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#### CIR will pass – Obama support and House Republicans support

Kaplan 10/24

(Rebecca, CBS News, 10/24/13, “Obama to House GOP: Pass immigration reform this year”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57609109/obama-to-house-gop-pass-immigration-reform-this-year/>, accessed 10/24/13, JZ)

In an attempt to re-start movement on the rest of his domestic agenda, President Obama on Thursday called on the House of Representatives to move legislation to reform the immigration system before the end of the year.

"This is not just an idea whose time has come, this is an idea whose time has been around for years now," Mr. Obama said. "It's good for our economy, it's good for our national security, it's good for our people, and we should do it this year."His speech came at the same time as the House Energy and Commerce Committee held a hearing on the flawed rollout of the Affordable Care Act exchanges.

The last major legislative action on an immigration bill was passage of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, the Senate's comprehensive legislation, back in June. The bill beefed up security along the southern border, provided a provisional legal status and eventual pathway to citizenship for people living in the country illegally, and outlined reforms for the existing visa programs.

Crafted by a bipartisan group in the Democratically-controlled Senate, that is Mr. Obama's preferred reform bill. But it didn't take long for House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, to declare the bill a non-starter for House Republicans and to promise the lower chamber would produce its own bill.

At a press conference earlier this week, Boehner said, "I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed. And I'm hopeful."

After Mr. Obama's speech, Boehner spokesman Brendan Buck added, ""The Speaker agrees that America has a broken immigration system and we need reform that would boost our economy. He's also been clear that the House will not consider any massive, Obamacare-style legislation that no one understands. Instead, the House is committed to a common sense, step-by-step approach that gives Americans confidence that reform is done the right way. We hope that the president will work with us - not against us - as we pursue this deliberate approach."

How exactly the House will move forward is unclear. But House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., has advanced a series of single-issue bills that have no Democratic support, and House Democrats introduced a version of the Senate bill that includes a border-security plan with bipartisan support in the House. A bipartisan working group that had been crafting a comprehensive bill for the House collapsed last month.

#### The plan is unpopular – border security

Bogda director of USC Political Student Assembly 13 (Justin, July 8, 2013, USDA, “Economic Costs of Border Wait Times on the U.S. Agricultural Sector”, p.2, <http://gain.fas.usda.gov/Recent%20GAIN%20Publications/Economic%20Costs%20of%20Border%20Wait%20Times%20on%20the%20U.S.%20Agricultural%20Sector_Mexico%20ATO_Mexico_7-8-2013.pdf>, Accessed: 9/17/13, TM)

Executive Summary: **The border between the United States and Mexico is widely recognized as one of the busiest in the world. There are 43 points of entry** (POE’s) along the border, and **counties** and municipalities **on both** the U.S. and Mexican **side of the border**, with the exception of San Diego, **have** relatively **higher rates of poverty** than counties and municipalities not directly on the border. **Issues such as poverty and drug trafficking make many of these border towns high security risks,** and accordingly, **regulations of border crossings are of the highest priority**. Every day at least 800,000 people travel between the United States and Mexico, and within a year, more than 300 million of these two-way border crossings occur. Mexico is the third largest trading partner of the United States, and trade between the two countries amounts to over $1 billion U.S. dollars (USD) a day. **However, due to border security measures and the congestion that they create, a great deal of revenue can be lost,** and many exporters run the risk of damaging their product with prolonged border wait times. **Several measures to bolster the rate of flow between the two nations could be implemented, but are often limited by security concerns such as undocumented immigration and drug trafficking**

#### Immigration key to the economy – competitiveness, growth, jobs, innovation

Palomarez 3-6-13 [Javier, President & CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce., "The pent up entreprenuership that immigration reform woudl unleash" Forbes -- www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/]

Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy.¶ Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades.¶ Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants.¶ Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies.¶ There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed. After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place.¶ Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses.¶ While immigrants are both critically-important consumers and producers, they boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well.¶ Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want.¶ For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost.¶ Immigration reform would also address another important angle in the debate – the need to entice high-skilled immigrants. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need.¶ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years.¶ As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Prevents global decline

Caploe ‘9

(David Caploe is CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7, The Strait Times, lexis)=

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades. Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

#### Nuclear war

**Auslin ‘9**

(Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would **dramatically raise tensions** inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

## CP

#### Text: The President of the United States should issue an executive order to substantially increase investment in US-Mexico ports of entry.

#### XO has supreme law of the land.

Nelson 2009

[Anne E. J.D. Candidate, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law, 2010, “Muddled to Medellin: A Legal History of Sole Executive Agreements”, <http://www.arizonalawreview.org/pdf/51-4/51arizlrev1035.pdf>, 1036-1027, accessed 9/21, CC]

Can the President of the United States unilaterally make federal law? For most students of American Government, the knee-jerk reaction to this question is an emphatic "no," as they are taught that it is the legislature's role to create laws and the President's role to see that the laws are faithfully executed. n1 Indeed, the United States' political identity depends on a delicate separation of powers that prevents the President from accumulating too much power. n2 Over time, however, the delicate separation of powers balance has shifted, and this emphatic "no" has [\*1036] transformed into a more muddled "maybe," with the President's use of sole executive agreements.¶ Sole executive agreements present a unique challenge to traditional separation of powers principles. These agreements are legal tools the President can use to unilaterally resolve foreign disputes with other countries. The Supreme Court has upheld the President's authority to enter into sole executive agreements and has broadly held that these agreements, being analogous to treaties, are fit to preempt conflicting state law. Thus, sole executive agreements are a means by which the President can sideline the legislature and unilaterally create federal law.¶ Sole executive agreements have been used since the early days of the Republic. n3 Since the turn of the twentieth century and the rise of the United States as a global power, Presidents have aggressively used sole executive agreements to resolve significant matters of foreign policy. The expansive use of sole executive agreements has attracted debate amongst scholars as to their constitutional validity, why they have been held to preempt federal law, and, most importantly, how the preemptive effect of these agreements could be limited to better harmonize with the Supremacy Clause and traditional separation of powers principles. n4¶ Until recently, the Supreme Court has not provided much guidance to this debate. In a series of decisions, n5 the Supreme Court has sanctioned the use of sole executive agreements and concluded that such agreements can be considered "the supreme Law of the Land." n6 In doing so, the Court has granted sweeping power to the President to effectively create federal law through sole executive agreements without any meaningful limitations.

