### 1AC

**Plan: The United States Department of Commerce should remove the tomato price floor against Mexico.**

### 1AC

**Contention 1 is Protectionism---2 internal links---**

**First trade credibility --- the price floor destroys it and causes retaliation**

**Riley and Lamborn 12**, Bryan Riley is a Jay Andel Senior Analyst in Trade Policy at the Heritage Foundation, Mark Lamborn is a member of the young leaders program at Heritage, What Does the Obama Administration Have Against Cheap Vegetables?, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/10/01/what-does-the-obama-administration-have-against-cheap-vegetables/>

The dispute dates back the [North American Free Trade Agreement](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2001/08/the-effects-of-nafta-on-exports-jobs) (NAFTA), which removed tariffs on Mexican tomatoes—but not for long. When American consumers started buying more Mexican tomatoes, U.S. tomato producers filed complaints that their Mexican competitors were “dumping” tomatoes on the American market. The resulting 1996 agreement set a minimum price at which Mexican producers could sell tomatoes in the U.S. This interference in the market was accepted by Mexican producers as a better alternative to the possibility of protectionist anti-dumping duties being imposed on their tomatoes by U.S. bureaucrats. However, U.S. tomato growers now think that the price dictated by the current agreement, [renewed in 2008](http://ia.ita.doc.gov/tomato/2008-agreement/2008-agreement.html" \t "_blank), is too low. Half of all tomatoes consumed in the U.S. come from Mexico. New tariffs would penalize U.S. consumers, and Mexico would almost **surely**[**retaliate**](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-27/u-s-ends-mexican-tomato-price-accord-raising-risk-of-trade-war.html) by imposing duties on competitive U.S. exports. It’s time to get the government out of the tomato dispute altogether. **If the** existing **pact is going to be abolished, it should be in favor of** completely **free trade, not greater protectionism** that raises prices. The U.S. government needs to guarantee consumers the freedom to spend their money on tomatoes from Florida, Mexico, or anywhere else without interference. Anything else would simply be **rotten trade policy**.

**Giving in to the Florida growers opened the door to future protectionism**

**Jungmeyer 2/1**, Lance Jungmeyer is the President of Save My Tomato!,<http://savemytomato.com/why-is-u-s-commerce-department-threatening-economic-welfare-of-american-workers-businesses-with-an-unfair-policy-on-mexican-tomato-imports/>

Malena Produce of Rio Rico, Ariz., is another FPPA member company that stands to lose if the agreement is scuttled. Gonzalo Avila of Malena Produce said, “The Department of Commerce clearly refuses to consider the broad impacts on U.S. jobs and the economy by pandering to a handful of growers in Florida. That Commerce **opens the door** for a group of Florida growers to continue to beg for government protection from other U.S. companies that have outpaced and out-innovated them is irresponsible. How will Commerce explain shielding the weakest links in Florida when my employees and their families could suffer if I am forced to eliminate jobs?”

**This precedent alone ensures a trade war**

**Jungmeyer 2/1**, Lance Jungmeyer is the President of Save My Tomato!,<http://savemytomato.com/why-is-u-s-commerce-department-threatening-economic-welfare-of-american-workers-businesses-with-an-unfair-policy-on-mexican-tomato-imports/>

NOGALES, AZ – February 1, 2013 – If the U.S. Department of Commerce refuses to accept good-faith concessions by Mexico’s tomato-growing industry after months of negotiating a trade agreement, it signals a **dangerous precedent** that would have unintended consequences for U.S. jobs, said an industry group that fears a broad trade war could break out. “If the Commerce Department kills the tomato trade agreement, this will almost certainly threaten the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of American workers, seriously strain thousands of American businesses and needlessly impose a substantially higher cost to American consumers of tomatoes,” said Lance Jungmeyer, President of the Fresh Produce Association of the Americas (FPAA). “What’s more, the Commerce Department risks igniting a trade war with our second-largest trading partner, a war that could impact exports of other American commodities.”

**Second internal’s retaliation ---they said they’d retaliate to the fullest extent**

**Korves 12**, Ross Korves joined Truth About Trade and Technology in 2004 as the Economic and Trade Policy Analyst. Researching and analyzing economic issues important to agricultural producers, Ross provides an intimate understanding regarding the interface of economic policy analysis and the political process. Mr. Korves served the American Farm Bureau Federation as an Economist from 1980 – 2004. He served as Chief Economist from April 2001 through September 2003 and held the title of Senior Economist from September 2003 through August 2004. Born and raised on a southern Illinois hog farm and educated at Southern Illinois University, Ross holds a Masters Degree in Agribusiness Economics. His studies and research have expanded internationally through his work in Germany as a 1984 McCloy Agricultural Fellow and study travel to Japan in 1982, Zambia and Kenya in 1986 and Germany in 1987, U.S. Tomato Dispute With Mexico, <http://www.truthabouttrade.org/2012/10/04/u-s-tomato-dispute-with-mexico/> MWimsatt

The Mexican government indicated it will **retaliate to the fullest extent allowed**.  They consider the preliminary decision to end the suspension of the anti-dumping case to be an attempt by the Obama Administration to gain support of farmers in a key swing state in the Presidential election.  Talk of Mexican retaliation brought up comparisons to the NAFTA trucking situation when Mexico placed tariffs on $2.4 billion of U.S. agricultural exports to force the Obama Administration to alter its position.  The value of Mexican tomato exports to the U.S. is $1.9 billion per year.

