=====================1=====================

====Text: The Federal Government of Mexico should modernize the US-Mexico border. ====

====Mexico can do it – US aid empirically not necessary====

\*\*Rama and Gardner 12 (Anahi Rama and Simon Gardner, writters for Reuters. 7/03/12. "Mexico~’s president-elect may double security spending: aide". Chicago Tribune. articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-07-03/news/sns-rt-us-mexico-election-securitybre86301s-20120703\_1\_enrique-pena-nieto-drug-violence-fight-drug)\*\*

MEXICO CITY (Reuters) - Mexico~’s President-elect Enrique Pena Nieto will seek

AND

would create jobs, boost security and promote economic development, Lozoya said.

=====================2=====================

====Momentum from shutdown fight gives Obama the PC necessary to pass immigration reform====

\*\*McMorris-Santoro 10/15\*\* (BuzzFeed White House Reporter. "Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He~’s Coming For Immigration Next" http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for)

WASHINGTON — As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House

AND

fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform."

====Obama~’s PC is key to passing immigration – needs to keep the pressure on the GOP====

\*\*Balz 10/17\*\* (Dan, journalist at The Washington Post, where he has been a political correspondent since 1978. "Can Obama seize the moment and make Washington work?" http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/can-obama-seize-the-moment-to-make-washington-work/2013/10/17/d84c1934-3753-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f\_story.html?tid=pm\_politics\_pop)

The two other legislative priorities the president cited were immigration reform and passage of the

AND

prepared to do to produce the kind of bipartisanship he long has promised.

====Economic engagement with Mexico~’s politically divisive ====

\*\*Wilson ~’13\*\* Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International. Center for Scholars (Christopher E., January, "A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region," http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new\_ideas\_us\_mexico\_relations.pdf)

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing

AND

action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.

====CIR~’s key to Latin American relations====

\*\*Shifter 12\*\* Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. "Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America," April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States~’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

====Relations are key to solve a laundry list of existential threats—-the brink is now====

\*\*Shifter 12\*\* Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. "Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America," April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust

AND

—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

=====================3=====================

====A. Interpretation – "economic engagement" means the aff must be an exclusively economic action – it cannot encompass broader forms of engagement====

\*\*Jakstaite, 10\*\* - Doctoral Candidate Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Political Sciences and Diplomacy (Lithuania) (Gerda, "CONTAINMENT AND ENGAGEMENT AS MIDDLE-RANGE THEORIES" BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW %26 POLITICS VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2 (2010), DOI: 10.2478/v10076-010-0015-7)

The approach to engagement as economic engagement focuses exclusively on economic instruments of foreign policy

AND

other types of engagement, such as the conditional-unconditional economic engagement.

====B. Violation – the affirmative ~~[uses non-economic instruments ~~]====

====C. Voting issue – ====

====1. Limits – they explode the topic – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical. It~’s impossible to predict or prepare====

====2. Ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans====

=4=

====The 1AC ~’s problem-solution rhetoric addresses danger from a managerial perspective. This way of being educates us in to believing that the earth and humans are disposable tools. ====

McWhorter 92 (Ladelle, Heidegger and the Earth Essays in Environmental Philosophy, Thomas Jefferson University Press, pg.6)

The danger of a managerial approach to the world lies not, then, in

AND

human resources. personnel to be managed. or populations to be controlled.

====In order to find a different relationship to technology the alternative is to do nothing because only doing nothing allows for a new destining of being.====

Harman in 09 (Graham, Professor of Philosophy @ American University in Cairo, "Cambridge Journal of Economics", 2009, Vol. 34(1), Technology, objects and things in Heidegger p.17-25)

Another word in Heidegger~’s constellation of technology terms is danger, which turns out to

AND

wish to know~’ (Heidegger, 1994, pp. 71–2).

