potential biomass sources, as sugarcane and corn, where production levels for food are not enough for the country consumption that they need to be imported. Second the prices of ethanol are not stable, since the national market depends on how much the international price fluctuates. This is further discussed by Bosque & Ortigoza (2011) where as discussed previously, high international sugar prices have affected the ethanol production all around the world and in Mexico, so using sugarcane for ethanol fuel is not feasible if sugar would give higher revenue for sugarcane industrials. There are some other factors that could jeopardize the development as expected for Mexican sugarcane ethanol, as stated by Ambriz (cited by Bosque & Ortigoza, 2011) like high water requirements from the production process, less efficiency than corn ethanol and Mexican sugar mills’ obsolete technology.

#### Mexican CORN ethanol undermines the environment and causes food price volatility

Ganz, Renewable Energy Mexico, 12

(Aurora, 8-21-12, “Mexico looks to ethanol production for energy generation,” www.renewableenergymexico.com/?p=537, accessed 12-29-13, CMM)

However, increasing ethanol in the energy sector also provokes some negative effects. Meeting the growing demand for ethanol implies intensifying agricultural expansion and deforestation, affecting land use and food production. The consequent soil depletion of massive production damages both the ecosystem and the stability of the food sector, altering prices and available quantities of some of the main sources of sustenance, such as food crops. As a matter of fact, converting grain to fuel boosts food prices since a growing ethanol demand increases its price and consequently raises the associated price of grain and food. Moreover, using food for energy generation raises the grave moral dilemma of allocating considerable vital sources to the energy sector instead of to the growing population.¶ A worrying example comes from the recent events in the United States, the biggest ethanol producer after Brazil, where a drought completely damaged the agriculture in Texas, increasing the price of corn to such an extent that the petroleum refining company Valero Energy Corp decided to close down two of its ten ethanol plants.

#### Food prices won’t cause instability

**WFP 2012**

(World Food Program, “High Food Prices: Why This Is Different From 2008”, 9-4, <http://www.wfp.org/stories/high-food-prices-why-different-2008>, ldg)

1. Global stocks of rice and wheat are higher than they were in 2008. The price and supplies of rice, a staple food for many millions of people, are relatively stable in Asia. 2. In 2008, several major food-producing countries imposed export bans, which caused shortages on world markets. Meanwhile, in food-deficit countries, there was panic-buying, with governments paying very high prices, especially for rice. So far this time this has not happened. 3. In contrast to 2008, global economic growth is presently weak, so demand is not pushing prices further upwards. 4. Many countries are better prepared to face the current situation. Some have worked on establishing and improving social safety nets such as school meals, and public works programmes. 5. Better tools exist at the international level to coordinate the policy response. For example, in 2011 the G20 set up the Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS), hosted at FAO, which tracks food commodity markets and aims to improve transparency and act as an early warning system.

#### Famine doesn’t cause war - empirically conflicts don’t escalate

**Salehyan, University of North Texas assistant political science professor, 2008**

(Idean, “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet”, Journal of Peace Research, 45.3, SAGE, ldg)

A few caveats are in order here. It is important to note, again, that the most severe effects of climate change are likely to be felt in the future, and the future is inherently uncertain.4 While fundamental shifts in the environment are not inconceivable, our best bet for predicting what is to come is to look at what has transpired in the past. Since it is frequently argued that climate change will lead to resource scarcities and exacerbate inequality, it is possible to draw upon past evidence regarding these factors to develop a sense of how conflicts might unfold given changes in the Earth’s atmosphere. Additionally, I do not take issue with the claim that climate change will present considerable challenges for human societies and ecosystems more generally. Humanitarian crises stemming, in part, from climate change have the potential to be severe, and steps must be taken quickly to attenuate such contingencies. Rather, my purpose here is to underscore the point that environmental processes, by themselves, cannot explain why, where, and when fighting will occur; rather, the interaction between environmental and political systems is critical for understanding organized armed violence. First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. **For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs.** But **popular accounts** typically **do not look at the dogs that do not bark**. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, food scarcity and hunger are problems endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, food shortages and malnutrition affect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and state failure. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). **In short, resource scarcity**, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts **are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare**; therefore, environmental conditions, by themselves, cannot predict violent outbreaks. Second, **even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare** and state collapse. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions – not just the response of central governments – in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so.

