### Contention One is Disposability

#### Currently, untold numbers of Mexican men, women, and children are being unfairly imprisoned by human traffickers along the border—a bilateral partnership is critical

**Garza, 11** (Rocio, Candidate for Juris Doctor, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, May 2011; A.B. (2005) Harvard University, CARDOZO J. OF INT’L & COMP. LAW, March, www.cjicl.com/uploads/2/9/5/9/2959791/cjicl\_19.2\_garza\_note.pdf‎)

On any given day, a Mexican woman will be promised a good paying job as a nanny or waitress in the United States. A Mexican man will be promised employment as a waiter or construction worker. They will be told that they will earn enough money to send back to their families in Mexico. Given that, for many years, undocumented immigrants have been working in the United States and sending money to their families in Mexico, this will be an enticing and believable job offer. Having limited economic resources in their home country and perhaps a lack of formal education, they will take the risk and pay a coyote to transport them to the United States. They will leave behind their families and all that they know for a chance at the elusive American Dream. Their immigration stories are all too common. Many people will arrive in the United States to find jobs in the agriculture, restaurant, construction, and housekeeping industries, joining countless other undocumented immigrants. They will live in the shadows across the United States. Others, however, will be less fortunate. When they arrive in the United States, many people will be told their transportation fees have increased and will be hard-pressed into forced labor or forced prostitution to repay their debts. They may even be coerced into signing “labor contracts,” stipulating wage deductions for food and shelter. They will likely not know how much they owe and the money they earn will go directly to their captors. What begins as a smuggling operation can quickly turn into the heinous crime of human trafficking. 1 Human trafficking is the exploitation of people primarily for labor or sex using force, coercion or fraud. 2 It dehumanizes victims by treating them as commodities3 and by subjecting them to dreadful living conditions.4 Traffickers may recruit, transport, or harbor victims using force, threat, or fraud for the purpose of sexual exploitation, forced labor, or other similar practices.5 Men, women, and children can all be victims of human trafficking. Described as “a modern-day form of slavery,”6 human trafficking manifests itself in a number of forms.7 As of June 2010, the United Nations estimated that “there are at least 12.3 million adults and children in forced labor, bonded labor, and commercial sexual servitude at any given time.”8 However, due to the clandestine nature of human trafficking,9 the exact number of victims is unknown with estimates ranging from four million to twenty-seven million.10 Human trafficking is not a new phenomenon, 11 but no one knows how long it has been in existence. In the last decade, since 2000, governments around the world began to acknowledge the prevalence of human trafficking, its destructive impact on victims, and the need to eradicate it.12 People tend to disassociate themselves from human trafficking, thinking it does not happen within their communities.13 However, in actuality, trafficking touches almost all countries in one way or another.14 A combination of internal motivating factors and external factors make the exploitation of people possible.15 Some of the factors that motivate traffickers to exploit people and make victims vulnerable to exploitation include poverty, lack of economic opportunities, lack of education, lack of information about legal immigration, and social conflicts within countries.16 Among others, external factors include gender discrimination, weak border controls, absence of legislation to address immigration and trafficking, government corruption, and demand for cheap labor and sexual services in receiving countries of human trafficking victims. 17 Enacting anti-trafficking laws is one of the first steps a country must take to prosecute traffickers, protect victims, and prevent trafficking. 18 To date, more than half of all countries have enacted laws prohibiting human trafficking in all its forms,19 yet the problem persists. Although outlawing human trafficking is a positive development, prosecution, protection, and prevention do not immediately follow. Given the complex factors under which human trafficking flourishes,20 more than enacting anti-trafficking legislation is needed to curb these despicable acts.21 The United States enacted federal legislation, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), criminalizing trafficking in persons. 22 The TVPA may be utilized to protect victims of “severe forms of trafficking” and to prosecute traffickers.23 A person subjected to forced labor or sexual exploitation, as in the situations described above of the victims who fall into the hands of traffickers, may be able to press charges against their traffickers and get legal protection.24 Similarly, in 2007, Mexico enacted the Law to Prevent and Punish Trafficking in Persons (Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law). However, access to the TVPA is contingent on the victim seeking help or being rescued. Given that victims are usually undocumented, fear being deported, and are intimidated with violence, the chances that the TVPA reaches intended victims is often slim. Similarly, in 2007, Mexico enacted the Law to Prevent and Punish Trafficking in Persons (Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law).25 Despite enacting anti-trafficking legislation, Mexico is not yet in compliance with the United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children (UN Protocol), 26 which sets out the international legal framework to eradicate human trafficking.27 The UN Protocol is a supplement to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.28 Although the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law29 surpasses the minimum requirements for incarceration of traffickers outlined in the UN Protocol, Mexico has failed to adequately implement the law.30 As of June 2009, there had been no convictions under this federal law.31 In December 2009, however, a Mexican federal judge achieved the first conviction under the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law in a case involving six trafficking offenders.32 With only one successful prosecution, Mexico continues to be a transit, origin and destination country for human trafficking victims.33 The porous United States-Mexico border continues to be a significant point of entry for human trafficking victims 34 that are beyond the reach of the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law and unlikely to benefit from the TVPA. Along the approximately 2,000-mile division, the challenges of eradicating human trafficking are manifold.35 One of these challenges is determining whose responsibility it is to remedy the human trafficking situation. Should the United States expend more resources saving victims and incarcerating traffickers within its borders? Is it Mexico’s responsibility to warn its citizens and keep them safe from traffickers? Should it matter that what makes victims vulnerable to traffickers is their basic human instinct to do better for themselves and their progeny by seeking better economic opportunities? Human trafficking transcends boundaries and so must its solution. The United States and Mexico are both deeply affected and inextricably linked by human trafficking due to their history and extensive shared geographic border. Hence, a solution for addressing human trafficking must take into consideration both countries’ interests through a bilateral partnership.