**That destroys the economy and manufacturing**

**ENEB 12**, Express News Editorial Board for MySanAntonio, Don’t Start a Trade War with Mexico Again, <http://mexicotrucker.com/editorial-dont-start-a-trade-war-with-mexico-again/> MWimsatt

The United States is still recovering from the self-inflicted economic wounds of one unnecessary trade war with Mexico. Now is not the time to start another tiff with the nation’s **third-largest trading partner** and its **second-largest export market**. A year ago, the Obama administration restarted a long-delayed test program of a cross-border trucking provision of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The Bush administration started the demonstration program in 2007.

A Democratically controlled Congress, at the behest of the Teamsters Union, killed it in 2009. Mexico then slapped punitive tariffs on 89 categories of U.S. exports with an annual value of $2.4 billion. Trade with Mexico has been one of the few bright spots in the U.S. economy. Two-way trade in goods and services surged to $500 billion last year, a 17 percent increase over 2010 and 24 percent above pre-recession highs set four years ago. An election year ploy shouldn’t be allowed to derail this economic success story. With the restart of the program, Mexico lifted the tariffs, a move that Texas A&M University’s Center for North American Studies estimated would restore 12,000 U.S. jobs. Put another way, the trade war — and the special-interest politics in the United States that sparked it — cost 12,000 Americans their jobs. Now tomato growers in Florida have renewed a long-running effort to block Mexican imports. They filed a complaint with the U.S. Department of Commerce, claiming Mexico is dumping produce on the U.S. market. The complaint undermines a bilateral agreement established in 1996 that grants Commerce the authority to set the floor for tomato prices. The United States and Mexico renewed that agreement in 2002 and 2008. It serves the interests of growers and consumers in both countries and works within the NAFTA framework. But in an election year, the growers in a battleground state are hopeful that the Obama administration will help them achieve their protectionist goals. Just as in the case of the trucking provision, Mexico will retaliate if the United States imposes tariffs on its produce industry. Exporters in Texas — who send agricultural products, **manufactured goods** and commercial services to Mexico — would likely be among the **hardest hit**. And Texas logistics and distribution centers would be hurt by a restriction of Mexican imports. Trade with Mexico has been one of the few bright spots in the U.S. economy. Two-way trade in goods and services surged to $500 billion last year, a 17 percent increase over 2010 and 24 percent above pre-recession highs set four years ago. An election year ploy shouldn’t be allowed to derail this economic success story.

**Destroys the manufacturing base**

Shoick 13, D. Rick Van Schoik  Jan 3, 2013, “Tomato fight could hurt U.S.-Mexico trade” UT San Diego, <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2013/Jan/03/tomato-fight-could-hurt-us-mexico-trade/>

The Department of Commerce has looked into the issue twice in the past and concluded that indeed a completely level playing field exists with our NAFTA partner. Florida growers already have won minimum price guarantees on Mexican-grown tomatoes. If Florida wins, Mexico can impart heavy tariffs in retribution, as it did when we denied their NAFTA trucks access to U.S. markets.And if they win, we pay higher prices on not just tomatoes but most everything we import, which is a bit of most everything, including energy.¶ Yes, cheaper wages in Mexico explain a small part of the difference, but a maturely sophisticated agriculture, supply chain and marketing successes mean that North America enjoys superb tomatoes from Mexico year-round.¶ Having recently sponsored a major conference on U.S.-Mexico trade, I can attest to how protectionism born in Florida can affect not only relations between U.S. and Mexico, but trade in general. The competitiveness of North America’s joint manufacturing and production worldwide is threatened, jeopardizing prosperity of all North Americans.The last time the U.S. and Mexico had a trade dispute, it cost California and San Diego, respectively. That disagreement was over allowing Mexican trucks to enter and deliver into the U.S. interior as agreed under NAFTA. The Teamsters and other unions claimed safety and environmental differences between U.S. and Mexican trucks. Surveys were conducted that concluded Mexican trucks were safer exactly because they do undergo so many inspections, and protections are in place to assure Mexican trucks meet U.S. and California emissions standards.

**It’s reverse causal---a firm commitment against exploitation of anti-dumping provisions is modeled by other countries and creates a stable investment climate for trade**

**Korves 12**, Ross Korves joined Truth About Trade and Technology in 2004 as the Economic and Trade Policy Analyst. Researching and analyzing economic issues important to agricultural producers, Ross provides an intimate understanding regarding the interface of economic policy analysis and the political process. Mr. Korves served the American Farm Bureau Federation as an Economist from 1980 – 2004. He served as Chief Economist from April 2001 through September 2003 and held the title of Senior Economist from September 2003 through August 2004. Born and raised on a southern Illinois hog farm and educated at Southern Illinois University, Ross holds a Masters Degree in Agribusiness Economics. His studies and research have expanded internationally through his work in Germany as a 1984 McCloy Agricultural Fellow and study travel to Japan in 1982, Zambia and Kenya in 1986 and Germany in 1987, U.S. Tomato Dispute With Mexico, <http://www.truthabouttrade.org/2012/10/04/u-s-tomato-dispute-with-mexico/>

Almost 17 years after NAFTA was implemented and five years after the last transition periods has ended, the U.S. and Mexico need a better way to settle these disputes than filing anti-dumping cases.  Mexican chicken meat and pork producers continue to bring cases against U.S. producers just like the U.S. tomato producers.  **Having a competitive advantage should not result in a trade dispute** case.  President Obama and Mitt Romney should commit to not using anti-dumping cases as should President-elect Nieto of Mexico. An investment climate should be created where decisions can be made with a long-term view knowing that producing a quality product at a competitive price will be rewarded.  Mexican producers have invested in new technology and claim their vine-ripened tomatoes are superior products.  Their market share in the U.S. winter fresh market has increased from about one-third to one-half over the last 16 years. The three NAFTA countries will never reach their full potential of investment opportunities for producers and savings from lower prices for consumers **until political influence in importing and exporting is further reduced**.  Politicians will continue to intervene as long as political rewards are available.