#### Net benefit –

#### Obama needs strong presidential powers to pass climate agreements.

Sassoon 9

[David, December 7, founder and publisher of InsideClimate News, the non-partisan and non-profit news organization that won the Pulitzer Prize for National Reporting in 2013, Inside Climate News, “Obama's Treaty-Making Powers Broader Than Recognized”, <http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20091207/obamas-treaty-making-powers-broader-recognized>, accessed 9/20, CC]

Though arguably the most powerful man on the planet, U.S. President Barack Obama heads to Copenhagen later this month wearing handcuffs. The failure of Congress to pass domestic climate legislation has meant the president has had to advance slowly, lest he get ahead of lawmakers in the Capitol. After all according to the Constitution, international treaties must be ratified by 67 "yes" votes in the Senate.¶ Also still fresh in everybody's mind is the 95-0 vote the Senate cast in opposition to US participation in the Kyoto Protocol, though that vote happened more than a decade ago.¶ But a working paper just posted at the Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia University's law school takes a fresh look at the legal basis of the president’s independent power to enter into internationally binding commitments related to climate change, and it finds that the president has broader powers than commonly recognized. It also identifies an intriguing possibility backed by historical and legal precedent.¶ The president could submit a climate treaty for passage in both houses of Congress by a simple majority, rather than before the Senate alone for passage by a super-majority. In other words, it is possible for Obama to get a global deal ratified by securing a filibuster-proof 60 "yes" votes in the Senate, rather than 67.¶ "Every vote is blood," Michael Gerrard, executive director of the center, told SolveClimate. "And there's a century's worth of practice that provides the legal basis."¶ The working paper is a reassuring bit of legal sleuthing. Even if the U.S. passes domestic climate legislation, genuine concern remains that in the polarized politics inside the beltway, a global treaty could still fail to garner 67 votes needed for U.S. ratification. Now, with Obama announcing that he will travel to Copenhagen on the summit's closing day, when deals are customarily finalized, the idea of needing seven fewer votes in the Senate to secure passage of an eventual treaty is a tantalizing prospect that could fortify his ambition.¶ The center's paper opens a legal discussion with important political implications for the president to consider.¶ It points to a suite of broad presidential powers to conduct foreign affairs that could loosen his handcuffs as international climate negotiations proceed in Copenhagen and beyond. There's a legal basis for Obama to exercise more global leadership in spite of a laggard Congress.

#### Warming causes extinction – consensus it's real, anthropogenic, and outweighs other threats

Deibel 7 (Terry, "Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic of American Statecraft," Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to het the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possible end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to t

## K

#### The elimination of physical barriers only upholds capitalism by increasing competition for labor while failing to eliminate social and economic division which is the true limit to social mobility

DeFazio, professor @ the English Department at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 02

[Kimberly, May/June, Red Critique, “Whither Borders?”, <http://www.redcritique.org/MayJune02/whitherborders.htm>, accessed 7-19-13, GSK]

If it were really the "universal" interests of the "host nation" that immigration policies work to serve, and not big business, all members of the nation would see their living and working conditions improve. Instead, in all nations, the conditions of the majority of working people have drastically deteriorated, while corporate profits have skyrocketed. If immigration (and the permeability of borders) were really used to benefit all members of the national population "immigration" would be used to ensure all people had adequate resources to meet all their needs, rather than pit workers against one another to compete for disappearing jobs with dwindling wages and dwindling basic resources such as water and medicine. In spite of capitalist ideologues' best efforts at constructing imaginary borders, it is, increasingly, the class position of workers everywhere—their lack of access to the means of production and, as a result, the increasing lack of access to all other social resources necessary to survive—that is becoming clear: not their "national" insecurity but their material insecurity. The ruling classes, in short, are proving daily their utter incapacity to actually secure the material conditions of citizens, even while they attempt to divert all attention onto matters of national insecurity.

#### Capitalism fosters an imperialist mindset that inevitably leads to war—empirics prove

Packer 03- hold primary leadership roles at the International Socialist Group and the Fourth International (Dave, “Theory and history¶ Capitalism means War”, The International Socialist Group 2003, <http://www.isg-fi.org.uk/spip.php?article10>, MB)

¶ The twentieth century was the bloodiest century in human history, easily exceeding the previous record, held by the nineteenth century, which began most notably with the Napoleonic wars. During these two centuries, the capitalist world was marked by the rise of competing imperialisms, at first in Europe but soon joined by the USA and Japan. Between 1876 and 1914 European powers annexed approximately eleven million square miles of territory, mainly in Asia and Africa. By the twentieth century, inter-imperialist competition for colonies and markets was to drag nearly the entire world into two devastating world wars, with over one hundred and sixty additional wars since the end of World War Two.¶ ¶ The competition between capitals inherent within the capitalist system forced it to continually revolutionise and expand the means of production, which eventually led to a scramble across the world for colonies, markets and empires, like the British Empire, or its main competitor empires of France and latecomer Germany. Inter-imperialist competition eventually progressed beyond the numerous colonial wars of conquest, to armed conflict between the ‘great’ nations themselves. However, this now took the form of a struggle for world hegemony. Here lay the origins of the two World Wars of the twentieth century. Capitalism, at first by establishing direct colonial rule and later through economically dominated neo-colonies, was now transformed from a progressive to a reactionary imperialist force in the world. As Ernest Mandel writes in his book on the Second World War:¶ The imperialist conquest of the world is not only, or even mainly, a drive to occupy huge territories . . . The motor force of the Second World War was the need to dominate the economy of whole continents through capitalist investment, preferential trade agreements, currency regulations and political hegemony. The aim of the war was the subordination not only of the less developed world, but also of other industrial states, whether enemies or allies, to one hegemonic power’s priorities of capital accumulation. (1)¶ ¶ Capitalism means war because it is driven, in the last analysis, by economic forces, which require ever-expanding markets and opportunities for investments. It does this within the framework of competition between capitals which, after World War Two, resulted in the world hegemony of US imperialism. This hegemonic drive is in the nature of every imperialism: ‘There is not the slightest proof of any limitation on the war aims of Japan, Germany or the USA,’ writes Mandel of the Second World War. ‘Very early on the Tanaka memorandum established that for the Japanese army, the conquest of China was only a stepping stone to the conquest of world hegemony, which could be achieved after crushing US resistance.’ (2)

#### Rejection of the aff is key to a historical materialist criticism – voting negative endorses an anti-capitalist methodology that denaturalizes the functions of capital

San Juan 6 (Epifanio, Jr., Fulbright Lecturer in American Studies at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, “Crisis and Contradiction in Globalization Discourse” http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/crisisandcontradictioninglobalizationdiscourse.htm) APB