=Meltdowns=

====Turn - Plan forces security cuts – counterproductive at best====

\*\*UCS 9/10\*\*(Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of top-notch scientists that research potential threats that politics and the media don~’t see and reveal them to the general public. "Small Modular Nuclear Reactors Won~’t Solve Nuclear Power~’s Safety, Security and Cost Problems, New Report Finds" [[http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html-http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html]])

The April 2013 bombings at the Boston Marathon remind us that terrorism is an ongoing

AND

a plant~’s design, a robust and flexible security force will be needed.

\*\*====SMRs are costly, inefficient and increase the chances of an attack – ====\*\*

\*\*USC 9/26 \*\*(Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of top-notch scientists that research potential threats that politics and the media don~’t see and reveal them to the general public. "Small Modular Nuclear Reactors Won~’t Solve Nuclear Power~’s Safety, Security and Cost Problems, New Report Finds" [[http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html-http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html]])

WASHINGTON (September 26, 2013)—Nuclear power proponents pinning their hopes on small

AND

commercial small reactor by 2020.¶ But do small reactors make economic sense?

====Squo solves – Nuclear power is already prominent is Mexico and Laguna Verde is being protected. ====

\*\*Navarro ~’10 \*\*(Carlos Navarro, Editor/Writer at University of New Mexico, Past Reporter %26 Copy Editor at Knight-Ridder Financial News, Education: Texas A%26M International University, Loyola University New Orleans, Warren Easton High School."Mexican Government, Congress Support Nuclear Power to Varying Degrees; Detractors Want Laguna Verde Power Plant Closed" Most recent date specified is 2010. [[http://repository.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/12618/Mexican%20Government,%20Congress%20Support%20Nuclear% 20Power%20to%20Varying%20Degrees%3B%20Detractors%20Want%20Laguna%20Verde%20Power%20Plant%20Closed.pdf?sequence=1-http://repository.unm.edu/bitstream/handle/1928/12618/Mexican Government, Congress Support Nuclear%25 20Power to Varying Degrees%3B Detractors Want Laguna Verde Power Plant Closed.pdf?sequence=1]])

Meade insisted that nuclear power has a future in Mexico, even though there are

AND

. ¶ Hurricanes have not threatened Laguna Verde directly in the past few years

====4. No Impact– average death in all meltdowns is 400 deaths====

Cohen, no date (Bernard L, Prof at the U of Pittsburgh. "Risks of Nuclear Power" http://physics.isu.edu/radinf/np-risk.htm)

Risks from reactor accidents are estimated by the rapidly developing science of "probabilistic risk

AND

downs each year for nuclear power to be as dangerous as coal burning.

=Warming=

====SMRs don~’t solve anything – multiple warrants====

\*\*Makhijani ~’11 \*\*(Dr. Arjun Makhijani is president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, "The problems with small nuclear reactors." The Congress Blog, 6/15/11, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/166609-the-problems-with-small-nuclear-reactors~~%23ixzz2hx6Y2QjZ ) //JJV

There are economies of scale associated with security, too. Today, large crews

AND

past the graveyard of the "nuclear renaissance" that never was. ¶

====SMRs are less cost-competitive – harms outweigh the benefits, if any. ====

\*\*USC 9/26 \*\*(Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of top-notch scientists that research potential threats that politics and the media don~’t see and reveal them to the general public. "Small Modular Nuclear Reactors Won~’t Solve Nuclear Power~’s Safety, Security and Cost Problems, New Report Finds" [[http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html-http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html]])

As Lyman~’s report points out, utilities started building larger reactors in the first place

AND

requirements for emergency planning, control room staffing, and security force staffing.

====China already solves all SMR impacts====

\*\*Yurman ~’12 \*\*(Dan, Sr. Project Planner at Vantage Partners LLC¶ Past¶ Communications Strategies %26 Services for Energy Technologies at Independent Consultant;Self Employed¶ Project Manager at CH2MHill¶ IT Project Manager at Bechtel¶ see all¶ Education¶ University of Colorado Denver¶ Fairleigh Dickinson University, "2012 ~~ The year that was in nuclear energy" [[http://ansnuclearcafe.org/category/small-modular-reactors/-http://ansnuclearcafe.org/category/small-modular-reactors/]]) // JJV

After a long reconsideration (following the Fukushima crisis) of its aggressive plans to

AND

an estimate of 80 GWe by 2020 to about 55–60 GWe.