**Low tariffs on manufacturing is key to manufacturing clusters---those are uniquely key to aerospace**

**Krizner 12**, Ben Krizner writes for World Trade 100, American Manufacturing in Mexico, <http://www.tpslogistics.com/2012/05/26/americanmanufacturingmexico/> MWimsatt

With the economy seemingly in perpetual recovery mode, U.S. companies have moved forward on building new facilities in Mexico to take advantage of NAFTA’s benefits – projects that were delayed because of the recession.

Aside from NAFTA, there are other factors that play into Mexico’s favor when companies contemplate international expansion projects:

•  Companies can manufacture in Mexico and take advantage of the numerous free trade agreements the country has with other nations. (Mexico has more free trade agreements than the United States.)

•  The supply chain from Mexico is shorter, compared with China.

•  The cost of labor is rising in China, making Mexico an attractive destination for international expansion projects.

The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) said in a report last year that wages in Mexico will be significantly lower than in China by 2015. The report noted that Mexican factory workers earned more than four times as much as Chinese workers in 2000. After China’s entry into the World Trade Organization in 2001, maquiladora industrial zones bordering the United States experienced a large loss in manufacturing. By 2010, however, Chinese workers were earning only two-thirds as much as their Mexican counterparts. BCG forecasts that the fully loaded cost of hiring Chinese workers will be 25 percent higher than the cost of using Mexican workers by 2015.

And according to Maquila Reference, a reference guide to the maquiladora industry, manufacturers producing goods for the U.S. market are reconsidering their manufacturing options in China, and looking at Mexico’s dual benefits of low-cost labor and reduced tariffs under various NAFTA clauses.

Companies with manufacturing operations in Mexico have two different logistics strategies. Some companies use established U.S. logistics networks to ship from their Mexico-based plants. “They are piggybacking on their existing logistics infrastructure, plus taking advantage of the low cost of labor and production in Mexico,” Howland says. Other companies are building distribution centers in Mexico, where product can be distributed globally at a lower cost than from the United States. “The property costs (on both sides of the border) are about the same, but labor and environmental costs are lower (in Mexico),” says Steven Zisser, an attorney with San Diego-based Zisser Group, which focuses on Customs law. “There are fewer restrictions on the Mexican side.” An example, according to Zisser, is Plantronics, a manufacturer of audio communications equipment. The company’s worldwide distribution center is located in Tijuana, where it ships product around the world. “The company takes advantage of Mexico’s many free trade agreements,” Zisser says. “It saves millions of dollars in duties.” Most plants are located close to the border in the states of Baja California, Sonora, and Chihuahua. Part of the attraction of the border region is the maquiladora industry, which allows foreign-based manufacturers to import material and equipment on a **duty- and tariff-free basis** for assembly, processing, or manufacturing and then re-export the assembled, processed and/or manufactured products, sometimes back to the raw materials’ country of origin. Because of the short drive to the United States, the logistics infrastructure in the border region isn’t as critical a site location factor as it is in other parts of Mexico, Zisser says. Another factor in siting facilities close to the border is convenience. “Executive teams can cross quickly for the day,” says Zisser, pointing to Toyota, which operates a daily shuttle between its U.S. headquarters in Torrance, Calif., and plant in Tijuana, a two-hour trip. Increasingly, however, companies with an interest in building a facility in Mexico are looking at sites in the interior of the country, especially the region that encompasses Mexico City, Guadalajara, and San Luis Potosi. “Growth in manufacturing and assembly plants is taking place further south,” Howland says. “There is a lot of strength in the interior regions of the country.” Interior state governments and local communities are offering generous incentivepackages to offset the cost of construction, and there is better access to utilities and labor, along with a lower cost for land. “States in the interior region are just as competitive as U.S. states,” Zisser says. Governments are helping to finance the construction of industrial parks in the interior region and upgrade the logistics infrastructure leading to the United States. Companies can find a more stable workforce in the interior region, as compared with the border region, Howland says. One reason is because maquiladora workers along the border tend to move from job to job. Moving cargo into the U.S. Logistically, manufacturers can take advantage of a dedicated intermodal service between Kansas City, Dallas, and several Mexican destinations operated by Kansas City Southern Railroad and Kansas City Southern de Mexico. Kansas City Southern de Mexico operates a rail system of 2,645 track miles, serving Northeast and Central Mexico, and the port cities of Lazaro Cardenas and Tampico. It provides a direct connection between the United States and Mexico’s industrial heartland. The service is the beginning of a key segment within the growing KCS International Intermodal Corridor and an alternative to the more congested Chicago gateway for traffic between Mexico and the Northeast and Midwest U.S. In addition to market competitive transit times and rates, the service allows for a fast and efficient border crossing. From the border crossing in Laredo, Texas, manufacturers can use Interstate 35, which stretches to Duluth, Minnesota, near the Canadian border, and intersects with practically every major east-west interstate. Along I-35, manufacturers can find a group of metropolitan areas in the southern Interior Plains region of the United States, running from San Antonio, Texas, to Kansas City. Each metro area has logistical strengths that companies considering export opportunities in Mexico or a manufacturing facility in Mexico seek. While Mexico attracts a variety of industries, the country’s heavily encourages expansions in the automotive, aerospace, and medical device industries. Automotive: Ford, General Motors, and Toyota have established manufacturing facilities along the border. According to Maquila Reference, Baja California is a “preferred destination for the North American, European, and Asian automakers, with more than 60 foreign automotive companies in the region.” In addition, there are more than 1,100 tier-one automotive suppliers in Mexico, many of which have multiple manufacturing facilities in the country. Eighty percent of vehicles produced in Mexico are exported to the United States, and 11 out of every 100 automobiles sold in the United States are made in Mexico, according to Maquila Reference. Auto production in Mexico is expected to reach 2.4 million units annually by 2014, with a projected growth rate of 5.5 percent per year, while generating 56,000 jobs. Aerospace: According to the Mexican Aerospace Industry Federation, the aerospace sector in Mexico is expected to create 35,000 jobs during the next several years. Currently, more than 190 aerospace companies have operations in Mexico, employing about 190,000 workers. The federal government believes that Mexico can become a producer of planes for international markets within the next decade, according to Geo-Mexico. The city of Querétaro has become the hub of Mexico’s aerospace sector, with several companies choosing it for manufacturing operations. Another company starting production in Querétaro is Eurocopter, a manufacturer of helicopters. The Europe-based conglomerate is investing $550 million to build a facility that will produce components for the aeronautical industry, primarily for export. The components include door structures and tail sections for Airbus and other planes.