In order to probe and analyze the multilayered contradictions of any phenomenon, we need to apply the principle of historical totalizing: connecting spheres of culture, ideology, and politics to the overarching structure of production and reproduction. This is axiomatic for any historical-materialist critique. Consequently, the question of cultural identity cannot be mechanically divorced from the historically determinate mode of production and attendant social relations of any given socioeconomic formation. What is the point of eulogizing hybrid, cyborg-esque, nomadic global citizens—even fluid, ambivalent "subject positions" if you like—when the majority of these postmodernized creatures are dying of hunger, curable epidemics, diseases and psychosomatic illnesses brought about precisely by the predatory encroachment of globalizing transnational corporations, mostly based in the U.S. and Western Europe? But it is not just academic postmodernists suffering from the virus of pragmatist metaphysics who apologize for profit-making globalization. Even a latterly repentant World Bank expert, Joseph Stiglitz, could submit in his well-known Globalization and Its Discontents, the following ideological plea: "Foreign aid, another aspect of the globalized world, for all its faults still has brought benefits to millions, often in ways that have almost gone unnoticed: guerillas in the Philippines were provided jobs by a World Bank financed-project as they laid down their arms" (Stiglitz 420). Any one slightly familiar with the Cold War policies of Washington vis-à-vis a neocolony like the Philippines knows that World Bank funds were then used by the U.S. Pentagon to suppress the Communist Party-led peasant rebellion in the 1950s against the iniquitous semi-feudal system and corrupt comprador regime (Doty; Constantino). It is globalization utilized to maintain direct coercive U.S. domination of the Philippines at a crucial conjuncture when the Korean War was mutating into the Vietnam War, all designed to contain "World Communism" (China, Soviet Union). Up to now, despite nationalist gains in the last decade, the Philippine government plays host every year to thousands of U.S. "Special Forces" purportedly training Filipino troops in the war against "terrorism"—that is, against anti-imperialist forces like the Communist Party-led New People's Army and progressive elements of the Moro Islamic National Liberation Front and the Moro National Liberation Front (International Peace Mission). One needs to repeat again that the present world system, as Hugo Radice argues, remains "both global and national", a contingent and contradictory process (4). Globalization dialectically negates and affirms national entities—pseudo-nations as well as those peoples struggling for various forms of national sovereignty. While a universal "free market" promoted by TNC triumphalism is deemed to be homogenizing and centralizing in effect, abolishing independent states/nationalities, and creating a global public sphere through juxtaposition, syncretic amalgamation, and so on, one perceives a counter-current of fragmentation, increasing asymmetry, unbridgeable inequalities, and particularistic challenges to neoliberal integration—including fundamentalist political Islam, eco-terrorism, drugs, migration, and other movements of "barbarians at the gates" (Schaeffer). Is it a question of mere human rights in representation and life-style, or actual dignity and justice in the everyday lives of whole populations with singular life-forms? Articulating these historical contradictions without theorizing the concept of crisis in capital accumulation will only lead to the short-circuiting transculturalism of Ashcroft and other ideologies waging battle for supremacy/hegemony over "popular common sense" imposing meaning/order/significance on the whole globalization process (Rupert). Indeed, academic inquirers of globalization are protagonists in this unfolding drama of universalization under duress. One may pose the following questions as a heuristic pedagogical maneuver: Can globalized capital truly universalize the world and bring freedom and prosperity to everyone, as its celebrants claim? Globalization as the transnationalized domination of capital exposes its historical limit in the deepening class inequality in a polarized, segregated and policed world. While surplus-value extraction in the international labor market remains basic to the logic of accumulation, the ideology of neoliberal transnationalism has evolved into the discourse of war on terrorism ("extremism") rationalized as "the clash of civilizations". Contradictions and its temporary resolutions constitute the imperialist project of eliding the crisis of unilateral globalism. A historical-materialist critique should seek to highlight the political economy of this recolonizing strategy operating in the fierce competition of the ruling classes of the U.S., Japan, and Europe to impose hegemonic control in an increasingly boundary-destroying space and continue the neocolonial oppression of the rest of the world. What is needed is a radical critique of the ideology of technological determinism and its associated apologetics of the "civilizing mission", the evangelism of "pre-emptive" intervention in the name of Realpolitik "democracy" against resistance by workers, peasants, women, indigenous communities (in Latin America, Africa, the Philippines and elsewhere [see Houghton and Bell; San Juan, "U.S. Imperial Terror"]), and all the excluded and marginalized peoples of the planet.

## 1NC Manufacturing

**1. Economy is resilient**

**Zumbrun & Varghese 5/9** 2012, \*Joshua Zumbrun and Romy Varghese are writers for Bloomberg Businessweek, “Fed’s Plosser Says U.S. Economy Proving Resilient to Shocks,” http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-05-09/fed-s-plosser-says-u-dot-s-dot-economy-proving-resilient-to-shocks

Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank President Charles Plosser said the U.S. economy has proven “**remarkably resilient” to shocks that can damage growth, including surging oil prices and natural disasters**. “The economy has now grown for 11 consecutive quarters,” Plosser said today according to remarks prepared for a speech at the Philadelphia Fed. “Growth is not robust. But growth in the past year has continued **despite significant risks and external and internal headwinds**.” “The U.S. economy has a history of being remarkably resilient,” said Plosser, who doesn’t have a vote on policy this year. “These shocks held GDP growth to less than 1 percent in the first half of 2011, and many analysts were concerned that the economy was heading toward a double dip. Yet, the economy proved resilient and growth picked up in the second half of the year.”

#### **2. U.S. competitiveness high now, recovering business efficiency and profitability**

Susan Adams, Forbes, 5/30/13 (Forbes staff, Forbes, “The World’s Most Competitive Countries” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/susanadams/2013/05/30/the-worlds-most-competitive-countries/> accessed 8/15/13 KR)

The United States is back in first place. For the past 25 years, IMD, the international business school in Lausanne, Switzerland, has issued a list of the countries it says are the world’s most competitive. The U.S. was in first place until 2009, when the great recession knocked it down a notch. The impact on the banking system and other financial institutions was enough to keep the U.S. out of the top spot for the past three years, including last year, when Hong Kong was in first place and the U.S. came in second. But now that financial markets have recovered and business efficiency and profitability have revived, the U.S. has regained its dominant position.

This year IMD ranked 60 countries across the world, measuring “how nations and enterprises manage the totality of their competencies to achieve increased prosperity.” The ranking relies on a staggering 333 criteria in four broad categories—economic performance, government efficiency, business efficiency and infrastructure. For one third of the ranking, IMD uses a survey of more than 4,200 international executives. For the rest, it relies on hard statistical data from organizations like the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which keep track of measures like direct investment, budget surpluses, revenues from tourism, and unemployment. IMD also takes advantage of 55 “partner institutes” around the world, like the Irish Development Agency, the German Federation of Industry, and the Mitsubishi Research Institute in Japan. (For more on the methodology, click here.)

Here is IMD’s list of the ten most competitive nations:

1. U.S.A.

2. Switzerland

3. Hong Kong

4. Sweden

5. Singapore

6. Norway

7. Canada

8. UAE

9. Germany

10. Qatar.

For a complete ranking of all 60 countries, click here.

I talked to Professor Stephane Garelli, director of IMD’s World Competitiveness Center, about the results. Garelli has served as Managing Director of the World Economic Forum, he has consulted with big companies like Hewlett-Packard HPQ -0.44% Europe, verification and testing company SGS , and Nestlé, and he is chairman of the Swiss newspaper Le Temps. After pouring over the competitiveness rankings, he has a thorough take on the macroeconomic picture in each of the 60 nations on the list. I interviewed Prof. Garelli about why some countries achieved their rankings. Here are excerpts from our conversation:

How did the U.S. get back to No. 1?

The financial markets are in better shape and companies are in good shape in terms of profitability. The cash available on balance sheets totals $2,150 billion. Apple AAPL +1.85% alone has $145 billion in cash. Also U.S. companies continue to be highly innovative. Over the last 15 years, most of the big innovations that have changed our lives, from Google to Facebook, were born in the U.S. In the longer run, there has been an energy renaissance in the U.S. In 2015 the U.S. will produce more gas than Russia. This is a consequence of shale gas, fracking and all that. In 2020 the U.S. will produce more oil than Saudi Arabia, 12 million barrels a day. By that year, the cost of electricity in the U.S. may be half the cost in Europe. It will be a huge competitive advantage for the U.S. Then you have the impact on infrastructure. You need to build pipelines from north to south. Spending that money also helps revive the economy.

Why are China (No. 21) and India (No. 40) not higher up in the competitiveness ranking? Aren’t those economies growing?

Asia is slowing down. It’s not a market that is self-sustaining. It’s still very dependent on exports to the U.S. and Europe. So when there’s a slowdown in Europe, that affects exports from China, Taiwan (No. 11) and Singapore (No. 5). Countries like Singapore, which were growing 6%-7% a year are now only growing by 0.2% in the first quarter. Taiwan is growing by 1.5% and Korea (No. 22), 1.4%.