#### Mexican sex trafficking has consigned almost 70,000 minors to living hell—the problem is spreading

**Alis and Romo, 5/17** (Krupskaia Alis and Rafael Romo, CNN, 5/17/13, “Mexican sex traffickers moving into U.S.”, <http://thecnnfreedomproject.blogs.cnn.com/2013/05/17/mexican-sex-traffickers-moving-into-u-s)//EM>

Joanna moves her hands nervously as she speaks. Her oversized, golden earrings rattle as she shakes her head to make a point. Joanna is not her real name. She's speaking on the condition that CNN will protect her privacy and not disclose her real name. **She's only 16 years old, but has already experienced a lifetime of horror, abuse and torture**. She's a former sex slave. It all started when she met a charming man. "I was in a normal relationship with him for three months," she says. At the time she was only 14 years old. She was treated like royalty and fell in love. A few months later he asked her to elope and she agreed. "He promised that we would get a house and that we would raise children. I was naïve and believed everything he said. We started living together in July and by September he was already forcing me to work as a prostitute," Joanna said. By then it had become painfully clear that Joanna's boyfriend was in reality her captor, a pimp who preyed on young, vulnerable teenagers whom he recruited in central Mexico with the purpose of forcing them into prostitution. Joanna says she was forced to have sex with dozens of men for as many as 18 hours a day. There were days, she says, she would only sleep a couple of hours before starting another long and painful shift, sleeping with strangers who paid only a few dollars to be with her 15 minutes. The worst part was that if she failed to make at least $600 a day, she faced severe punishment. "He hit me many times with a phone cable. He would hit me in the legs and hands. One time he started beating me with a broomstick. **He beat me so hard that I couldn't even get up afterwards**," Joanna said. According to the Mexico City Human Rights Commission, **as many as 70,000 minors in Mexico are victims of human trafficking**. Most of them are subjected to forced labor, but a significant number are forced into prostitution, as in the case of Joanna. Over the last decade, the problem has crossed the U.S. border. The arrests of 13 people in New York state in late April suggests pimps are also fond of getting cash, not only in Mexican pesos, but also in U.S. dollars. According to authorities, the suspects worked a "sex trafficking corridor," transporting women from the small town of Tenancingo, in the central Mexican state of Tlaxcala, to the New York area. Over a period of seven years, federal officials say, dozens of women were exploited; some of them were illegally transported from Mexico. Once in the United States, they were forced to have sex with as many as 30 customers per day, according to the federal complaint charging all 13 suspects. Victims were paid $30 to $35, the complaint says. Their driver would keep half. The other half went to the pimp, and the victims were left with nothing. Manhattan U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara said the defendants blatantly lied to their victims in order to recruit them. "With promises of a better life, the members of this alleged sex trafficking and prostitution ring lured their unsuspecting victims to the United States and then **consigned them to a living hell** - forcing them to become sex slaves living in abhorrent conditions, and using threats, verbal abuse, and violence – sexual and otherwise – when they resisted and even sometimes when they didn't," Bharara said. The complaint describes how one victim was smuggled into the United States with her young child. Once in New York, she was made to sleep on the floor with the child. But that was just the beginning of her ordeal. On one occasion, when the woman refused to work as a prostitute, she and her child were forced to stay outside on a cold winter night. Federal agents conducted raids at six locations, including four brothels in Yonkers, Poughkeepsie, Newburgh, and Queens. If convicted, the suspects face anywhere from two years in prison to life. Humberto Padgett is a Mexican journalist who wrote a book titled "Intimate Portrait of a Pimp." Based on years of research and interviews with victims and pimps, the book describes how Mexican pimps operate and how they exploit their victims. Padgett says trafficking young women in Mexico has increased faster than drug trafficking in recent years. "You can only sell a kilo of marijuana once. But you can sell a woman multiple times, even as many as 60 times per day. In five years, a woman can make as much as a million dollars for her pimp," Padgett says. Last year, Mexico approved a law that makes human trafficking a federal crime punishable by up to 40 years in prison. The law targets not only those involved in sex trafficking, but also other forms of modern slavery, including forced labor and child pornography. Padgett says pimps force women to stay with them by threatening to kill family members if they escape. Maria, another former sex slave who asked that her real name not be used, lost her father six months after escaping her pimp. The now-17-year-old believes the prostitution ring that held her is responsible for his murder. "More than anything, I feel guilty about my father's death. Sometimes I think that I should've stayed with the pimp so that he would kill me and not my father," Maria says. She's back with her family, but still suffers from depression and nightmares associated with the verbal and physical abuse to which she was subjected. **"There's no way I'm ever going to feel better," she says. "They destroyed my life."**

#### Mexico key – they’re a global hotspot for sex trafficking

Department of State, 13 (U.S. Department of State, 2013, “Trafficking in Persons Report 2013” <http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2013/index.htm)//EM>