====Delays kill solvency – It will take too long create a safe version of SMRs and costs too much too solve warming if we~’re really on the brink====

\*\*USC 9/26 \*\*(Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of top-notch scientists that research potential threats that politics and the media don~’t see and reveal them to the general public. "Small Modular Nuclear Reactors Won~’t Solve Nuclear Power~’s Safety, Security and Cost Problems, New Report Finds" [[http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html-http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html]])

Small reactor aficionados argue that mass-producing the reactors on an assembly line instead

AND

small reactor licensing and development. That would be a recipe for disaster."

====No impact - There are multiple logical barriers that preclude any state from supplying terrorists with WMDs – makes nuclear terrorism IMPOSSIBLE. ====

\*\*Walt, 7/25/13 \*\*(Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international affairs at Harvard University~’s Kennedy School of Government, where he served as academic dean from 2002-2006, 7/25/13, "Why We Don~’t Need to Worry About a ~’Nuclear Handoff~’", Foreign Policy, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/07/25/why\_we\_dont\_need\_to\_worry\_about\_a\_nuclear\_handoff, Accessed 9/3/13, NC)¶ After the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. national security establishment started focusing on the various ways that "international terrorism" might pose a threat to U.S. interests or the United States itself. Unsurprisingly, experts began to dream up all sorts of frightening scenarios and worry about all sorts of far-fetched scenarios. I remember this period well, and I recall sitting through seminars and workshops at which lots of very smart and creative people were imagining various nasty things that groups like al Qaeda might try to do. Hijack gas trucks and blow up the Lincoln Tunnel? Take over the Mall of America and create carnage on a big shopping day? Commandeer a supertanker and smash it into the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge? Wait until summer and then set forest fires all over the American West? The list of conceivable dangers was infinitely long, but if you sat in enough of those seminars, you could easily become convinced that it was only a matter of time before somebody did something really nasty to you or your loved ones.¶ Imagination is one thing, but disciplined risk assessment is another. It~’s easy to dream up bad things that could conceivably happen, but intelligent public policy should rest on a more careful and sustained appraisal of how likely those various scary things are. And that~’s why I suggest you read Keir Lieber and Daryl Press~’s recent article in the journal International Security on "Why States Won~’t Give Nuclear Weapons to Terrorists."¶ The fear that nuclear-armed states would hand weapons to terrorists has been a staple of U.S. threat-mongering ever since 9/11. It was a key part of the justification for invading Iraq in 2003, and it forms part of the constant drumbeat for military action against Iran. But it never made much sense for two reasons. First, a nuclear-armed state has little incentive to give up control over weapons it has labored long and hard to acquire, for what could the state possibly gain from doing so? Second, a state giving nuclear weapons to terrorists could never be sure that those weapons would not be traced back to it and thereby invite devastating retaliation.¶ Lieber and Press examine the historical record and show that it is almost impossible to conduct a major terrorist operation and not be blamed for it. Here~’s the abstract for their article:¶ "Many experts consider nuclear terrorism the single greatest threat to U.S. security. The fear that a state might transfer nuclear materials to terrorists was a core justification for the invasion of Iraq in 2003 and, more recently, for a strike against Iran~’s nuclear program. The logical basis for this concern is sound: if a state could orchestrate an anonymous nuclear terror attack, it could destroy an enemy yet avoid retaliation. But how likely is it that the perpetrators of nuclear terrorism could remain anonymous?¶ Data culled from a decade of terrorist incidents reveal that attribution is very likely after high-casualty terror attacks. Attribution rates are even higher for attacks on the U.S. homeland or the territory of a major U.S. ally — 97 percent for incidents in which ten or more people were killed. Moreover, tracing a terrorist group that used a nuclear weapon to its state sponsor would not be difficult, because few countries sponsor terror; few terror groups have multiple sponsors; and only one country that sponsors terrorism, Pakistan, has nuclear weapons or enough material to manufacture them. If leaders understand these facts, they will be as reluctant to give weapons to terrorists as they are to use them directly; both actions would invite devastating retaliation."¶ I might add that this is the kind of important, nonpartisan, policy-relevant work that more social scientists ought to be doing. It is also important to disseminate these findings widely, so that 1) U.S. policymakers won~’t keep chasing phantom dangers, 2) the leaders of nuclear-armed states understand that their arsenals are good for deterrence and not much else, and 3) said leaders also understand the need to keep whatever weapons they might have under very reliable control.¶