As for China, it had to go through a revolution to get to be a market economy and it’s still basically an agricultural country. The industrialization of China is only 15 years old, not more. They have developed on the coast, where 400 million people live. But 700 million people live in the agricultural lands inside, which has a completely different kind of productivity. They are farmers.

#### 3. Alternative causes to competitiveness: STEM education and Immigration

McDaniel, Alternet, 7/3/13 (Paul, writer for Alternet, Immigrants play a critical role in driving U.S. Talents and economic competitiveness” <http://www.alternet.org/immigration/immigrants-are-key-driver-us-talent-and-economic-competitiveness> accessed 8/18/13 KR)

U.S. workers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields have been important contributors to American innovation, job creation, rising incomes, and global economic competitiveness throughout the years. And not surprisingly, immigrants have played a critical role in American innovation through STEM fields and all parts of the U.S. economy. A new report by Gordon Hanson (University of California, San Diego) and Matthew Slaughter (Dartmouth) describes these important relationships between talent, economic competitiveness, and immigration in the United States. In their paper, the authors present data in support of three critical points:

First, the contribution of talent to American innovation and overall competitiveness is as important today as in the past:

“Talent – especially the talent of highly educated STEM workers – drives much of America’s innovation and economic growth. In the increasingly global economy, America’s need for talent has become even more acute. Despite the nation’s historic innovation prowess, concern is rising among leaders that our economic strength is waning.”

Second, immigration adds to the talent pool in the United States, which is as important today as it has been in the past:

“Immigration plays a critical role in helping America meet its steadily growing demand for talent – especially for highly skilled STEM workers. Immigrants have long made substantial contributions to American innovation, both at the highest levels and throughout the economy at all stages of discovering and developing new ideas. Over time, America’s reliance on talented immigrants has been rising, not falling. America attracts immigrants who achieve very high levels of education and who are strongly inclined toward training in STEM disciplines.”

Third, the supply of and need for STEM talent in the U.S. includes an opportunity for immigrants to continue to help meet that growing demand:

“Even after the Great Recession, America’s need for more talent persists, as it did for decades before. America’s demand for skilled STEM workers continues to grow – and immigrants continue to help meet this demand, both directly and more broadly through their expansive contributions to America’s innovation potential. Post-recession, unemployment in STEM occupations has been falling sharply as the STEM labor market rapidly tightens.”

Immigrants make significant contributions to innovation throughout the country, from the discovery of new ideas, research and development of new products, and patenting, to starting and leading new and innovative companies that create thousands of jobs in the U.S. As the report reiterates, immigrants founded or co-founded 25 percent of all U.S. high-tech firms between 1995 and 2005. In 2005, those new companies employed nearly half a million people and produced more than $50 billion in sales. Beyond the national level, cities and regions within the U.S. that attract greater numbers of skilled immigrants tend to be more successful at innovation. Furthermore, innovation-intensive metropolitan areas tend to have higher rates of patenting, lower unemployment rates, and higher demand for high-skilled workers since patenting growth is correlated with job growth, population growth, and increases in educational attainment.

America’s past innovation grew in part from a robust education system and an environment that allowed for the world’s most talented – native- and foreign-born alike – to thrive. Based on the evidence of the importance of immigrants to American innovation, we must ensure that comprehensive immigration reform in 2013 allows immigrants to contribute their talent and skill here in the U.S. Furthermore, we must guarantee that our education system cultivates a long-term future workforce of talented individuals with the STEM expertise necessary to allow the U.S. to continue to be an innovation leader in our global innovation economy.

**Economy**

**No impact to econ war—no escalation**

**Apps 10** 6/8, \*Peter Apps: Political Risk Correspondent and writer for Reuters, “Crisis fuels unrest, crime, but war risk eases,” http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/06/08/idINIndia-49123220100608

(Reuters) **The global financial crisis has made the world less peaceful** by fuelling crime and civil unrest, a worldwide study showed on Tuesday, **but the risk of outright armed conflict appears to be falling.** Perhaps as a result of the more cash-strapped times, **defence spending as a percentage of gross domestic product was down to its lowest in four years with countries also showing generally better relations** with their neighbours. "In most areas of the world, **war risk seems to be declining**," he said. "**That is very important." A 25 percent reduction in violence would save about $1.7 trillion a year, enough to pay off Greece's debt**, fund the United Nations millennium development goals and pay for the European Union to reach its 2020 climate and carbon targets. The struggling euro zone economies of Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain showed a particular rise in unrest risks, while Africa and the Middle East were the only two regions to have become safer since the survey began in 2007. **Africa had seen a drastic fall in the number of armed conflicts and an improvement in relations between neighbours, he said, overshadowing the impact of greater crime. Better ratings for the Middle East and North Africa came primarily from improving relations between nations.**

#### Their part of the Royal evidence is just a review of other peoples arguments- the conclusion votes neg

**Royal ‘10**(Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, ECST=Economic Cost Signaling Theory)

**CONCLUSION The logic of ECST supports arguments for greater economic interdependence** to reduce the likelihood of conflict. **This chapter does not argue against the utility of signaling theory.** It does, however, suggest that when considering the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises, **ECST logic is dubious as an organizing principle for security policy makers. The discussion pulls together some distinct areas of research** that have not yet featured prominently in the ECST literature. **Studies associating economic interdependence, economic crises and the potential for external conflict indicate that global interdependence is not necessarily a conflict suppressing process** and maybe conflict**- enhancing at certain points.** Furthermore, **the conditions created by economic crises decrease the willingness of states to send economic costly signals,** even though such signals maybe most effective during an economic crisis.

**Heg**

**1. No Impact- No Transition Wars**

**MacDonald and Parent 11** (Spring, Paul K. MacDonald is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College. Joseph M. Parent is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami, "Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment", [http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/ISEC\_a\_00034-MacDonald\_proof2.pdf](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/ISEC_a_00034-MacDonald_proof2.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

Contrary to these predictions, our analysis suggests some grounds for optimism. **Based on the historical track record of great powers facing acute relative decline, the United States should be able to retrench** in the coming decades. **In the next few years, the United States is ripe to overhaul its military, shift burdens to its allies, and work to decrease costly international commitments**. It is likely to initiate and become embroiled in fewer militarized disputes than the average great power and to settle these disputes more amicably. Some might view this prospect with apprehension, fearing the steady erosion of U.S. credibility. Yet our analysis suggests that retrenchment need not signal weakness. **Holding on to exposed and expensive commitments simply for the sake of one’s reputation is a greater geopolitical gamble than withdrawing to cheaper, more defensible frontiers**. Some observers might dispute our conclusions, arguing that hegemonic transitions are more conflict prone than other moments of acute relative decline. We counter that there are deductive and empirical reasons to doubt this argument. Theoretically, hegemonic powers should actually find it easier to manage acute relative decline. **Fallen hegemons still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them. Further, they are no longer the top target for balancing coalitions, and recovering hegemons may be influential because they can play a pivotal role in alliance formation**. In addition, hegemonic powers, almost by definition, possess more extensive overseas commitments; they should be able to more readily identify and eliminate extraneous burdens without exposing vulnerabilities or exciting domestic populations. We **believe the empirical record supports these conclusions**. In particular, **periods of hegemonic transition do not appear more conflict prone** than those of acute decline. **The last reversal at the pinnacle of power was the Anglo- American transition, which took place around 1872 and was resolved without armed confrontation**.