Mexico is a large source, transit, and destination country for men, women, and children subjected to sex trafficking and forced labor. Groups considered most vulnerable to human trafficking in Mexico include women, children, indigenous persons, persons with mental and physical disabilities, as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth, and undocumented migrants. Mexican women and children are exploited in sex trafficking within Mexico and the United States, lured by fraudulent employment opportunities, deceptive offers of romantic relationships, or extortion, including through the retention of identification documents or threats to notify immigration officials. Mexican men, women, and children also are exploited in forced labor in agriculture, domestic service, manufacturing, construction, in the informal economy, and in forced street begging in both the United States and Mexico. Staff at some substance addiction rehabilitation centers and women’s shelters have subjected residents to forced labor and forced prostitution. The vast majority of foreign victims in forced labor and sexual servitude in Mexico are from Central and South America, particularly Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador; many of these victims are exploited along Mexico’s southern border. Trafficking victims from the Caribbean, eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa have also been identified in Mexico, some en route to the United States. Organized criminal groups coerced children and migrants into prostitution and work as hit men, lookouts, and in the production, transportation, and sale of drugs. There were also reports during the year of criminal groups using forced labor in coal mines and kidnapping professionals, including architects and engineers, for forced labor. Child sex tourism persisted in Mexico, especially in tourist areas such as Acapulco, Puerto Vallarta, and Cancun and in northern border cities like Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez. Many child sex tourists are from the United States, Canada, and western Europe, though some are Mexican citizens. In some parts of the country, threats of violence from criminal organizations impede the ability of the government and civil society to combat trafficking effectively. The Government of Mexico does not fully comply with the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; however, it is making significant efforts to do so. During the year, authorities approved a new national anti-trafficking law and increased convictions of trafficking offenders at the state level. Some states strengthened their anti-trafficking law enforcement capacity, and the government maintained varied training efforts at the national and local level. Specialized victim services and shelters remained inadequate, however, and victim identification and interagency coordination remained uneven. There was no centralized data on victim identification or law enforcement efforts, efforts against forced labor continued to be relatively weak, and official complicity continued to be a serious problem.

#### This modern form of slavery affects millions of oppressed persons worldwide—we need to act both via legislation and through our speech-act

**Shahinian, 13** – Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Slavery, United Nations (Gulnara, April 26, 2013, “Slavery must be recognised in all its guises,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2013/apr/26/slavery-recognised-all-guises)//DH

¶ Five years ago, I became the UN's first special rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery. Since then, I have been asked time and again by government officials, businesspeople and NGOs not to use the word "slavery" at all. I have been asked to change the name of my mandate and not speak out about what I have seen. They have asked me to use other words instead – ones that don't carry the same meanings or implications. Yet what other word describes people who have been beaten mercilessly, shut indoors, made to work without pay, sexually abused, poorly fed and threatened with more abuse against themselves and their family if they attempt to leave? This is not just violence or exploitation. What describes the situation in which a mother has no right over her child, or a father is forced to put down his own life – and those of his family – as collateral, working for nothing to try to repay a debt that will never go away? These are the forms of slavery that exist today.¶ ¶ Millions of people live in some form of enslavement. The exact numbers are impossible to calculate. Modern slavery is one of the most powerful criminal industries (pdf), and it is because of our collective silence and refusal to acknowledge its existence that it thrives and transforms itself into new forms year after year. By not speaking out, we are helping to perpetuate an industry that strips millions of their humanity and rights.¶ ¶ Slavery did not end when it was legally abolished. Instead, it is flourishing, extending its tentacles into every corner of the planet. ¶ This is something that touches all our lives. It is almost impossible not to be complicit. How many of us ask ourselves who makes biofuels, jewellery, vegetables, fruit, clothes, shoes and even carpets? We all enjoy the cheap fruits of enslavement, while telling ourselves that exploitation happens "over there" and is nothing to do with our own country or community. ¶ Sex trafficking is finally starting to receive visibility as the horrendous human rights abuse it is. Yet more widespread forms of slavery and trafficking continue to go unreported and ignored. ¶ I have spent the past five years talking to people in forced labour, domestic servitude, bonded labour, servile marriages and child slavery. These forms of slavery remain invisible, since people are silenced by discrimination, fear of retaliation and lack of awareness. These modern forms of human slavery and criminal acts are often excused as tradition, culture, religion or poverty, or dismissed as nothing more than bad labour practices.¶ ¶ The slavery industry relies on the invisibility of those it preys on. Those trapped are not visibly shackled, but they do live their lives under the control of others. ¶ For the world to tackle slavery effectively, we need to recognise this industry in people in all of its manifestations. Human rights are equal and inalienable. I have met organisations working on ending forced marriage, or on the abuse and exploitation of domestic workers and children, who feel they are unable to call these abuses slavery as the word is too loaded and they would put their work at risk. This must stop. Slavery is slavery, no matter what form it takes.¶ ¶ We must face up to all forms of slavery or inadvertently ignore the plight of millions. One type of slavery, such as sex trafficking, cannot be considered more worth fighting for than another. We have a collective responsibility to end this pernicious and persistent problem.¶ ¶ All countries must ensure that they have national legislation prohibiting and criminalising all forms of slavery, and this legislation must be properly enforced. The failure of justice systems to put anti-slavery laws into action is one of the props the slavery industry relies upon. This needs to change.¶ ¶ To combat slavery, we need to speak for people who have been silenced by this most brutal of trades. We must stop being complacent, and find the courage to hold individuals, companies and governments accountable. Complacency is no longer an option.