====4. No Impact– average death in all meltdowns is 400 deaths====

Cohen, no date (Bernard L, Prof at the U of Pittsburgh. "Risks of Nuclear Power" http://physics.isu.edu/radinf/np-risk.htm)

Risks from reactor accidents are estimated by the rapidly developing science of "probabilistic risk

AND

downs each year for nuclear power to be as dangerous as coal burning.

====1. Empirically denied – diseases have been around forever and haven~’t caused extinction. Plus, genetic diversity ensures that some humans will always survive.====

====3. Multiple alternate causalities to disease====

\*\*Brower, 03\*\*

(Jennifer, science/technology policy analyst, and Peter Chalk, political scientist, Summer 2003, Rand Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, "Vectors Without Borders," [[http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/summer2003/vectors.html-http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/summer2003/vectors.html]])

This year~’s outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Beijing, Hong

AND

increase the likelihood that people will come into contact with potentially fatal diseases.

====4. Microbiology research solves the disease impact—humans won~’t be part of the extinction====

\*\*Health, 99\*\*

(Jim, Orchids Australia, December, http://www.orchidsaustralia.com/whysave.htm)

So maybe we do need them. Could the information in them have practical uses? A hard fact

glares. Pharmaceutical companies can now put together their own molecules. Anyway, the economics of searching for medicines in "baleful weeds and precious-juiced flowers" has always been poor. Spending the money on molecular biology gives much better odds than spending the money on saving species.

====4. Intervention checks – if 50% of the population started dying, people would take precautions to prevent future outbreaks.====

====5. Medicine solves — old diseases would never rise again to kill us all — penicillin is awesome — it solves the botanic plague, hydration solves Ebola, and small pox has pretty much been eradicated.====

====6. Most diseases are dumb — they can~’t kill us all the only disease close to this is HIV but if people started releasing this or it actually became a pandemic people would probably start figuring out how to treat it.====

====Water forces cooperation, not wars====

\*\*Wolf et al, 06\*\*

(Aaron T., Ph.D. in environmental policy analysis, professor of geography in the Department of Geosciences at Oregon State University, \*AND Annika Kramer, Senior Project Manager for Adelphi, \*AND Alexander Carius, Co-Founder and Managing Director, Adelphi, \*AND Geoffrey D. Dabelko, director of the Environmental Change and Security Program, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, July 2006, " Water Can Be a Pathway to Peace, not War," Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/NavigatingPeaceIssue1.pdf, Hensel)

These apocalyptic warnings fly in the face of history: no nations have gone to

AND

ignore a promising way to help prevent war: cooperative water resources management.

====Empirically, there will be no resource wars. Even if they win a risk of their impact, it stays localized====

\*\*Salehyan, 8 (\*\*Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 "From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*" Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3, http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf)

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts

AND

livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

====2. Multiple alt causes the Aff can~’t solve====

\*\*Journal of Commerce, 12\*\* ("Agriculture Trade a ~’Risky Business~’", April 16, Proquest) // NK

Analysts and economists at the U.S. Department of Agriculture are full of

AND

Affected by the extreme climatic situation, and demand for imported food grew.

====4. Famine inevitable – economic recession====

\*\*Independent Media Institution, 8\*\* (http://www.alternet.org/environment/87071/)

Much of our current recessionary intrigue has been aided and abetted by market speculation,

AND

probably in for a famine or two before all is said and done.

====7. Hunger related deaths declining====

\*\*The Hunger Project, 8\*\*("Decline in the number of hunger related deaths," http://www.thp.org/reports/decline.htm)

Recent studies indicate that 24,000 individuals die each day of hunger-related

AND

of population growth, indicating an overall decline in hunger-related deaths.