#### No ABR threat- biological limitations

**The Economist, 2011**

(“The Spread of Superbugs”, 3-31, www.economist.com/node/18483671, ldg)

There are **basic biological reasons**, too, for thinking that resistance may be **self-limiting**. For a bug, being resistant is costly. It has to adjust its physiology, and resistance often works by making enzymes that degrade the drug, or by producing extra copies of proteins that pump the drug out of the bacterial cell, both of which require a lot of energy. Some creatures cannot seem to manage the trick at all—at least for certain drugs. One species of Streptococcus, called S. pyogenese, has never been seen to throw up a penicillin-resistant strain, whereas another, S. pneumoniae, is frequently not susceptible to that drug (see chart 1). In these circumstances, the theory goes, a resistant organism is less a superbug and more a cosseted creature that can beat the competition **only in the unfair arena of a hospital or a clinic**. Another reason, then, for accepting the status quo.

#### No scenario for superbugs- virulence trades off with transmissibility

**Orent, anthropologist specializing in evolutionary epidemiology, 2005**

(Wendy, “Bird bug has flown the coop”, 10-23, lexis, ldg)

Transmissibility is the ability of the virus to get out of one host and into another. In order to do so, the virus has to do something to the host to get itself shed. People act like transmissibility is just some little quirk of the genome, but what it really is, is the ability of the virus to colonize tissues, say, in the upper airways so that you sneeze or cough, and the virus is shed in large quantities. . . . You might go to work one day not feeling terribly well. You try not to sneeze all over everywhere. But flu is extraordinarily transmissible. It's these tiny, tiny particles that just fly off in a big cloud [when an infected person sneezes] and spread very easily. . . . So flu depends on keeping you out there --- going to work, you know, going to school, sitting on a bus --- if it's going to spread. It has to keep the host relatively healthy. A host can't keel over and die. Think about how ebola doesn't spread because it's so lethal that it just kills you right off. And certain forms of plague can do that, too. **They kill you very quickly so there's no chance for the bug to spread**. . . . So if transmissibility increases, the virulence should decrease, because the virus needs to keep you mobile to get you to transmit it. If you think about it, it's just Darwinian logic. **If you're too sick to transmit the disease, it dies with you**.

#### Sugarcane ethanol generates more pollution than previously thought

Campbell, Spak, and Carmichael 11

(J. E. Campbell, S.N. Spak, G. R. Carmichael, UI College of Engineering alumni, an assistant professor with joint appointments in the UI Public Policy Center, School of Urban and Regional Planning, and the UI College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, “Sugarcane ethanol in Brazil a substantial pollution source”, Western Farm Press, an industry trade magazine that provides growers and agribusiness with in-depth coverage of the region's major crops plus the legislative, environmental and regulatory issues that affect their businesses, 12/29/11, <http://westernfarmpress.com/government/sugarcane-ethanol-brazil-substantial-pollution-source//HZ>)

University of Iowa researchers and their colleagues have shown that ethanol fuel producers in Brazil — the world's top producer of ethanol from sugarcane as an alternative to petroleum-based fuel — generate up to seven times more air pollutants than previously thought.¶ The study, titled "Increased estimates of air-pollution emissions from Brazilian sugarcane ethanol," is featured in the Nature Highlights section and published in the Dec. 11 advance online publication of the journal Nature Climate Change.¶ The research team used agricultural survey data from Brazil to calculate emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases from the entire production, distribution, and lifecycle of sugarcane ethanol from 2000 to 2008.¶ The estimated pollutants were 1.5 to 7.3 times higher than those from satellite-based methods, according to lead author Elliott Campbell of the University of California, Merced.¶ Greg Carmichael, Karl Kammermeyer Professor of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering in the UI College of Engineering and co-director of the Center for Global and Regional Environmental Research (CGRER), and UI assistant professor Scott Spak note that the findings reflect continued practices and trends that are a part of the production of sugarcane ethanol. These include the practice of burning sugarcane fields before harvest, as well as the fact that sugarcane production in Brazil continues to grow.¶ "We found that the vast majority of emissions come from burning the sugarcane fields prior to harvesting, a practice the Brazilian government has been moving to end," says Spak. "However, the sugarcane industry has been expanding rapidly and moving into more remote areas, which makes it much more difficult to enforce new regulations over this growing source of air pollution and greenhouse gases.¶ "As people try to determine how to integrate biofuels into the global economy, Brazilian sugarcane ethanol has often been considered a more environmentally friendly fuel source than U.S. corn ethanol. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considers sugarcane ethanol an 'advanced biofuel' with fewer greenhouse gas emissions than conventional biofuels like corn ethanol. These new findings help us refine those estimates and move closer to making more informed comparisons between different fuel sources, and ultimately make better decisions about how to grow and use biofuels," Spak says.¶ In addition to Campbell, Carmichael, and Spak, co-researchers include C.C. Tsao and Y. Chen of the University of California, Merced, and Marcelo Mena-Carrasco of Universidad Andrés Bello, Santiago, Chile.¶ Campbell and Mena are UI College of Engineering alumni. Spak is an assistant professor with joint appointments in the UI Public Policy Center, School of Urban and Regional Planning, and the UI College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.