The tenor of that transition may have been influenced by a number of factors: both states were democratic maritime empires, the United States was slowly emerging from the Civil War, and Great Britain could likely coast on a large lead in domestic capital stock. Although China and the United States differ in regime type, **similar factors may work to cushion the impending Sino-American transition. Both are large, relatively secure continental great powers, a fact that mitigates potential geopolitical competition**.93 China faces a variety of domestic political challenges, including strains among rival regions, which may complicate its ability to sustain its economic performance or engage in foreign policy adventurism.94 Most important, the United States is not in free fall. Extrapolating the data into the future, we anticipate the United States will experience a “moderate” decline, losing from 2 to 4 percent of its share of great power GDP in the five years after being surpassed by China sometime in the next decade or two.95 **Given the relatively gradual rate of U.S. decline relative to China, the incentives for either side to run risks by courting conflict are minimal. The United States would still possess upwards of a third of the share of great power GDP, and would have little to gain from provoking a crisis over a peripheral issue. Conversely, China has few incentives to exploit U.S. weakness**.96 **Given the importance of the U.S. market** to the Chinese economy, in addition to the critical role played by the dollar as a global reserve currency, it is unclear how Beijing could hope to consolidate or expand its increasingly advantageous position through direct confrontation. In short, **the United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism**. Indeed, there is evidence that a policy of retrenchment could reap potential benefits. The drawdown and repositioning of U.S. troops in South Korea, for example, rather than fostering instability, has resulted in an improvement in the occasionally strained relationship between Washington and Seoul.97 U.S. moderation on Taiwan, rather than encouraging hard-liners inBeijing, resulted in an improvement in cross-strait relations and reassured U.S. allies that Washington would not inadvertently drag them into a Sino-U.S. conflict.98 Moreover, **Washington’s support for the development of multilateral security institutions, rather than harming bilateral alliances, could work to enhance U.S. prestige while embedding China within a more transparent regional order**.99 **A policy of gradual retrenchment need not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments or unleash destabilizing regional security dilemmas**. Indeed, even if Beijing harbored revisionist intent, it is unclear that China will have the force projection capabilities necessary to take and hold additional territory.100 **By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can strengthen the credibility of its core commitments** while accommodating the interests of a rising China. Not least among the benefits of retrenchment is that it helps alleviate an unsustainable financial position. Immense forward deployments will only exacerbate U.S. grand strategic problems and risk unnecessary clashes.

**2. Turn- Proliferation**

**A. Hege Causes Prolif**

John **Mearsheimer 10** (December 16, Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science University of Chicago, Political Science Ph.D., Former fellow Council om Foreign Relations, "Imperial By Design", [http://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-by-design-4576?page=3](http://nationalinterest.org/article/imperial-by-design-4576?page=3" \t "_blank))

IF ALL of this were not enough, **global dominance**, especially the Bush administration’s penchant for big-stick diplomacy, **negatively affects nuclear proliferation** as well. **The United States is deeply committed to making sure that Iran does not acquire a nuclear arsenal and that North Korea gives up its atomic weapons, but the strategy we have employed is likely to have the opposite effect. The main reason that a country acquires nuclear weapons is that they are the ultimate deterrent.** It is extremely unlikely that any state would attack the homeland of a nuclear-armed adversary because of the fear that it would prompt nuclear retaliation. Therefore, **any country that feels threatened by a dangerous rival has good reason to want a survivable nuclear deterrent**. This basic logic explains why the United States and the Soviet Union built formidable stockpiles during the Cold War. It also explains why Israel acquired atomic weapons and refuses to give them up. **All of this tells you that when the United States places Iran, Iraq and North Korea on the “axis of evil” and threatens them with military force, it gives those countries a powerful incentive to acquire a nuclear deterrent**. The Bush administration, for example, would not have invaded Iraq in March 2003 if Saddam had an atomic arsenal because the Iraqi leader probably would have used it, since he almost certainly was going to die anyway. It is not clear whether Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons today, but given that the United States and Israel frequently hint that they might attack it nevertheless, the regime has good reason to want a deterrent to protect itself. Similarly, **Pyongyang would be foolish to give up its nuclear capability in the absence of some sort of rapprochement with Washington**.

**B. Proliferation leads to nuclear war**

**Utgoff 02** (Victor A. Utgoff, Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses and senior member of the National Security Council Staff, 2002 (“Proliferation, missile defence and American ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, June, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via EBSCOhost Electronic Journals Service, p. 90)

In sum, widespread **proliferation is likely to lead to a**n occasional **shoot-out with nuclear weapons**, and **that** such shoot-outs **will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible** with the weapons at hand. **Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West** of the late 1800s. **With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips**, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while **we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of** dead cities or even **whole nations**.

**3. Turn- Hege causes a Russian-Sino Alliance culminating in nuclear war**

Paul Craig **Roberts 07** (August 9, assistant secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was associate editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and contributing editor ofNational Review, William E. Simon chair in political economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, and senior research fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, "US Hegemony Spawns Russian-Chinese Military Alliance", [http://www.antiwar.com/roberts/?articleid=11422](http://www.antiwar.com/roberts/?articleid=11422" \t "_blank))

This week the **Russian and Chinese militaries are conducting a joint military exercise** involving large numbers of troops and combat vehicles. The former Soviet Republics of Tajikistan, Kyrgkyzstan, and Kazakstan are participating. Other countries appear ready to join the military alliance. **This new potent military alliance is a real world response to neoconservative delusions about US hegemony. Neocons believe that the US is supreme in the world and can dictate its course**. The neoconservative idiots have actually written papers, read by Russians and Chinese, about why the US must use its military superiority to assert hegemony over Russia and China.
Cynics believe that the neocons are just shills, like Bush and Cheney, for the military-security complex and are paid to restart the cold war for the sake of the profits of the armaments industry. But the fact is that the neocons actually believe their delusions about American hegemony. Russia and China have now witnessed enough of the Bush administration's unprovoked aggression in the world to take neocon intentions seriously. As the US has proven that

it cannot occupy the Iraqi city of Baghdad despite 5 years of efforts, it most certainly cannot occupy Russia or China. That means **the conflict toward which the neocons are driving will be a nuclear conflict**. In an attempt to gain the advantage in a nuclear conflict, the neocons are positioning US anti-ballistic missiles on Soviet borders in Poland and the Czech Republic. This is an idiotic provocation as the Russians can eliminate anti-ballistic missiles with cruise missiles. Neocons are people who desire war, but know nothing about it. Thus, the US failures in Iraq and Afghanistan. Reagan and Gorbachev ended the cold war. However, US administrations after Reagan's have broken the agreements and understandings. The US gratuitously brought NATO and anti-ballistic missiles to Russia's borders. The Bush regime has initiated a propaganda war against the Russian government of Vladimir Putin. These are gratuitous acts of aggression. **Both the Russian and Chinese governments are trying to devote resources to their economic development, not to their militaries. Yet, both are being forced by America's aggressive posture to revamp their militaries. Americans need to understand** what the neocon Bush regime cannot: **a nuclear exchange between the US, Russia, and China would establish the hegemony of the cockroach**.