====New tech solves the impact – no famine because farmers can produce more food====

\*\*Zubrin 11\*\* (Dr. Robert Zubrin, president of Pioneer Astronautics, Senior Fellow with the Center for Security Policy "WHY IT~’S WRONG TO AGREE WITH THE MALTHUSIANS ABOUT ETHANOL" May 13, 2011[[http://www.ilcorn.org/daily-update/182-why-it-rsquo-s-wrong-to-agree-with-the-malthusians-about-ethanol/)//-http://www.ilcorn.org/daily-update/182-why-it-rsquo-s-wrong-to-agree-with-the-malthusians-about-ethanol/)//]] CG

In an op-ed article printed in the Denver Post May 8, editorial

AND

average farms, and then go global, thereby raising crop yields everywhere.

====. Utilities are transitioning to natural gas now – it~’s because of low prices, not regulations====

\*\*Bertrand 12\*\*

(Pierre, "Blame Coal~’s Hardship On Economic Factors, Not Federal Regulations, Says EPA Administrator," International Business Times, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/350973/20120611/coal-natural-gas-epa-lisa-jackson.htm

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson said Monday her environmental policies

AND

are not unmindful of that. How could you expect them to be?"

====1. Empirically denied and alternate causality – hundreds of thousands of species die annually ====

\*\*Paltrowitz, 01\*\*

(JD Brooklyn Journal of I-Law, 2001 (A Greening of the World Trade Organisation")

However, the panel did not take into account the practical reality that negotiations are

AND

impose few constraints on a contracting party~’s implementation of domestic environmental policies." n108

====3. Collapse is common – won~’t spillover and adaption checks====

====4. New species fill the void====

\*\*Kerr, 94\*\*

(Richard, Science 28)

In the immediate aftermath of an extinction, some taxa – groups of animals such as species or genera – flourish, then gradually fade. Others that had apparently vanished can reappear, Lazarus-like. In the turmoil, new groups may gain ascendancy, filling ecological niches left empty by the extinction and displacing other survivors to create a new ecological order (See box on p.29).

====1. Icebergs are a negative feedback – none of their evidence takes this into account====

\*\*Macfarlane, 09\*\*

(Jo, The Daily Mail Online. "Amazing discovery of green algae which could save the world from global warming" http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1104772/Amazing-discovery-green-algae-save-world-global-warming.html?ITO=1490~~%23)

Melting icebergs, so long the iconic image of global warming, are triggering a

AND

calculates that a further 26million tons of CO2 is removed from the atmosphere.

====2. Newest studies prove that CO2 is not anthropogenic – emissions from fossil fuels only stay in the atmosphere for five years and natural forcings are more important====

\*\*Marohasy, 09\*\*

(Jennifer, senior fellow at the Australian think tank the Institute of Public Affairs, PhD in biology from the University of Queensland. Cites research from Robert H. Essenhigh, Department of Mechanical Engineering at Ohio State University, "Carbon Dioxide in Atmosphere 5-15 Years Only" 4-17-09. http://jennifermarohasy.com/blog/2009/04/carbon-dioxide-in-atmosphere-5-15-years-only/)

If carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels only stayed in the atmosphere a few years

AND

-accepted, rider that CO2 emissions from combustion should therefore be curbed.

However, the actual data in the text of the IPCC Report separately states a

AND

The economic and political significance of that conclusion will be self-evident.

====3. Growing emissions in developing countries make CO2 reduction impossible – modeling is irrelevant====

\*\*Koetzle, 08\*\*

Ph.D. and Senior Vice President of Public Policy at the Institute for Energy Research (William, "IER Rebuttal to Boucher White Paper", 4/13/2008, http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2008/04/13/ier-rebuttal-to-boucher-white-paper/)

For example, if the United States were to unilaterally reduced emissions by 30%

AND

these reductions are to a large extent mirrored by all significant emitting nations.