**That’s the foundation of airpower and readiness capabilities- key to crisis management and communications**

National Aerospace Week 10 (September 18, “Aerospace and Defense: The Strength to Lift America,” <http://www.nationalaerospaceweek.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/whitepaper.pdf>) National Aerospace Week

The beginning of a new decade presents the defense industry with challenges that aren’t new, but are becoming more urgent. Developing a national strategy to ensure a robust industrial base and modernizing our military hardware must become frontburner priorities. The health of the industrial base is at the heart of our ability to supply our nation with the weapons systems it requires. As we wrote in our landmark study on the industrial base in 2009: “Military technologies used to be much more closely related to civilian technologies. They even used common production processes. But because DOD is today the sole customer for industry’s most advanced capabilities, the defense industrial base is increasingly specialized and separate from the general manufacturing and technology sectors. That means even a healthy general economy will not necessarily help underwrite the industrial capabilities DOD most needs.” A huge step forward was made this year when the industrial base was included in the Quadrennial Defense Review as a factor to be considered in its long-term planning. We’re optimistic that the next step — inclusion of industrial base considerations in program plans and policy — will be executed as directed by the QDR — ensuring that it becomes incorporated into long-range defense plans. However, we remain concerned about the fragility of the supplier base. With another round of acquisitions and consolidations imminent along with a projected decline in defense spending, the supplier base remains particularly vulnerable. These small businesses are critical to the primes and to the government. They face multiple challenges overcoming barriers to federal contracting and once they leave the contracting base, they and their unique skills cannot be recovered. 2010 Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc. 4 Along with our concern about the industrial base is the long-term issue of modernizing our military hardware. The 1980s defense build-up is now 25 years old, and systems acquired then are in need of replacement. The decade of 2010-19 is the crucial time to reset, recapitalize and modernize our military forces. Not only are many of our systems reaching the end of their designed lives, but America’s military forces are using their equipment at many times the programmed rates in the harsh conditions of combat, wearing out equipment prematurely. Delaying modernization will make it even harder to identify and effectively address global threats in the future. The requirements identified in the QDR — for the United States to overmatch potential adversaries and to execute long-duration campaigns in coming years against increasingly capable potential opponents — will require complex and expensive aerospace capabilities. This is a concern that the Defense Department recognizes. Under Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter has said that the department is looking to develop a “family of systems” for future strike options that will be supported by the “family of industry.” 9 This is welcome news. However, defense modernization is not optional. While the fiscal 2011 budget request is a reasonable target that takes into account funding needed to fight two wars, the pressure on the procurement and research and development budget is sure to increase in the future. At the same time, America must adapt its defenses to new kinds of threats. A large-scale attack on information networks could pose a serious economic threat, impeding or preventing commerce conducted electronically. This would affect not only ATM transactions, but commercial and governmental fund transfers and the just-in-time orders on which the manufacturing sector depends. It could even pose threats to American lives, interrupting the transfer of medical data, disrupting power grids, even disabling emergency communications links. In partnership with the government, our industry is on the forefront of securing these networks and combating cyber attack. The American people also demand better security for the U.S. homeland, from gaining control of our borders to more effective law enforcement and disaster response. The aerospace industry provides the tools that help different forces and jurisdictions communicate with each other; monitor critical facilities and unpatrolled borders, and give advance warning of natural disasters, among other capabilities. In many cases, government is the only market for these technologies. Therefore, sound government policy is essential not only to maintain current capabilities, but to ensure that a technology and manufacturing base exists to develop new ones.