**4. Turn- Terrorism**

**A. Hege Causes Terrorism**

Ivan **Eland 08** (May 5, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center on Peace & Liberty at The Independent Institute. Dr. Eland is a graduate of Iowa State University and received an M.B.A. in applied economics and Ph.D. in national security policy from George Washington University. He has been Director of Defense Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, and he spent 15 years working for Congress on national security issues, "Reverand Wright Is Not Totally Wrong", [http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2182](http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2182" \t "_blank))

But what about Wright’s implication that **U.S. foreign policy causes blowback terrorism against the United States**? Again, the facts are on his side. Poll after poll in the Arab/Islamic world indicates that U.S. political and economic freedoms, technology, and even culture are popular in these countries, but U.S. interventionist foreign policy toward the Middle East is not. **Bin Laden has repeatedly said that he attacks the United States because of its occupation of Muslim lands and its support for corrupt Middle Eastern governments**. Finally, **empirical studies have linked U.S. foreign occupation and military interventions with blowback terrorism against the U.S**. targets. The upshot of Rev. Wright’s remarks is that **if the United States militarily intervened less overseas, the chickens would not be roosting as much in the U.S. henhouse**. It is too bad that Rev. Wright’s largely correct analysis of U.S. foreign policy is being thrown out with his other wacky and bigoted ravings.

**B. Terrorism goes nuclear**

**Alexander ’03** (Yonah, Prof, Dir – Inter-University for Terrorism Studies, Washington Times, 8-28, Lexis)

Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary **terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence** in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear **we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning** national, regional and **global security** concerns.

**5. US hegemony will decline– shrinking economy**

Bernd **Debusmann 12** (April 20, World Affairs columnist Bernd Debusmann has reported from close to 100 countries, on stories from the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the seizure of American hostages in Iran to Lebanon’s descent into anarchy and the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan. Debusmann was shot twice in the course of his work -- once covering a night battle in the center of Beirut and once in an assassination attempt prompted by his reporting. “America’s decline – myth or reality?”, <http://blogs.reuters.com/bernddebusmann/2012/04/20/america%E2%80%99s-decline-%E2%80%93-myth-or-reality/>, accessed 1/20)

¶ Take note of a new phrase in the seemingly endless debate over **whether the days of the United States as the world’s pre-eminent power are numbered:** Those who doubt the country’s economic decline are holding an “intellectual ostrich position.”¶ The expression was coined by **Edward Luce**, author of a deeply-researched new book entitled Time to Start Thinking: America in the Age of Descent. It **notes that the United States accounted for 31 percent of the global economy in 2000 and 23.5 percent in 2010. By 2020, he estimates that it will shrink to around 16 percent.¶** Luce’s diagnosis of descent, published in April, was the latest addition to a steadily growing library of books, academic papers and opinion pieces for or against the idea that the United States can maintain its status as the world’s only superpower. If we adopt Luce’s phrase, it’s a discussion between declinists and ostriches. The latter include President Barack Obama and his presumptive Republican rival in next November’s presidential elections.¶ “It means that we’re going to have a 2012 election where…both candidates will start on a false premise: that relative economic decline is simply to be ignored or dismissed,” Luce said in an interview with Foreign Policy magazine. “And I’d describe that as a kind of intellectual ostrich position.”¶ The false premise, in this view, was set out by Robert Kagan, a scholar at the Brookings Institution, a Washington-based think tank, in a lengthy analysis entitled Not Fade Away: Against the Myth of American Decline. One of the points Kagan made to support his argument: the U.S. share of world Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has held steady over the past four decades. Plain wrong, says Luce.¶ The Kagan article, now expanded into a book (The World America Made), is reported to have so impressed Obama that it influenced his State of the Union Speech in January, when he said “Anyone who tells you that America is in decline or that our influence has waned doesn’t know what they are talking about.”¶ They don’t? Here’s the view of Clyde Prestowitz, a labor economist and veteran declinist, weighing into the debate in April: “You’d have to be blind not to see the deterioration of our infrastructure. **We used to have trade surpluses. Now we have chronic deficits. We used to tell ourselves that didn’t matter because we had surpluses in high tech items. But now we have deficits there, too. We used to be the world’s biggest creditor. Now we are its biggest debtor**…How can anybody claim we are not suffering decline?”¶ **Washington’s loss of influence has been evident in many regions of the world**, most recently at a summit that brought together leaders of North and Latin America in the Colombian city of Cartagena. There, in Uncle Sam’s traditional backyard, Obama’s assertion that U.S. influence had not waned highlighted a particularly wide gap between rhetoric and reality.

## 1NC Relations

#### 1. Relations high now – Obama’s trip to Mexico and education reform prove

Guilamo-Ramosprofessor and co-director of the Center for Latino Adolescent and Family Health at the Silver School of Social Work at NYU and Lopez president of the Universidad Popular Autonoma del Estado de Puebla (UPAEP) 13(Vincent and Jose Alfredo Miranda, May 28, 2013, “The U.S. and Mexico Have Much to Learn from Each Other”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/vincent-guilamoramos/us-mexico-relations\_b\_3347068.html , accessed: 8/18/13, TM)

Barack **Obama's recent visit to Mexico,** the fourth of his presidency, **represented an important, deliberate attempt to shift the focus of Mexico-U.S. relations from security to economic improvement.**

But **it also represented** much more **-- a chance to allay the public's profoundly negative conceptions of Mexico by shifting the conversation to education, labor, environment, and other human-scale issues that are truly vital to the future of both countries.**

While much media coverage focuses on Mexican immigration battles, drug wars and narco-trafficking, the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico has been evolving in complex and positive ways.

**That is really not so surprising when one considers that the Latino population in the U.S. surpassed 50 million** not too long ago, and people of Mexican ancestry account for more than 60 percent of this total. Mexico's economy and middle class are growing.

**And there is Obama's pivotal "100,000 Strong in the Americas" initiative, launched in 2011 to expand study-abroad exchange opportunities between the U.S. and Latin America. Increasing student exchange, and building understanding through higher education, offers at least the potential to help offset the tarnished public perception of bilateral relations. Not incidentally, this cross-border tradition contributes heavily to both countries' economies.**

Obama's trip reminded us that the two neighbors have much to learn from each another. In the U.S., about a third of the population is under 25, while in Mexico, half of the population is less than 25, a bountiful group of potential college attendees. While higher education has long presented a roadmap to better jobs and futures for young people in America, our increasing educational fees and student debt loads are making such prospects more difficult to realize, particularly among lower-income families. Mexico's landscape is of course different. Public education is free, but just 1 out of every 3 individuals of eligible age enters college, showing limitations in the existing capacity of the country's education system.

#### 2. Plan not key- Mexico-US economic ties inevitable

Blank 13 (Fulbright Research Chair in Governance and Public Administration @ University of Ottawa [Stephen Blank, “North American Solutions,” World Policy Council, June 17, 2013 - 4:20pm | Pg. http://www.worldpolicy.org/blog/2013/06/17/north-american-solutions)

We share integrated energy markets, use the same roads and railroads to transport jointly-made products, fly on the same integrated airline networks, and increasingly meet the same standards of professional practice. This is the true North American “reality.” By the 1990s, key elements of North America’s economy could be visualized as deeply integrated continental supply chains linking production centers and distribution hubs across the continent. No one planned these developments. The most powerful drivers of change were “bottom-up” changes in corporate strategies and structures rather than “top-down” government plans or decisions.