### Advantage 3: Trade Cred

#### Alt causes to biofuels

McDonald, JD and MBA from Mississippi College School of Law, 9

(Jeffrey, “Corn, Sugar, and Ethanol: How Policy Change Can Foster Sustainable Agriculture and Biofuel Production in Mexico and the United States,” Washington College of Law, ILSP Law Journal, Volume 1, Issue 3, http://www.wcl.american.edu/journal/ilsp/v1/3/mcdonald.pdf, accessed 12-30-13, CMM)

It is assumed that cheaper labor costs might give Mexico¶ an advantage in producing labor-intensive commodities.¶ However, in agriculture sector, any labor advantage is more¶ than offset by low worker productivity, poor soil conditions¶ and water availability, and the transportation infrastructure¶ in Mexico.109 Small and midlevel farmers in Mexico cannot¶ reasonably compete with their American counterparts.110¶ Unlike their U.S. competitors, small grain farmers who do not¶ produce exportable amounts of grain do not receive government¶ subsidies, in Mexico.111 Moreover, total productivity heavily¶ favors the United States (7.5 tons per hectare) over Mexico¶ (1.7 tons per hectare).112 Obviously, Mexican productivity¶ and efficiency must improve for its global competiveness, and¶ indeed its very vitality.

#### Trade doesn’t solve war

Martin et al., Paris School of Economics, 2008

(Phillipe, “Make Trade Not War?”, Review of Economic Studies, <http://econ.sciences-po.fr/sites/default/files/file/tmayer/MMT.pdf>, ldg)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 suggests however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Trade credibility is permanently damaged and they can’t overcome alt causes

**Kim, Heritage policy analyst, 2010**

(Anthony, “A trade war averted for now”, 4-12, <http://blog.heritage.org/2010/04/12/a-trade-war-averted-for-now/>, ldg)

So, a trade war was avoided. More precisely, it has been delayed. Considerable murkiness lingers on the trade horizon, and not just with Brazil. As Friday’s WSJ editorial points out: \* WTO-approved retaliation to counteract U.S. trade violations is spreading. More than $3.4 billion [in] U.S. exports now face punishing retaliation tariffs. \* The U.S.’s most economically damaging trade war is with Mexico. As part of the North American Free Trade Agreement ([NAFTA]), the U.S. is supposed to give Mexican trucking companies access to the U.S. But 17 years into [NAFTA], Mexican trucks still don’t cross the border, because the Teamsters union won’t accept the competition. A [NAFTA] dispute panel [has] authorized Mexico to retaliate. Last year it imposed duties on $2.4 billion of U.S. exports. \* The [European] Union and Japan have also asked the WTO for authorization to retaliate because the U.S. Commerce Department insists on deciding antidumping cases with an arcane calculation that the WTO ruled against in 2007. As a result, according to the trade publication “Inside U.S. Trade”, both Japan and the European Union are eyeing retaliation. The total value of U.S. exports affected could top $500 million. The fallout from U.S. protectionism will hurt our ongoing economic recovery efforts. The protectionism itself is doing irrevocable damage to America’s leadership in international economic discussions. Free trade and its expansion through multilateral, regional, and bilateral agreements have been vital to world economic strength and prosperity. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner commented during his recent two-day visit to India that President Obama “was ‘deeply committed’ to trying to build a consensus among Americans for more open trade and to support the [economic] recovery,” as noted in the Financial Times. While the Obama Administration has repeatedly said that the U.S. will not abandon its legacy of supporting open and free commerce, the fact is that it has done little to nothing to demonstrate that commitment in more substantive terms. One sign of inaction: three pending free trade agreements with Panama, Colombia, and South Korea remain on ice. Talking about “strengthening” America’s trade relations around the world, boosting exports, and even enforcing trade rules are only empty gestures without tangible action to re-establish America’s leadership in advancing free trade.