**China’s gearing up for expansion---airpower is key to deter regional war**

**Auslin 11**, The Growing Threat from China’s Air Force, Michael Auslin is the director of Japan studies at the American Enterprise Institute and a columnist for WSJ.com, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903461304576526424242918798.html

China watchers have been fixated on the maiden voyage of Beijing's first aircraft carrier this month. However, U.S. and Asian defense planners should take care not to ignore another aspect of China's growing military might. The Chinese Air Force may one day play the most significant role in challenging America's military presence in the Asia-Pacific. At the same time, looming cuts to the U.S. Air Force may wind up reducing its ability to protect American interests. As the U.S. Air Force's National Air and Space Intelligence Center put it in a report last year, the People's Liberation Army Air Force, or Plaaf, has been "transforming itself from a poorly equipped and trained organization into an increasingly capable fighting force. Dramatic changes have occurred, and continue to occur, in the areas of mission, organizational structure, personnel, education, training, and equipment."  Today, the Plaaf remains years behind the U.S. Air Force in experience, training and operational planning. But it is emphasizing those areas in an attempt to catch up. Analysts of China's Air Force warn against focusing solely on the planes it has, or "tail counting." An appreciation of its capabilities instead begins with what it can fly. The leading edge of its air power is the advanced Russian Su-27/30 fighter, of which it has 150 planes, followed by more than 100 indigenously produced J-11s, based on the Su-27 model, and nearly 200 multirole J-10s, which have both air-combat and ground-attack capabilities.  The Su-27/30 compares with any U.S. fighter, save the stealthy F-22, and China plans on adding nearly 100 more related J-11s. Overall, the Plaaf has **more than 1,600 combat aircraft**, which does not count the nearly 300 combat aircraft of the separate PLA Navy air forces. China's Navy, with its own combat air arm, is also flying advanced fighters and has been training its pilots to get ready for carrier operations. The Plaaf is also looking to the next generation of weapons. Earlier this year, it flew the first prototype of a fifth-generation stealth fighter, the J-20, ostentatiously doing so while then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates was on a visit to China to repair military relations. While the J-20 is at least a decade away from being operational, even Mr. Gates was forced to shorten his predictions of when American pilots would face Chinese stealth fighters. As Chinese pilots begin to engage in joint operations, night exercises and longer-range missions from its dozens of bases in coastal regions, the specter of a Chinese air umbrella over eastern Asia begins to look less far-fetched. China has moved beyond simply buying more planes and improving its training. In 2004, it came up with its first specific Plaaf strategy, focusing on "integrated air and space operations, both defensive and offensive." Using cyberwarfare, space assets and quick offensive strikes, the Plaaf is trying to become a high-tech, high-tempo aerospace force.  Not surprisingly, this doctrine is designed to negate the strengths of U.S. air and naval forces in the region, which would be fighting along extended lines, without immediately accessible bases for repair and resupply. China's military leadership, moreover, is building the missile capacity to try to destroy those vulnerable bases in Japan, Guam and elsewhere. All this development may be **emboldening China's Air Force**. This June, two Su-27s chased a U.S. reconnaissance plane flying over the Taiwan Strait. According to press reports, one of the Chinese fighter planes crossed the median line of the Strait, which has served as a de facto border between Chinese and Taiwanese territory for decades.  Earlier this year, Manila complained that Chinese jets flew into Philippine airspace during a dispute over maritime territorial claims in the South China Sea. Not forgotten in either Washington or Beijing is the March 2001 incident in which an aggressive Chinese pilot collided with a U.S. EP-3 reconnaissance plane, killing himself and causing the Americans to crash-land on Hainan Island, where they were held for 11 days. In the face of this Chinese buildup, Washington needs to do more to **maintain its air-power superiority**. In any conflict with China, the U.S. would rely on U.S. air power from the outbreak of hostilities. However, its aging F-15s and F-16s increasingly will be unable to match more modern Chinese counterparts, and even the far superior skills of U.S. pilots can't make up for outdated aircraft.  China's development of a carrier-killer missile means that U.S. naval air power may be pushed farther out into the Pacific. The rash decision to cancel the F-22 means the U.S. is dramatically limited in the numbers of the one aircraft that could assure command of the skies, while the F-35 is becoming increasingly expensive and is still behind development schedule. The Pentagon must resist any temptation to cut the number of F-35s, lest it become permanently outnumbered by Chinese fighters whose pilots will get better and more experienced over time.  Large numbers of Air Force tankers, with escort, will be needed to keep American birds in the fight.