#### ENDED HERE

#### 3. Relations resilient – bilateral interests and interdependence

Seelke, specialist in Latin American Affairs for the Congressional Research Service 13(Clare Ribando, January 16, 2013, Congressional Research Service, “Mexico’s New Administration: Priorities and Key Issues in U.S. – Mexican Relations”, p. 1-2, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42917.pdf, Accessed: 8/18/13, TM).

**Congress and the United States have a strong interest in the impact of the Peña Nieto government on economic and security conditions in Mexico and on U.S.-Mexican relations**.

 **Economically, the United States and Mexico are heavily interdependent, and the U.S. economy could benefit if Mexico is able to sustain or expand its economic growth rate** (which has averaged 3% over the last three years). Similarly, **security conditions in Mexico affect U.S. national security, particularly along the nearly 2,000 mile U.S.-Mexico border**. **Congress may closely monitor whether the reduction in organized-crime related violence that Mexico experienced in 2012 can be sustained without jeopardizing bilateral efforts against drug trafficking and organized crime. Maintaining strong bilateral cooperation on these and other issues, while also ensuring that U.S. interests are protected, are likely to be of keen interest to Congress**

#### **4. Alt cause to relations – border security**

Gardner reporter for Reuters 13 (Simon, June 25, 2013, Reuters, “Mexico Concerned about U.S. Bid to Beef Up Border Security”, http://news.yahoo.com/mexico-concerned-u-bid-beef-border-security-195321757.html, Accessed: 8/18/13, TM)

MEXICO CITY (Reuters) - The Mexican government on Tuesday voiced concern about U.S. congressional proposals to beef up security along the U.S.-Mexico border, saying it was divisive and would not solve the problem of illegal immigration. Immigration plays a significant part in the countries' bilateral relations. Millions of Mexicans live and work on the U.S. side of the border and tens try to enter the United States annually, often at peril to their lives. "Our country has let the United States government know that measures which affect links between communities depart from the principles of shared responsibility and good neighborliness," Foreign Minister Jose Antonio Meade said in a televised statement. "We're convinced that fences do not unite, fences are not the solution to the migration phenomenon and are not in line with a modern, safe border."

### Warming

#### 1. No Solvency- Global warming is irreversible- already passed the tipping point

Pal 13 (May 13, “Global Warming at an Intolerable Level”, Amitabh Pal, the managing editor of The Progressive and co-editor of the Progressive Media Project, http://progressive.org/global-warming-at-intolerable-level)

A fateful milestone for our planet was recorded recently: The proportion of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has now reached 400 parts per million. “The last time the carbon dioxide level was this high was at least three million years ago,” [states the New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/11/science/earth/carbon-dioxide-level-passes-long-feared-milestone.html?pagewanted=all" \t "_blank). “Billions of people are in harm’s way.” As climate activists like Bill McKibben argue, such a level of CO2 in the atmosphere is quite certainly setting us on a path of irreversible climate change—with catastrophic consequences for all of us. (Indeed, McKibben’s organization is named [350.org](http://www.350.org/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) for the acceptable upper limit of CO2 concentration in the atmosphere.) The new “number is a reminder that … we are altering the composition of our atmosphere at an unprecedented rate,” [writes Al Gore at Huffington Post](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/al-gore/carbon-dioxide-400-parts-per-million_b_3253361.html?utm_hp_ref=green" \t "_blank). “Indeed, every single day we pour an additional 90 million tons of global warming pollution into the sky as if it were an open sewer.” And we are living in a society that is the biggest culprit in this mess. “China is now the largest emitter, but Americans have been consuming fossil fuels extensively for far longer, and experts say the United States is more responsible than any other nation for the high level,” reports the New York Times. Or, as Rajendra Pachauri, head of the Nobel-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, [told me](http://www.progressive.org/intv0509.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank): “The problem has been caused not by today’s emissions or the last twenty-five years of emissions; it’s been caused by cumulative emissions beginning with industrialization. The role of the industrial countries is paramount in having contributed to human-induced climate change.” But the approach of the industrialized nations, led by the United States, has been to evade responsibility. The latest round of climate change talks in Qatar ended in December on a disappointing note, with the Western promise of compensatory funding for poorer nations lacking teeth, in large part due to American intransigence.

#### 2. No Solvency- C02 doesn’t cause warming- best data proves

Science Daily 13 (May 30, “Global Warming Caused by CFCs, Not Carbon Dioxide, Researcher Claims in Controversial Study”, Quoting Qin-Bin Lu a professor of physics and astronomy, biology and chemistry @ University of Waterloo Faculty of Science, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/05/130530132443.htm)

Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are to blame for global warming since the 1970s and not carbon dioxide, according to a researcher from the University of Waterloo in a controversial new study published in the International Journal of Modern Physics B this week. CFCs are already known to deplete ozone, but in-depth statistical analysis now suggests that CFCs are also the key driver in global climate change, rather than carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, the researcher argues. "Conventional thinking says that the emission of human-made non-CFC gases such as carbon dioxide has mainly contributed to global warming. But we have observed data going back to the Industrial Revolution that convincingly shows that conventional understanding is wrong," said Qing-Bin Lu, a professor of physics and astronomy, biology and chemistry in Waterloo's Faculty of Science. "In fact, the data shows that CFCs conspiring with cosmic rays caused both the polar ozone hole and global warming." "Most conventional theories expect that global temperatures will continue to increase as CO2 levels continue to rise, as they have done since 1850. What's striking is that since 2002, global temperatures have actually declined -- matching a decline in CFCs in the atmosphere," Professor Lu said. "My calculations of CFC greenhouse effect show that there was global warming by about 0.6 °C from 1950 to 2002, but the earth has actually cooled since 2002. The cooling trend is set to continue for the next 50-70 years as the amount of CFCs in the atmosphere continues to decline." The findings are based on in-depth statistical analyses of observed data from 1850 up to the present time, Professor Lu's cosmic-ray-driven electron-reaction (CRE) theory of ozone depletion and his previous research into Antarctic ozone depletion and global surface temperatures. "It was generally accepted for more than two decades that the Earth's ozone layer was depleted by the sun's ultraviolet light-induced destruction of CFCs in the atmosphere," he said. "But in contrast, CRE theory says cosmic rays -- energy particles originating in space -- play the dominant role in breaking down ozone-depleting molecules and then ozone." Lu's theory has been confirmed by ongoing observations of cosmic ray, CFC, ozone and stratospheric temperature data over several 11-year solar cycles. "CRE is the only theory that provides us with an excellent reproduction of 11-year cyclic variations of both polar ozone loss and stratospheric cooling," said Professor Lu. "After removing the natural cosmic-ray effect, my new paper shows a pronounced recovery by ~20% of the Antarctic ozone hole, consistent with the decline of CFCs in the polar stratosphere." By demonstrating the link between CFCs, ozone depletion and temperature changes in the Antarctic, Professor Lu was able to draw almost perfect correlation between rising global surface temperatures and CFCs in the atmosphere. "The climate in the Antarctic stratosphere has been completely controlled by CFCs and cosmic rays, with no CO2 impact. The change in global surface temperature after the removal of the solar effect has shown zero correlation with CO2 but a nearly perfect linear correlation with CFCs -- a correlation coefficient as high as 0.97." Data recorded from 1850 to 1970, before any significant CFC emissions, show that CO2 levels increased significantly as a result of the Industrial Revolution, but the global temperature, excluding the solar effect, kept nearly constant. The conventional warming model of CO2, suggests the temperatures should have risen by 0.6°C over the same period, similar to the period of 1970-2002. The analyses support Lu's CRE theory and point to the success of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. "We've known for some time that CFCs have a really damaging effect on our atmosphere and we've taken measures to reduce their emissions," Professor Lu said. "We now know that international efforts such as the Montreal Protocol have also had a profound effect on global warming but they must be placed on firmer scientific ground." "This study underlines the importance of understanding the basic science underlying ozone depletion and global climate change," said Terry McMahon, dean of the faculty of science. "This research is of particular importance not only to the research community, but to policy makers and the public alike as we look to the future of our climate." Professor Lu's paper, "Cosmic-Ray-Driven Reaction and Greenhouse Effect of Halogenated Molecules: Culprits for Atmospheric Ozone Depletion and Global Climate Change," also predicts that the global sea level will continue to rise for some years as the hole in the ozone recovers increasing ice melting in the polar regions. "Only when the effect of the global temperature recovery dominates over that of the polar ozone hole recovery, will both temperature and polar ice melting drop concurrently," says Lu. The peer-reviewed paper published this week not only provides new fundamental understanding of the ozone hole and global climate change but has superior predictive capabilities, compared with the conventional sunlight-driven ozone-depleting and CO2-warming models, Lu argues.