#### Trafficking operates through a dominant conception of Otherness that sees victims as unimportant, which perpetuates exploitation. Only through rejecting this understanding can we open up space for effective politics that combat this violence

**Todres 9** – Professor of Law at Georgia State University (Jonathan, “Law, Otherness, and Human Trafficking”, July 2009, Accessed via Project MUSE)//SG

The recent surge in interest in ending human trafficking has led even Hollywood to take up the cause. Hollywood’s foray into this area evidences the problem with the dominant discourse on human trafficking. In 2005, Lifetime Television aired the first major commercial film on the issue, Human Trafficking, starring Mira Sorvinoand Donald Southerland. The film was praised for bringing this horrific practice into stark daylight. The film’s portrayal of the issue, however, received little examination; in the film, all of the victims were white girls, except one (a Filipina girl), and all were abducted except one who was sold by her family—the only non-white girl. This portrayal overlooked important realities of human trafficking, including the fact that globally the majority of exploited girls and boys are not white, while reinforcing stereotypes that “other” cultures value children less and thus will sell their children while white Western families must be victims. I submit that these portrayals reflect much deeper held societal views that inform the prevailing understanding of and responses to the problem of human trafficking. Specifically, I suggest that “otherness” is a root cause of both inaction and the selective nature of responses to the abusive practice of human trafficking. Otherness with its attendant devaluation of the Other, facilitates the abuse and exploitation of particular individuals. Otherness operates across multiple dimensions to reinforce a conception of a virtuous “Self” and a lesser “Other.” In turn, the Self/Other dichotomy shapes the phenomenon of human trafficking, driving demand for trafficked persons, influencing perceptions of the problem, and constraining legal initiatives to end the practice. Thus, for example, otherness leads men in Western, industrialized countries to rationalize their exploitation of women and children in poorer countries. It also causes Western leaders to overlook the extent to which human trafficking related abuses occur within their own borders at the hands of their own citizens. Similarly, otherness operates in developing countries to permit the exploitation of particular populations. Ultimately, appreciating the true nature of the problem of human trafficking and its root causes will require overcoming deep-seated beliefs of the lesser value of “others” and acknowledging a truer picture of the Self and the role that the Self, or dominant group, plays not only in helping others but also in the exploitation of particular populations. Exposing and understanding dominant conceptions of the “other” is a necessary step in both generating the political will to eliminate human trafficking and developing effective measures to combat the practice. To successfully combat human trafficking, it is also essential to recognize and acknowledge all facets of the Self including its responsibility in fostering or tolerating the conditions under which the Other can be exploited.

#### Human trafficking is a cultural expression that sees bodies as expendable. This is new age slavery that not only attempts to profit off of the body, but also break it down, which is the worst form of dehumanization. This must be rejected

**Truong, 1** – PhD in International Studios, Associate Professor at the International Institute of Social Studies, (Thahn-Dam, “Human Trafficking and Organised Crime”, July 2001, <http://repub.eur.nl/res/pub/19084/wp339.pdf>, pgs. 13-14)//SG

Domination through the new forms of cultural expression of desire, be it in sex or health reflects the cruel nature of human greed as well as the absurdity of moral systems in late capitalist-patriarchy. Data on the sex trade suggest that the majority of clients purchasing children’s sexuality in the Third World are males from the West, East Asian countries, Australia and the Middle East. These countries have produced different kinds of economic miracles, known as the miracle of post-war reconstruction, miracle of catching-up, oil-driven miracle. Sinisterly, they also produce new forms of cultural expression of desire that are being ‘socially dumped’ on young people that may or may not be their fellow citizens. The mismatch between supply and demand of organs has existed for many years since transplanting technology and practices became institutionalised in health systems in the U.S.A. and Western Europe. While Xenotransplant research has yielded some results, its development and application is not quick enough to deal with the pressure of shortage. Within the health system, norms of allocation of organs for transplant are fraught with inequality whereby the majority of beneficiaries are middle-class adult men10. Fairness in organ allocation has become one of the most contentious public policy issues in addition to fairness in procurement. The health miracle may benefit a few people who can financially afford them. It also carries hidden social prices to be borne by others. In many ways, the intensification of violence in the trade in human bodies and body parts may be considered as being worse than slavery. The slave was valued for his/her labouring capacity, which implied that his/her body must be maintained. Mutilation could occur, but only for the purpose of discipline and punishment. By contrast, modern marketing of human bodies and body parts is more based on rapid cash earnings. Earnings through the manipulation of adult sexual desire by way of eroticising innocence can lead to the injection of hormones and drugs in the child’s body to transform appearance and behavior. These practices can become regular as long as earnings prevail. Earnings through the manipulation of pity and charity can lead to the mutilation of the child’s body to enhance misery for purposes of gains from donation. Assault on the body in these cases goes beyond discipline and punishment. It has economic purposes and hence its logic can shift from maintenance to disposal, as and when the commercial function of the human beings concerned no longer exists. To sum up this section, a similarity may be noted between the trade in human bodies and body parts and previous forms of slavery. This lies in the connection with production systems, despite the changing ideological structures. The imaginary of slavery has expanded from labouring power to other utility roles of the human body. This expansion is facilitated by an ongoing cultural decomposition of the human being, through a gradual removal of its spirit, personhood, and vitality, down to bare body parts. The implication of this decomposition is the emergence of a culture of disposal, i.e. as some human beings reach a ‘marginal’ level of social utility they can be disposed of. Seen through this angle, the issue of moral responsibility no longer rests exclusively on the negligent or greedy parents or guardians, the ‘loose’ woman who voluntarily opts for sex work as an alternative, or the unscrupulous criminal traders in human bodies and body parts. It also rests on those who socialise consumption in conspicuous ways, be it in the subjective field of sexual desire, or health. The ongoing cultural transformation that codifies the body in a causal manner and facilitates a proliferation of forms of domination must be recognized. The moral contradiction in this transformation emerges from the practices of different professional communities. When it comes to human bodies, the medical community can now make an organ of an animal compatible to a human body. When it comes to human social identity, the legal community must treat human migrants as alien entities. While different biological organisms can be made compatible, social organisms cannot, reflecting the lack of uniformity in the modes of cognition and re-cognition of what constitutes humanity today.