====4. Observational data proves warming has stopped – the multi-decadal oscillation overwhelms CO2 forcing====

\*\*Akasofu, 08\*\*

Former director of the Geophysical Institute and the International Arctic Research Center @ U of Alaska-Fairbanks (Syun-Ichi, "Global warming has paused", 9/27/2008, http://newsminer.com/news/2008/sep/27/global-warming-has-paused/?opinion)

Recent studies by the Hadley Climate Research Center (UK), the Japan Meteorological Agency

AND

the CO2 effect, as I have stated during the last several years.

=Natural Gas=

====They have no internal link – SMRs actually increase waste – turn – they produce nuclear waste that builds up and causes radiation====

====SMRs force the NRC to lower to standards for safety – they~’re not properly designed, therefore ineffective and dangerous.====

\*\*USC 9/26 \*\*(Union of Concerned Scientists, a group of top-notch scientists that research potential threats that politics and the media don~’t see and reveal them to the general public. "Small Modular Nuclear Reactors Won~’t Solve Nuclear Power~’s Safety, Security and Cost Problems, New Report Finds" [[http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html-http://www.ucsusa.org/nuclear\_power/nuclear\_power\_technology/small-modular-reactors.html]])

To cut operating costs, vendors also are pressuring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (

AND

vendors are hiding their design details and asking the public to trust them."¶

====1. Even a giant methane burp would have a miniscule effect====

\*\*Gao et al. 12 \*\*

(Xiang, Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, C. Adam Schlosser, Andrei Sokolov, Katey Walter Anthony, Qianlai Zhuang and David Kicklighter, "Permafrost, Lakes, and Climate-Warming Methane Feedback: What is the Worst We Can Expect?," May, Report No 218, http://18.7.29.232/bitstream/handle/1721.1/70566/MITJPSPGC\_Rpt218.pdf?sequence=1)

Overall, these results present, for the ﬁrst time, a quantitative insight on

AND

is relatively small, whether or not humans choose to constrain global emissions.

====2. No methane leaks====

\*\*Cathles, 12\*\*

Professor of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences @ Cornell University (Cathles, Lawrence M., Larry D. Brown (Professor of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences @ Cornell University), Milton Taam (Electric Software, Inc.), Andrew Hunter (Professor of chemical and Biological Engineering, Cornell University) "A commentary on "The greenhouse gas footprint of natural gas in shale formations" by R.W. Howarth, R. Santoro, and Anthony Ingraffea." Climatic Change, 2012, pg. http://cce.cornell.edu/EnergyClimateChange/NaturalGasDev/Documents/PDFs/FINAL%20Short%20Version%2010-4-11.pdf .

Howarth et al. were correct to highlight concerns that leakage of methane during production

AND

coal, and thus remains an attractive transition fuel to low carbon alternatives.

====7. Methane is good – Japan proves, more profits, gas boom ====

\*\*Blackman ~’13 (Sarah Blackman, an online reporter working across NRI Digital~’s websites, covering renewable energy and growth within power markets, offshore oil drilling and the market for new and sustainable hydrocarbons, as well as reporting on the transport, health and hospitality sectors. "Methane hydrates: a new gas boom?" May 9, 2013. [[\*\*http://www.offshore-technology.com/features/featuremethane-hydrates-new-gas-boom-http://www.offshore-technology.com/features/featuremethane-hydrates-new-gas-boom]]\*\* ) \*\*

Methane hydrates could change the face of the energy sector, erasing price differentials and

AND

shale deposits around the world, could prove revolutionary to the energy industry.¶

====8. The bubble burst of methane in the Gulf in 2010 should~’ve triggered the impact ====

=HEG=

====No internal link – their links are based off of cooperation the aff does nothing to fix the congested borders in the sq====

====Local government at the borders are creating new border programs – solves the aff ====

\*\*Aguilar 8-15\*\* (Julian, Reporter at Texas Tribune, "A Federal Program to Ease Congestion at Border Crossings", The New York Times, August 15^^th^^ 2013, [[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/16/us/a-federal-program-to-ease-congestion-at-border-crossings.html?\_r=0-http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/16/us/a-federal-program-to-ease-congestion-at-border-crossings.html?\_r=0]], SD)

LAREDO — Pedestrians waited in a long line on the bridge between Nuevo Laredo,

AND

, Democrat of El Paso. Senator John Cornyn filed a companion bill.