#### US and China will never go to war-overwhelming mutual interest and history of conflict resolution prove.

**Wu, China Foundation for International Studies Center for American Studies executive director, 2013**

(Zurong, “China and America’s Innate Goal: Avoiding War Forever”, 7-30, <http://watchingamerica.com/News/217271/china-and-americas-innate-goal-avoiding-war-forever/>, ldg)

China and the U.S. are currently constructing a new kind of relationship between major powers, with several aims. One intrinsic aim is especially worthy of attention, namely that China and the U.S. will not go to war today, nor in the future, and will forever maintain a peaceful association. The Chinese and American governments and people are striving toward this goal unceasingly because it is in the best interests of the people of China, America and the whole world. To avoid conflict, to keep from fighting, to be mutually respectful and to embark upon a path of mutual cooperation — acting in these ways would benefit everyone. First of all, the globalization of the economy, information and other essential factors have created a global village, and the U.S. and China live and work together within this community; their interests are intertwined and neither can break the inseparable bond each has with the other. The global financial crisis of 2007 once again made clear the great extent to which the Chinese and American economies are linked and mixed, for when one sinks into a recession or depression, it is almost impossible for the other to recover and flourish alone. When it comes to international security, climate change, energy, counterterrorism, oceans and all sorts of other unprecedented areas, China and the U.S. share more common interests every day, and cooperative negotiations are unceasingly strengthened. Within this sort of atmosphere, discussing whether the U.S. and China want to go to war seems a little bit untimely and excessive. Second, the current period is fundamentally different than the era of the Cold War, for the development of peace is the theme of the present. People from countries around the world are all concentrating their energy on revitalizing the economy and improving quality of life. After the end of the Cold War, America launched several localized wars in smaller countries under the banner of the fight against terrorism, in the process bringing upon itself a heavy financial and economic burden. Perhaps it was upon consideration of the fact that large-scale conflicts could yield a level of suffering and destruction that would be difficult to endure that America has not launched any wars against the great powers that are in possession of nuclear arms. Even in the Cold War, during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, America and the Soviet Union did not go to war. The experience of history tells us that the inherent goal of this new form of Sino-U.S. relations will have the support of the strength of the entire ranks of the world’s great powers; thus as long as both China and the U.S. have unflagging perseverance, it can be achieved. Third, for over 40 years, China and the U.S. have promoted a strategy of mutual trust, of the expansion of cooperation, of controlling differences of opinion. These lessons from experience are the U.S. and China’s most valuable treasure. Since Nixon visited the Chinese, Sino-American relations have gone through wind and rain but have always developed onward; moreover, the speed, breadth and depth of the development have far exceeded everyone’s expectations. Indeed, Sino-U.S. relations enjoy a great vitality. And since the foundations were laid fairly recently, Sino-U.S. relations continually make significant progress. The highest leaders communicate freely and military leaders exchange visits often. The two militaries are in the process of issuing plans for Chinese troops to participate in the 2014 Pacific Rim joint military exercises. Both sides have decided to actively investigate significant military activities, report mechanisms to each other and continue to research matters of security and issues regarding standards of conduct, which are relevant to the Chinese and American navies and air forces. These collaborations will give rise to a significant and far-reaching influence on world peace and international security and will vigorously promote the actualization of the inherent goal of the new form of Sino-U.S. great power relations.

#### Jatropha leads to massive emissions -- turns warming

The Telegraph 11 “Jatropha biofuel 'produces six times greenhouse gas emissions of fossil fuels” http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/8398320/Jatropha-biofuel-produces-six-times-greenhouse-gas-emissions-of-fossil-fuels.html

Jatropha has been planted across Asia in countries under pressure from the West to reduce emissions from the destruction of rainforests, car exhausts and energy production from coal-burning power plants.

But the study for the anti-poverty agency ActionAid and the RSPB of a proposed 50,000 hectare jatropha plantation development in the Dakatcha woodlands of Kenya, near Malindi, found that emissions in producing the biofuel would be 2.5 to six times higher than the fossil fuel equivalents. The woodland hosts globally endangered bird life.The research examined the whole "life-cycle" of the jatropha production, primarily the clearance of woodland and scrubland, planting, harvesting, refining and transportation of the bio-diesel destined for heating and electricity production in Europe.

"Biofuels are far from the miracle climate cure they were thought to be," said Tim Rice, ActionAid's biofuel expert. "Like most other biofuels, jatropha could actually end up increasing carbon emissions."