#### Dehumanization makes every impact inevitable—it is the equivalent of nuclear war, environmental collapse, and genocide

**Berube,** **97** – professor of speech communication, (David, Nanotechnology Magazine, June/July 1997, <http://www.cla.sc.edu/ENGL/faculty/berube/prolong.htm>)

Assuming we are able to predict who or what are optimized humans, this entire resultant worldview smacks of eugenics and Nazi racial science. This would involve valuing people as means. Moreover, there would always be a superhuman more super than the current ones, humans would never be able to escape their treatment as means to an always further and distant end. This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matson's treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn: "its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record -- and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.... Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's next of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. **Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and** international **genocide**. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon.

#### The politics of disposability leaves entire populations open to eradication – this ignorance of human dignity has become politicized, and will ultimately be the death of politics

**Giroux 10** – Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State (Henry, “Memories of Hope in the Age of Disposability”, published 9/28/2010, <http://archive.truthout.org/memories-hope-age-disposability63631>) //SG

The new culture of cruelty combines with the arrogance of the rich as morally bankrupt politicians such as Mike Huckabee tell his fellow Republican extremists that the provision in Obama's health care bill that requires insurance companies to cover people with pre-existing conditions should be repealed because people who have these conditions are like houses that have already burned down. The metaphor is apt in a country that no longer has a language for compassion, justice and social responsibility. Huckabee at least is honest about one thing. He makes clear that the right-wing fringe leading the Republican Party is on a death march and has no trouble endorsing policies in which millions of people - in this case those afflicted by illness - can simply "dig their own graves and lie down in them."[(7)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#7.) The politics of disposability ruthlessly puts money and profits ahead of human needs. Under the rubric of austerity, the new barbarians such as Huckabee now advocate eugenicist policies in which people who are considered weak, sick, disabled or suffering from debilitating health conditions are targeted to be weeded out, removed from the body politic and social safety nets that any decent society puts into place to ensure that everyone, but especially the most disadvantaged, can access decent health care and lead a life with dignity. Consequently, politics loses its democratic character along with any sense of responsibility and becomes part of a machinery of violence that mimics the fascistic policies of past authoritarian political parties that eagerly attempted to purify their societies by getting rid of those human beings considered weak and inferior and whom they ultimately viewed as human waste. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that a lunatic fringe of a major political party is shamelessly mimicking and nourishing the barbaric roots of one of the most evil periods in human history. By arguing that individuals with pre-existing health conditions are like burned-down houses who do not deserve health insurance, Huckabee puts into place those forces and ideologies that allow the country to move closer to the end point of such logic by suggesting that such disposable populations do not deserve to live at all.¶ Welcome to the new era of disposability in which market-driven values peddle policies that promote massive amounts of human suffering and death for millions of human beings. Programs to help the elderly, middle aged and young people overcome poverty, get decent jobs, obtain access to health insurance and decent health care and exercise their dignity and rights as American citizens are denounced in the name of austerity measures that only apply to those who are not rich and powerful.[(8)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#8.) At the same time, the new disposability discourse expunges any sense of responsibility from both the body politic and the ever-expanding armies of well-paid, anti-public intellectuals and politicians who fill the air waves with poisonous lies, stupidity and ignorance, all in the name of so-called "common sense" and a pathological notion of freedom stripped of any concern for the lives and misfortunes of others. In the age of disposability, the dream of getting ahead has been replaced with, for many people, the struggle to simply stay alive. The logic of disposability and mean-spirited cruelty that now come out of the mouths of zombie-like politicians are more fitting for the authoritarian regimes that emerged in Russia and Germany in the 1930s rather than for any society that calls itself a democracy. A politics of uncertainty, insecurity, deregulation and fear now circulates throughout the country as those marginalized by class and color become bearers of unwanted memories, subject to state-sanctioned acts of violence and rough justice. Poor minority youth, immigrants and other disposable populations now become the flash point that collapses moral and political taxonomies in the face of a growing punishing state. Instead of becoming the last option, violence and punishment have become the standard response to confronting the problems of the poor, disadvantaged and jobless. As Judith Butler points out, those considered "other" and disposable are viewed as "neither alive nor dead, but interminable spectral human beings no longer regarded as human.[(9)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#9.) Thinking about visions of the good society is now considered a waste of time. As Zygmunt Bauman points out, too many young people and adults¶ are now pushed and pulled to seek and find individual solutions to socially created problems and implement those solutions individually using individual skills and resources. This ideology proclaims the futility (indeed, counterproductivity) of solidarity: of joining forces and subordinating individual actions to a "common cause." It derides the principle of communal responsibility for the well-being of its members, decrying it as a recipe for a debilitating "nanny state" and warning against care for the other leading to an abhorrent and detestable "dependency."