====Alternate causalities to an effective border policy — immigration and law enforcement====

\*\*O~’Neil 13\*\* — Shannon K. O~’Neil, Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. She is the author of the forthcoming book Two Nations Indivisible: Mexico, the United States, and the Road Ahead (Oxford University Press, 2013), from which this essay is adapted (Shannon K. O~’Neil, Council on Foreign Relations, March/April 2013, "Mexico Makes It", [[http://www.cfr.org/mexico/mexico-makes/p30098-http://www.cfr.org/mexico/mexico-makes/p30098]], Accessed 08-01-2013 ~| AK)

For all these reasons, the United States should strengthen its relationship with its neighbor

AND

support social and economic development in often neglected and crime-ridden areas.

====No impact to off-shoring:====

====1) Wage increases and selective re-shoring====

\*\*Heineman, 3/26\*\* (Ben, The Atlantic, 3/26/13, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/03/why-we-can-all-stop-worrying-about-offshoring-and-outsourcing/274388/, "Why We Can All Stop Worrying About Offshoring and Outsourcing," alp)

Labor markets have for the past quarter century been at the center of the globalization

AND

more by the company and less by third parties, will remain critical.

====3) Reshoring doesn~’t solve competitiveness – low skill and job redistribution====

* Offshoring creates large domestic markets abroad that benefit trade/multinationals and create an export market for expensive goods

\*\*Speakman 12 (Colin, Director of China Programs at CAPA International Education, president of the Council on China Exchange, former Senior Vice President/Global Director of Partnership Programs at the American Institute for Foreign Study, master~’s degree from the London School of Economics and Political Science, contributing writer for China Daily, China Daily, August 15, 2012, "Outsourcing is not that bad for US," [[\*\*http://www.chinadailyapac.com/article/outsourcing-not-bad-us-http://www.chinadailyapac.com/article/outsourcing-not-bad-us]]\*\*, alp)\*\*

Put more generally, where in a typical American multinational company~’s mission statement do the

AND

for those jobs rather than how it can reclaim the old outsourced jobs.

====2) Proximity – predictive ev that reshoring~’s inevitable – unionization and regulation are alt causes====

\*\*Fluser No date (Fluser, SEO Business Directory, no date, last updated 2013, "Re-Shoring, Off-Shoring, or Right-Shoring - Global Trade and Wages in the Balance," [[\*\*http://fluser.com/articles/re-shoring-off-shoring-or-right-shoring—global-trade-and-wages-in-the-balance-429.php-http://fluser.com/articles/re-shoring-off-shoring-or-right-shoring--global-trade-and-wages-in-the-balance-429.php]]\*\*, alp)\*\*

There sure is a lot of talk about China taking jobs away from the United

AND

at in the United States, and that is free-market capitalism.

====Manufacturing industry empirically resilient====

\*\*WSJ 11 (Wall Street Journal. 2/25/11. "The Truth About U.S. Manufacturing."online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703652104576122353274221570.html.html~~%23articleTabs%3Darticle)\*\*

Is American manufacturing dead? You might think so reading most of the nation~’s editorial

AND

supplies, pharmaceuticals and medicine, and oil and natural-gas equipment.

====SQ solves====

\*\*Ignatius, 12\*\*

(David Ignatius writes a twice-a-week foreign affairs column and contributes

AND

ahead/2012/05/04/gIQAbj5K2T\_story.html)

Energy security would be one building block of a new prosperity. The other would

AND

machinery, furniture, fabricated metals, plastics and rubber, and transportation g

====No internal link to heg – past declines in the manufacturing industry didn~’t lead to a loss of heg====

====U.S.-Mexico relations are on the upswing – transition in focus and Obama~’s recent visit====

\*\*Nelson and Nicholas, 5/2/13\*\*

senior writers at The Wall Street Journal (Collin McCain, Peter, "Mexico, U.S. Leaders Try To Deepen Economic Ties", 5/2/13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324766604578459190363300754.html) RT

MEXICO CITY—President Barack Obama offered his support Thursday for Mexico~’s shifting security strategy

AND

Joshua Meltzer, a global economy and development fellow at the Brookings Institution.