#### 3. Alt Cause- Agriculture makes warming inevitable

Laskawy 12 (April 10, Tom Laskawy- founder and executive director of the Food & Environment Reporting Network and a contributing writer at Grist covering food and agricultural policy, “New science reveals agriculture’s true climate impact”, http://grist.org/climate-change/new-science-reveals-agricultures-true-climate-impact/)

The effect of excess fertilizer on our waterways gets much more attention than it does when it enters the air. And for good reason. It’s toxic to consume nitrates in your drinking water. We’re learning that agricultural overuse of fertilizer has contaminated the drinking water of whole regions of California. Meanwhile, nitrogen that runs into the ocean causes oxygen-depleted “dead zones” around the world. The dead zone in our own Gulf Of Mexico (measured every summer) keeps getting larger — last year’s was the size of New Jersey. While we know that excess fertilizer escapes farm fields as gas, exactly how much and where it goes has largely been a mystery. But it has been a mystery worth solving, as the amount of nitrous oxide — the third most potent greenhouse gas behind carbon dioxide and methane — in the atmosphere is increasing fast. In fact, it has risen by 20 percent since the Industrial Revolution, with a good part of that increase coming in the last 50 years. For the sake of comparison, atmospheric carbon dioxide rates have increased around 40 percent in the same period. But nitrous oxide is around 300 times more potent as a greenhouse gas. And it’s also a major ozone-depleting chemical.

Pinpointing the cause of these nitrous emissions has been made especially difficult by the fact that every molecule of nitrous oxide looks alike. And there are so many sources — from microbes in farm fields, oceans, and natural landscapes to oceanic phenomena and human activities like rainforest destruction.

As a result, it has been impossible to know just how much is coming from fertilizer use; and Big Ag has never been made accountable. But that may have all just changed. Now, a group of scientists at the University of California, Berkeley have found a way to “fingerprint” various sources of nitrous oxide — and they’ve determined that the accelerated increase in atmospheric nitrous oxide in the last few decades has indeed been due to synthetic nitrogen fertilizer use. The researchers accomplished this feat through a fascinating technique — using a natural “archive” of air frozen in Antarctic ice combined with an actual archive of air samples taken from a (stunningly beautiful) pollution tracking station in Tasmania, Australia. In their analysis, published in the journal Nature Geoscience, the scientists found that microbes in heavily fertilized farm fields produce nitrous oxide heavy with a particular isotope (nitrogen-14, for those keeping score at home). Their analysis also showed differences in the samples between the two sites that suggest the ability to create a geographical emissions map. As lead scientist Kristie Boering explains: The fact that the isotopic composition of N2O shows a coherent signal in space and time is exciting, because now you have a way to differentiate agricultural N2O from natural ocean N2O from Amazon forest emissions from N2O returning from the stratosphere. The result doesn’t just prove that overuse of fertilizer is causing climate change (it does). The Berkeley team also has, in essence, come up with a way to enforce restrictions on nitrous oxide emissions. As Boering observed: “It is a tool that, ultimately, we can use to verify whether N2O emissions by agriculture or biofuel production are in line with what they say they are.” Until now, Big Ag has been able to pay lip service to limiting fertilizer overuse without committing to, much less accepting, new regulations. And even if producers had agreed to such limitations, it would have been impossible to know whether they’d fulfilled their promises. So while this new science doesn’t take away all the political barriers to engaging agriculture in climate change negotiations, it could make it much more possible to do so. The Berkeley researchers fully understand that eliminating synthetic nitrogen fertilizer isn’t exactly an option. But they hope that farmers will spend more time figuring out how to use it more efficiently — and the analytical tools the researchers have developed will for the first time allow farmers to measure that efficiency precisely. Just as importantly, these tools will also enable scientists to calculate definitively the true climate impact of biofuels — a subject of great controversy to this point.

#### 4. Alt Cause- deforestation causes warming and destroys bio-d

Sheer and Moss 12 (November 13, Roddy Sheer- Harvard University degree in Environmental Studies, Contributor to Scientific American, Doug Moss- Contribtor to Scientific American, Founder of the Environmental Magazine, Editor of The Environmental Magazine, “Deforestation and Its Extreme Effect on Global Warming”, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=deforestation-and-global-warming

From logging, agricultural production and other economic activities, deforestation adds more atmospheric CO2 than the sum total of cars and trucks on the world's roads

Dear EarthTalk: Is it true that cutting and burning trees adds more global warming pollution to the atmosphere than all the cars and trucks in the world combined?— Mitchell Vale, Houston

By most accounts, deforestation in tropical rainforests adds more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere than the sum total of cars and trucks on the world’s roads. According to the World Carfree Network (WCN), cars and trucks account for about 14 percent of global carbon emissions, while most analysts attribute upwards of 15 percent to deforestation.

The reason that logging is so bad for the climate is that when trees are felled they release the carbon they are storing into the atmosphere, where it mingles with greenhouse gases from other sources and contributes to global warming accordingly. The upshot is that we should be doing as much to prevent deforestation as we are to increase fuel efficiency and reduce automobile usage.

According to the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), a leading green group, 32 million acres of tropical rainforest were cut down each year between 2000 and 2009—and the pace of deforestation is only increasing. “Unless we change the present system that rewards forest destruction, forest clearing will put another 200 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere in coming decades…,” says EDF.

“Any realistic plan to reduce global warming pollution sufficiently—and in time—to avoid dangerous consequences must rely in part on preserving tropical forests,” reports EDF. But it’s hard to convince the poor residents of the Amazon basin and other tropical regions of the world to stop cutting down trees when the forests are still worth more dead than alive. “Conservation costs money, while profits from timber, charcoal, pasture and cropland drive people to cut down forests,” adds EDF. Exacerbating global warming isn’t the only negative impact of tropical deforestation. It also wipes out biodiversity: More than half of the world’s plant and animal species live in tropical rainforests.