[(10)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#10.)¶ Tea Party candidates express anger over government programs, but say nothing about a government that provides tax breaks for the rich, allows politicians to be bought off by powerful lobbyists, contracts out government functions to private industries and guts almost every major public sphere necessary for sustaining an increasingly faltering democracy. Tea Party members are outraged, but their anger is really directed at the New Deal, the social state and all those others whom they believe do not qualify as "real" Americans.[(11)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#11.) At the same time the American public is awash in a craven and vacuous media machine that routinely tells us that people are angry, but offers no analysis capable of treating such anger as symptomatic of an economic system that creates massive inequalities, rewards the ultra rich and powerful and punishes everybody else. Bob Herbert has recently argued that the rich and powerful are indifferent to poor people and, of course, he is right, but only partly so.[(12)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#12.) In actuality, it is much worse. Today's young people and others caught in webs of poverty and despair face not only the indifference of the rich and powerful, but also the scorn of the very people charged with preserving, protecting and defending their rights. We now live in a country in which the government allows entire populations and groups to be perceived and treated as disposable, reduced to fodder for the neoliberal waste management industries created by a market-driven society in which gross inequalities and massive human suffering are its most obvious byproducts.[(13)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#13.) The anger among the American people is more than justified by the suffering many people are now experiencing, but an understanding of such anger is stifled largely by right-wing organizations and rich corporate zombies who want to preserve the nefarious conditions that produced such anger in the first place. The result is an egregious politics of disconnection, not to mention a fraudulent campaign of lies and innuendos funded by shadowy, ultra right billionaires such as the Koch brothers,[(14)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#14.)the loss of historical memory amply supported in dominant media such as Fox News and a massively funded depoliticizing cultural apparatus, all of which help to pave the way for the new barbarism and its increasing registers of cruelty, inequality, punishment and authoritarianism.¶ This is a politics that dare not speak its name - a politics wedded to inequity, exclusion and disposability and beholden to what Richard Hofstadter once called the "paranoid style in American politics."[(15)](http://www.truth-out.org/archive/item/91994:memories-of-hope-in-the-age-of-disposability#15.) Driven largely by a handful of right-wing billionaires such as Rupert Murdoch, David and Charles Koch and Sal Russo, this is a stealth politics masquerading as a grassroots movement. Determined to maintain corporate power and the benefits it accrues for the few as a result of vast network of political, social and economic inequalities it reproduces among the many, this is a politics wedded at the hip to an irrational mode of capitalism that undermines any vestige of democracy. At the heart of the new barbarian politics is the drive for unchecked amounts of power and profits in spite of the fact that this brand of take-no-prisoners politics is largely responsible for both the economic recession and producing a society that is increasing becoming politically dysfunctional and ethically unhinged. It is a fringe politics whose funding sources hide in the shadows careful not to disclose the identities of the right-wing billionaire fanatics eager to finance ultra-conservative groups such as the Tea Party movement. While some Republicans seem embarrassed by the fact that the likes of Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh and Sarah Palin have taken over their party, most of its members still seem willing to embrace wholeheartedly the politics of inequality, exclusion and disposability that lies at the heart of an organized death-march aimed at destroying every public sphere essential to a vibrant democratic state.

#### Structural violence outweighs all of your magnitude claims

Hintjens 7 – Lecturer in the Centre for Development Studies, University of Wales, (Helen, “MDF Understanding Development Better”)

From Johan Galtung, famous Norwegian peace ‘guru’, still alive and heads up TRANSCEND University on-line, has been working since 1960s on showing that violence is not OK. His Ghandian approach is designed to convince those who advocate violent means to restore social justice to the poor, that he as a pacifist does not turn a blind eye to social injustices and inequality. He **extended therefore our understanding of what is violent**, coercion, force, to include the economic and social system’s **avoidable injustices**, deaths, inequalities. Negative peace is the absence of justice, even if there is no war. Injustice causes **structural violence** to health, bodies, minds, damages people, and **must therefore be resisted (non-violently**). Positive peace is different from negative (unjust and hence violent) peace. Positive peace requires actively combating (struggling peacefully against) social injustices that underpin structural violence. Economic and social, political justice have to be part of peacebuilding. This is the mantra of most NGOs and even some agencies (we will look later at NGO Action Aid and DFID as examples). Discrimination has to end, so does the blatant rule of money, greater equality is vital wherever possible. All of this is the opposite of neo-liberal recipes for success, which in Holland as in Indonesia, tolerate higher and higher levels of social inequality in the name of efficiency. **Structural violence kills far more people than warfare** – for example one estimate in DRC is that **4 million people have been killed in** **war** since 1998, but NGOs estimate that an additional **6 million people have died in DRC since then, from disease, displacement and hunger,** bringing the total to an unthinkable 10 million of 90 million est. population. “Since there exists far more wealth in the world than is necessary to address the main economic causes of structural violence, **the real problem is one of priorities**”…p. 307 “**Structural violence…is neither natural nor inevitable**”, p. 301 (Prontzos).