**China is overtaking the U.S. in aerospace power---that causes Asian nuclear war and Taiwan conflict**

**Stokes 10** (Mark, International Conference on A Rising Chinese Hegemony & Challenges to the Region, “ The Dynamic Aerospace Balance in The Asia-pacific Region: Implications for Stability in the Taiwan Strait and Beyond”, http://www.braintrust.tw/download/20100719conference/paper-stokes.pdf)

Largely driven by a Taiwan scenario, China’s capacity to conduct a successful aerospace campaign to swiftly gain a decisive air advantage is surpassing defenses that its neighbors, including Taiwan, Japan, perhaps India, and even U.S. forces operating in the Western Pacific, can field. Among the most significant capabilities that are contributing toward an imbalance are the PLA’s long range precision strike systems, primarily its conventional ballistic and land attack cruise missiles. Perhaps equally important, however, is an evolving sensor network that would be needed to cue strike assets and offer situation awareness around China’s periphery. Another factor is China’s growing ability to defend its strike assets from interdiction on the ground and redundancy in its command and control system. Over time, an expansion of its theater missile infrastructure, conventional air power, and sensor systems could give China a decisive edge in securing control over the skies around its periphery should territorial disputes erupt into conflict. The ability to dominate the airspace over a given geographic domain has the **potential to create instability** should political disagreements flare. The more confident that a country is of military success, the greater the chance that force could be assertively applied in pursuit of political demands. Balance and stability require that no one single power be assured of air superiority. Over the next 15 years, the PRC may be increasingly confident of its ability to dominate the skies around its periphery within a region limited by a persistent surveillance architecture. If confident in its ability to dominate the skies around its periphery, Beijing also could be more assertive in its dealings with others in the region**.** A strategic shift in regional aerospace balance also may increasingly **unravel the fabric of U.S. alliances** and prompt allies and friends to consider weapons of mass destruction and means of delivery as a means of security**.** Addressing these challenges requires maintaining or developing the means to undercut the political and military utility of the PRC's theater missile-centric strategy and striving for a balance that could deter PRC resort to force or other means of coercion. However, alternative approaches could offer initiatives for moderating PLA force postures and address underlying security dilemmas through cooperative threat reduction programs.

**Taiwan war is likely --- it goes nuclear**

**Colby and Denmar, et al 13**, Elbridgc A. Colby. cochair, is a principal analyst and drvison lead for global strategic affairs at the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA). where he focuses on strateg deterrence, nuclear weapons, and related issues. Previously, he served as policy adviser to the secretary of defense’s representative for the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, as an expert adviser to the Congressional Strategic Posture Commission, as a staff member on the President’s Commission on the Intdhgcnce Capa biLities of the US. Regarding WMD. and in a number of other government positions. Mr. Colby also serves or has served as a consultant to a number of U.S government bodies. He publishes and speaks regularly on strategic issues in the United States. Europe, and Asia. Mr. Colby is a graduate of Harvard College and Yale Law School and is a member of the Council on Foreign Rdations (term) and of the International Institute of Strategic Studies Abraham M. Denmark. cochair. is vice president for political and security affairs at the National Bure-au of Asian Research (NBR) and is an Asia-Pacific security adviser at the Center for Naval Analyses. He manages NBR research programs, dialogues, projects, and initiatives reLated to po. litical and security issues in the Asia-Pacific region. He has experience both inside and outside of government, having previously worked as a fellow at the Center for a New American Security and as country director for China affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Deknse. Mr. Denmark holds an MA. in international security from the Josef Korbel Schoel of International Studies at the University of Denver and has studied at China’s Foreign Atfairs University and Peking Universit, Nuclear Weapons and U.S.-China Relations, <http://csis.org/files/publication/130307_Colby_USChinaNuclear_Web.pdf>

Taiwan. **Taiwan remains the single most plausible and dangerous source of tension and conflict between the United States and China**. Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, and the United States maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense. Although the tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated, by rapidly-diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements. Moreover, for the foreseeable future Taiwan is the contingency in which **nuclear weapons would most likely become a major factor**, because the fate of the island is intertwined both with the legitimacy of the **C**hinese **C**ommunist **P**arty and the reliability of U.S. defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.

**Trade solves war---there’s strong statistical and empirical support for our argument**

**Griswold 11** Daniel Griswold is director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute and author of Mad about Trade: Why Main Street America Should Embrace Globalization. “Free Trade and the Global Middle Class,” Hayek Society Journal Vol. 9 [http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/Hayek-Society-Journal-Griswold.pdf Accessed 6/30/12](http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/Hayek-Society-Journal-Griswold.pdf%20Accessed%206/30/12)

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

### 1AC

**Contention 2 is the Freight industry-**

**The tomato price floor will threatens the cross-border supply chain---that destroys 275,000 jobs**

**Jungmeyer 2/1**, Lance Jungmeyer is the President of Save My Tomato!,<http://savemytomato.com/why-is-u-s-commerce-department-threatening-economic-welfare-of-american-workers-businesses-with-an-unfair-policy-on-mexican-tomato-imports/>

Why would the U.S. government deliberately **place at risk more than 275,000 jobs** held by American workers, who are such a critical part of Mexican tomato supply chain on our side of the border? Of the 81 cents not generated after the first point of sale, a full 38.5 cents goes toward U.S. labor, a significant stakeholder in the public interest. This labor is comprised of warehouse workers, such as the thousands employed in the border regions that import Mexican tomatoes, not to mention the laborers at the many repacking operations and wholesalers scattered around the United States. According to the above USDA/ERS calculations, the Mexican tomato supply chain generated$3.64 billion in labor activity in the United States in 2011, after the point of first sale. This equates to 275,000 full-time job equivalents. Why would the U.S. government turn its back on the many businesses that form and support the Mexican tomato supply chain on the U.S. side of the border? This includes not only distributors, truckers, retailers, but also revenues that go to media that run advertising about the tomatoes; businesses that fuel and repair the trucks that take the tomatoes to market; and many other ancillary providers. And they operate in communities across the U.S., communities that benefit from the trade.