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

\*\*Brooks and Wohlforth, 08\*\*

(Stephen G Brooks %26 William C. Wohlforth Associate Professors in the Department of Government @ Dartmouth College. World Out of Balance, p. 27-31)

"Nothing has ever existed like this disparity of power; nothing," historian Paul

AND

one thing; being the world~’s single superpower on the cheap is astonishing."

====Recently ratified TBA solves relations – leads to more cooperation – probably solves relations better====

\*\*Pascual, 13\*\*

(Carlos Pascual, Bureau of Energy Resources. "U.S. – Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement and Steps Needed for Implementation" April 25, 2013. http://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II06/20130425/100755/HHRG-113-II06-Wstate-PascualA-20130425.pdf )

The Transboundary Agreement is an important step in our national efforts tobetter secure our energy

AND

energy market, potentially leading to deeper and more meaningful collaboration over time.

====Double bind - SQ solves relations or relations are low which means impacts should have been triggered ====

=Econ=

====1. No impact because other actors check, the economy won~’t decline enough, past recessions prove we~’ll recover, and world war two wasn~’t caused by the depression====

====2. The economy is fine now. Further investment would hurt rather than help====

\*\*Detroit News, 13\*\*

("U.S. economy accelerates at 2.5% rate in Q1" From The Detroit News: http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20130426/BIZ/304260409~~%23ixzz2RbEUMQAw)

Washington — U.S. economic growth accelerated from January through March, buoyed

AND

3.2 percent. That~’s the best since the end of 2010.

====3. No historical connection between economic collapse and conflict====

\*\*Ferguson, 06 \*\*

M.A., Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, Resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Senior Research Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University (Niall, "The Next War of the World", Foreign Affairs, September-October 2006, May 21st 2010, KONTOPOULOS)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal

AND

economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

====4) No internal link – border infrastructure won~’t stimulate the economy in the long term; infrastructure projects take too long====

====5) The plans stimulus is too small ====

\*\*Shostak, 10\*\*

Adjunct Scholar of the Mises Institute (Frank, "Does the US Economy Need Another Stimulus Package?", Ludwig von Mises Institute, 9/17/10, [[http://mises.org/daily/4711)//RM-http://mises.org/daily/4711)//RM]]

But why should another stimulus program be effective given that the previous program appears to

AND

only a very large stimulus program is likely to produce the needed result.

====6) Cross-apply WSJ relations good now ====

====8) US manufacturing resilient now more than ever – the plan does nothing to solve through cooperations====

====No internal link to protectionism - their evidence isn~’t in context of stopping foreign investors or increasing trade ====

====9) Protectionism won~’t spiral out of control – interdependence.====

Marshall, 09

(Andrew – asia political risk correspondent, Assault on free trade a key political risk, Reuters, 1/21/2009, p. lexis)

PREVENTING DISASTER Despite the risks, many analysts argue that a wholesale retreat into protectionism

AND

markets that are highly dependent on exports," the Economist Intelligence Unit said.

=Solvency=

====Mexico says no – Energy negotiations mean nothing else gets through====

Washington Post 5-7-13, (Nick Miroff and William Booth, Contributors, March 7^^th^^, 2013, "The Americas", "To power Mexico forward, Peña Nieto looks to energy reform", [[http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-07/world/39073749\_1\_energy-industry-foreign-oil-petroleos-de-mexico-http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-07/world/39073749\_1\_energy-industry-foreign-oil-petroleos-de-mexico]], accessed 7/12/13, LLM)

Mexico remains the third-¶ largest source of foreign oil for the United States after

AND

Mexico~’s development into a more modern, democratic, middle-class society.