### Plan

**The United States federal government should substantially increase its bilateral assistance for human trafficking response towards Mexico.**

### Contention two is solvency

#### Affirmation of political hope is necessary to reinvigorate democracy. Democracy is militarized in the status quo, parallel with disposability. To educate and advocate for hope is to evoke the political power of resistance.

Giroux ‘10 – Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State (Henry, “Memories of Hope in the Age of Disposability”, published 9/28/2010, accessed online 7/2, <http://archive.truthout.org/memories-hope-age-disposability63631)//BZ>

The working-class neighborhood of my youth never gave up on democracy as an ideal in spite of how much it might have failed us. As an ideal, it offered the promise of a better future; it mobilized us to organize collectively in order to fight against injustice; and it cast an intense light on those who traded in corruption, unbridled power and greed. Politics was laid bare in a community that expected more of itself and its citizens as it tapped into the promise of a democratic society. But like many individuals and groups today**,** democracy is now also viewed as disposable, considered redundant, a dangerous remnant of another age.And yet, like the memories of my youth, there is something to be found in those allegedly outdated ideals that may provide the only hope we have for recognizing the anti-democratic politics, power relations and reactionary ideologies espoused by the new barbarians. Democracy as both an ideal and a reality is now under siege in a militarized culture of fear and forgetting**.** The importance of moral witnessing has been replaced by a culture of instant gratification and unmediated anger, just as forgetting has become an active rather than passive process, what the philosopher Slavoj Zizek calls a kind of "fetishist disavowal: 'I know, but I don't want to know that I know, so I don't know.'"(16)The lights are going out in America; and the threat comes not from alleged irresponsible government spending, a growing deficit or the specter of a renewed democratic social state.On the contrary, it comes from the dark forces of an economic Darwinism and its newly energized armies of right-wing financial sharks, shout till-you-drop mobs, reactionary ideologues, powerful, right-wing media conglomerates and corporate-sponsored politicians who sincerely hope, if not yet entirely believe, that the age of democratization has come to an end and the time for a new and cruel politics of disposability and human waste management is at hand. We are living through a period in American history in whichpolitics has not only been commodified and depoliticized, but the civic courage of intellectuals, students, labor unions and working people has receded from the public realm. Maybe it is time to reclaim a history not too far removed from my own youthful memories of when democracy as an ideal was worth struggling over, when public goods were more important than consumer durables, when the common good outweighed private privileges and when the critical notion that a society can never be just enough was the real measure of civic identity and political health.Maybeit's time to reclaim the spirit of a diverse and powerful social movement willing to organize, speak out, educate and fight for the promise of a democracy that would do justice to the dreams of a generation of young people waiting for adults to prove the courage of their democratic convictions.

#### A US-Mexico bilateral partnership increases prevention initiatives in addition to number of prosecutions – allows for information sharing and expedited investigations

**Garza 11** Candidate for Juris Doctor, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, AB from Harvard (Rocio, 11/1/11, "Addressing Human Trafficking Along the United States-Mexico Border: The Need for a Bilateral Partnership," <http://www.cjicl.com/uploads/2/9/5/9/2959791/cjicl_19.2_garza_note.pdf)//AM>