**And, it creates a chilling effect that dries up trade with Mexico---that’s catastrophic for the supply chain**

**Malkin 12**, Elisabeth Malkin is a staff writer at the New York Times, 12/24/12, Mexico Finds Unlikely Allies in Trade Fight, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/25/business/global/mexico-finds-some-us-allies-in-trade-dispute.html?ref=northamericanfreetradeagreement>

If the 1996 deal were canceled, importers, distributors and retailers said they suspect that American growers would file a new antidumping complaint against Mexican tomatoes. Under that process, the Commerce Department could impose tariffs on Mexican tomatoes if it determined that the Mexicans were selling below their costs. Even if the department eventually found that the Mexicans were not dumping, a complaint itself would have a **chilling effect** on trade. “All these **other companies involved in the Mexico supply chain stand to lose a good portion of their business if**[**protectionism**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/p/protectionism_trade/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier)**is** put **in place**,” said Lance Jungmeyer, the president of the Fresh Produce Association of the Americas, a trade association of importers and distributors based in Nogales, Ariz.

**Two impacts---first, cross-border freight is key to the freight industry and overall economic stability**

**Adler 12**, Lynn Adler is a staff writer for BBC, U.S. transport companies cash in on Mexican growth, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/12/04/us-usa-transports-mexico-idUSBRE8B307020121204>

(Reuters) - U.S. rail and trucking companies are making big investments on both sides of the border with [Mexico](http://www.reuters.com/places/mexico?lc=int_mb_1001) to **capitalize on booming trade** between the two countries.

Every day, about 10 [Kansas City Southern](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=KSU&lc=int_mb_1001) ([KSU.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=KSU.N)) trains crisscross the border at Laredo, Texas, hauling everything from cars to chemicals - up from about six trains just three years ago. The fourth-largest U.S. publicly traded railroad is leading the charge to take advantage of the swelling freight traffic between the countries as manufacturing booms south of the border because of the rising costs of goods from [China](http://www.reuters.com/places/china) and other exporters.Over the past five years, Kansas City Southern has spent about $300 million to lay roughly 90 miles of new track in Texas, buy and update terminals in [Mexico](http://www.reuters.com/places/mexico?lc=int_mb_1001) and make other network [upgrades](http://www.reuters.com/finance/markets/upgrades?lc=int_mb_1001). The railroad company now generates one-quarter of its revenue moving parts and finished goods across the border. [Union Pacific Corp](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=UNP&lc=int_mb_1001) ([UNP.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=UNP.N)), the No. 1 U.S. railroad company, owns a 26 percent stake in Mexican railway company Ferromex. Like rivals CSX Corp ([CSX.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=CSX.N)) and [Norfolk Southern Corp](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=NSC&lc=int_mb_1001) ([NSC.N](http://www.reuters.com/finance/stocks/overview?symbol=NSC.N)), Union Pacific is partnering with Kansas City Southern to haul carloads in the United States to locations not served by the railroad. As the U.S. economy creaks along, the growing business with Mexico is a cause for cheer: Both Kansas City Southern and Union Pacific are reporting much bigger increases in cross-border shipments than in overall volume. Two areas that are "just exploding" are transporting automobiles into the United States and intermodal shipping - moving goods in containers that are shifted from truck to train or train to ship - said William Galligan, vice president of investor relations at Kansas City Southern. The Kansas City, Missouri-based company, which took full ownership of a Mexican railroad now known as Kansas City Southern de Mexico in 2005, has built the first intermodal network between the countries. Kansas City Southern, which started investing in the Mexican rail company a decade earlier, was betting the North American Free Trade Agreement would significantly alter shipping. Total cross-border freight by train and truck has **surged nearly 35 percent in the past five years, according to U.S. government data**.

**Economic decline causes extinction and turns multilat**

**Merlini 11** (Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

**Second---maintaining low prices is key to the chemical industry---Mexican routes are crucial**

**IL 11**, Inbound Logistics, Chemical Logistics: Smart Strategies for Uncertain Times, <http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/chemical-logistics-smart-strategies-for-uncertain-times/>

This lack of capacity has meant an increase in transportation rates—a concern for chemical shippers who are also dealing with the consequences of surging oil prices.

“Right now, chemical shippers are **reeling from the double whammy** of increased carrier costs driven by a lack of capacity, and the huge increase in fuel surcharges,” says ChemLogix’s Hildebrandt. “They are **scrambling to reduce their costs**.” For many chemical providers, reducing costs may mean switching to different modes of transportation. With crude oil prices hovering at the $100-per-barrel mark, intermodal and rail transportation have been gaining favor among chemical shippers. “Our intermodal business has grown 50 percent in the past 24 months,” says Hildebrandt. “As oil prices go up, companies look at alternate means of shipping to reduce costs. Using intermodal, shippers can get their freight covered at a lower cost.” Rail and ocean options are also helping chemical shippers reduce costs. CG Railway, for example, offers a cost-effective alternate transportation mode for chemical producers shipping goods to and from Mexico. The shortline railroad, a subsidiary of International Shipholding Corporation, provides a rail-ferry service that transports railcars to and from Mobile, Ala., and the chemical industry-heavy port city of Coatzacoalcos in Mexico. The service provides cost-effective solutions in several ways. “Our route is 900 miles by sea, as opposed to more than 1,400 miles from the eastern United States to southern Mexico via the traditional Mexican-U.S. border crossings,” says George Nahas, vice president of sales and marketing for CG Railway. “Also, the frequency and consistency of our service allows companies to better manage inventory levels and reduce costs.”

**Extinction**

**Baum 99** (Rudy M., C&EN Washington, Chemical and Engineering News, Millennium Special Report, 12-6, [http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html](http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/cenear/991206/7749spintro2.html" \t "_blank))

But I know this, too: Science and technology have brought us to where we are, and only science and technology, coupled with innovative social and economic thinking, can take us to where we need to be in the coming millennium. Chemists, chemistry, and the chemical industry—what we at C&EN call the chemical enterprise—will play **central role**s in addressing these challenges. The first section of this Special Report is a series called "Millennial Musings" in which a wide variety of representatives from the chemical enterprise share their thoughts about the future of our science and industry. The five essays that follow explore the contributions the chemical enterprise is making right now to ensure that we will successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century. The essays do not attempt to predict the future. Taken as a whole, they do not pretend to be a comprehensive examination of the efforts of our science and our industry to tackle the challenges I've outlined above. Rather, they paint, in broad brush strokes, a portrait of scientists, engineers, and business managers struggling to make a vital contribution to **humanity's future**. The first essay, by Senior Editor Marc S. Reisch, is a case study of the chemical industry's ongoing transformation to sustainable production. Although it is not well known to the general public, the chemical industry is at the forefront of corporate efforts to reduce waste from production streams to zero. Industry giants DuPont and Dow Chemical are taking major strides worldwide to manufacture chemicals while minimizing the environmental "footprint" of their facilities. This is an ethic that starts at the top of corporate structure. Indeed, Reisch quotes Dow President and Chief Executive Officer William S. Stavropolous: "We must integrate elements that historically have been seen as at odds with one another: the triple bottom line of sustainability—economic and social and environmental needs." DuPont Chairman and CEO Charles (Chad) O. Holliday envisions a future in which "biological processes use renewable resources as feedstocks, use solar energy to drive growth, absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, use low-temperature and low-pressure processes, and produce waste that is less toxic." But sustainability is more than just a philosophy at these two chemical companies. Reisch describes ongoing Dow and DuPont initiatives that are making sustainability a reality at Dow facilities in Michigan and Germany and at DuPont's massive plant site near Richmond, Va. Another manifestation of the chemical industry's evolution is its embrace of life sciences. Genetic engineering is a revolutionary technology. In the 1970s, research advances fundamentally shifted our perception of DNA. While it had always been clear that deoxyribonucleic acid was a chemical, it was not a chemical that could be manipulated like other chemicals—clipped precisely, altered, stitched back together again into a functioning molecule. Recombinant DNA techniques began the transformation of DNA into just such a chemical, and the reverberations of that change are likely to be felt well into the next century. Genetic engineering has entered the fabric of modern science and technology. It is one of the basic tools chemists and biologists use to understand life at the molecular level. It provides new avenues to pharmaceuticals and new approaches to treat disease. It expands enormously agronomists' ability to introduce traits into crops, a capability seized on by numerous chemical companies. There is no doubt that this powerful new tool will play a major role in feeding the world's population in the coming century, but its adoption has hit some bumps in the road. In the second essay, Editor-at-Large Michael Heylin examines how the promise of agricultural biotechnology has gotten tangled up in real public fear of genetic manipulation and corporate control over food. The third essay, by Senior Editor Mairin B. Brennan, looks at chemists embarking on what is perhaps the greatest intellectual quest in the history of science—humans' attempt to understand the detailed chemistry of the human brain, and with it, human consciousness. While this quest is, at one level, basic research at its most pure, it also has enormous practical significance. Brennan focuses on one such practical aspect: the effort to understand neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease that predominantly plague older humans and are likely to become increasingly difficult public health problems among an aging population. Science and technology are always two-edged swords. They bestow the power to create and the power to destroy. In addition to its enormous potential for health and agriculture, genetic engineering conceivably could be used to create horrific biological warfare agents. In the fourth essay of this Millennium Special Report, Senior Correspondent Lois R. Ember examines the challenge of developing methods to counter the threat of such biological weapons. "Science and technology will eventually produce sensors able to detect the presence or release of biological agents, or devices that aid in forecasting, remediating, and ameliorating bioattacks," Ember writes. Finally, Contributing Editor Wil Lepkowski discusses the most mundane, the most marvelous, and the most essential molecule on Earth, H2O. Providing clean water to Earth's population is already difficult—and tragically, not always accomplished. Lepkowski looks in depth at the situation in Bangladesh—where a well-meaning UN program to deliver clean water from wells has poisoned millions with arsenic. Chemists are working to develop better ways to detect arsenic in drinking water at meaningful concentrations and ways to remove it that will work in a poor, developing country. And he explores the evolving water management philosophy, and the science that underpins it, that will be needed to provide adequate water for all its vital uses. In the past two centuries, our science has transformed the world. Chemistry is a wondrous tool that has allowed us to understand the structure of matter and gives us the ability to manipulate that structure to suit our own purposes. It allows us to dissect the molecules of life to see what makes them, and us, tick. It is providing a glimpse into workings of what may be the most complex structure in the universe, the human brain, and with it hints about what constitutes consciousness. In the coming decades, we will use chemistry to delve ever deeper into these mysteries and provide for humanity's basic and not-so-basic needs.