Victims on both sides of the United States-Mexico border ¶ would greatly benefit from improvements to both countries’ laws ¶ and their implementation. Regardless, the United States and Mexico can accomplish much more if they join efforts and collaborate in a formal bilateral partnership that takes into account the internal and external factors243 that make human trafficking possible. A bilateral partnership would ensure that both countries’ interests are represented in any solution to eradicate human trafficking. It could be beneficial in prosecuting traffickers, protecting victims, and putting preventative measures in place.¶ 1. Prosecution of Traffickers¶ A formal bilateral partnership could allow the United States and Mexico to share information about traffickers, which could lead to more prosecutions. Currently, if in the course of an investigation, a U.S. prosecutor believes that a trafficker returned to Mexico, the prosecutor may either petition for extradition or submit a request for the Mexican government to prosecute the accused in Mexico.244 Generally, Mexican President Calderon cooperates with the United States in extraditing criminals.245 Several traffickers have been extradited to the United States in connection to high profile cases, such as the Carreto-Valencia brothers who were charged with human trafficking for running a forced prostitution ring in New York.246 After several family members were charged in 2004, another participant was extradited in 2007 and sentenced in 2008.247 Another case involved defendants who illegally transported Mexican individuals to Florida and forced them to work in fruit harvesting fields by threatening them with violence.248 If the strategies used to prosecute these traffickers were maintained by a bilateral partnership, both the United States and Mexico could expedite their investigatory processes instead of acting unilaterally and only responding to each other’s requests for extradition and punishment. More efficient prosecutions would leave more resources and time to address the needs of victims. 2. Protection of Victims A bilateral partnership could be formed between U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and Mexican customs officials in order to create better strategies to identify human trafficking victims at the shared border. Although most immigrants agree to be smuggled, others are abducted and taken against their will.249 When these immigrants are intercepted at the border, they are often confused with smugglers and the people they are smuggling and not recognized as victims.250 Having a bilateral partnership could ensure that these issues come to light and that proper training is provided to U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents in order to prevent them from simply deporting victims or sending them back to their traffickers. Even if immigrants have consented to being smuggled, U.S. agents may be able to identify the signs of human trafficking if information is shared across the border. Suspected victims of human trafficking could be turned over to Mexican customs officials for further investigation and possible legal aid and protection. In a bilateral partnership with representatives from both countries, the United States and Mexico would be able to come up with strategies that keep traffickers and smugglers out of the United States while protecting the victims. For example, if a partnership were in place, the members of the partnership could designate specific steps for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents to take when they suspect the people they have detained are victims of human trafficking. These steps could include, for example, sending victims directly to predetermined and stateapproved Mexican shelters equipped to handle their needs as victims of human trafficking. Another specific step that a partnership may be able to put in place is that U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents could separate people they intercept at the border and ask them specific questions to determine if they are victims. Some victims of human trafficking report that if they had not been near their traffickers at the time they were stopped at the border and if they had been asked more direct questions, they would have revealed that they were being taken against their will and been rescued despite their fear of retaliation from traffickers. 3. Prevention of Human Trafficking Prevention tends to be a goal that is cast aside in favor of prosecution of traffickers and protection of victims because it is intangible. One can count the number of prosecutions and victims helped but cannot ascertain how many are saved with preventative measures. In the 2009 TIP Report, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton acknowledged that much remains to be done in identifying and tackling the root causes of human trafficking.253 Clinton urged all governments to leverage their resources and offered U.S. partnership to strengthen anti-trafficking efforts.254 One of the ways in which the United States can leverage its resources is by partnering with Mexico in order to continue raising awareness about the dangers of human trafficking and how smuggling can easily lead to trafficking. In addition, a partnership would send a message to both countries about the seriousness of the crime and the urgent need to address it together. In a partnership between U.S. and Mexican representatives, they would be able to strategize to develop viable alternatives to prevent illegal immigration, given that most victims are vulnerable due to a lack of economic alternatives. Furthermore, through a partnership, the United States and Mexico could develop joint and more informed awareness campaigns to warn their citizens about the dangers and criminal consequences of engaging in human trafficking.

**US human trafficking policies are modeled globally**

**Srikantiah 7** Associate Professor of Law and Director, Immigrants’ Rights Clinic, Stanford Law (Jayashri, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim In Domestic Human Trafficking Law,” Boston University Law Review v. 187, <http://www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/volume87n1/documents/SRIKANTIAHv.2.pdf)//AM>

As the United States continues to grapple with human trafficking, other countries are doing the same and, in many cases, are using the U.S. trafficking ¶ legislation as a model. Our trafficking approach could have global ¶ consequences. Unless we allow our approach to evolve as our understanding ¶ of trafficking evolves, we erroneously exclude trafficking victims from ¶ immigration relief.

#### Only engaging trafficking through a discursive lens can effectively transform the social conditions that create the possibility for violence

**Lobasz ’12** (Jennifer, Professor of International Relations at the University of Minnesota, “Victims, Villains, and the Virtuous Constructing the Problems of ‘Human Trafficking’”, June 2012, http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/131822/1/Lobasz\_umn\_0130E\_12756.pdf, pgs. 80-82, [SG])

In this dissertation, I carry out a genealogical discourse analysis. Genealogy in the tradition of Michel Foucault and Friedrich Nietzsche calls into question “ready-made syntheses” of the supposedly real, concrete, or self-evident, revealing that which is taken as to be contingent and contentious. In short, genealogy “seeks to defamiliarize—to literally make strange—commonsense understandings and so to make their constructedness apparent.” A genealogical approach transforms how social scientific questions are asked. In contrast to scholars who start from the assumption that human trafficking is a rapidly growing problem, for example, I ask how anti-trafficking discourses in the United States “set the term s of intelligibility of thought, speech, and action,” establishing the conditions of possibility for what can be meaningfully said or done in any given set of circumstances. Genealogy lies in contrast to positivist approaches to policy analysis that, according to Dvora Yanow, share the presumption that the nature of the problem is real and concrete: that problems exist in the world as unambiguous facts, and that the purpose of policy and implementation analysis is to mirror that reality as closely as possible. In this view, we can take action to correct the problem when we are able to capture its definition appropriately and correctly…If we cannot narrow the ‘gap’ between policy intentions and outcomes, we simply have not grasped ‘the nature’ of the problem, seen it in the right light, or hit on the correct solution to it. A genealogical approach to trafficking, for example, moves beyond critiques of policy implementation and rejects the position that a “trafficking victim” is a natural kind that investigators must simply “look harder” to find, or “do more” to help. Instead, a “trafficking victim” is seen as a person who occupies a particular subject position in domestic and international moral and political orders, and in trafficking discourses is distinguished from prostitutes and undocumented migrants among others. Along these lines, I hold that the challenges associated with establishing definitional parameters for “victims of trafficking” are interesting not because there should be greater precision and consistency, or because this is possible, but because actors’ difficulties in doing so provides a clearer glimpse into the discursive work and particular constellations of power necessary to produce the category in the first place. I use discourse analysis as a tool of genealogical investigation that works to highlight the productive power of anti-trafficking discourses. Discourse refers to far more than simply what is said or written. In Laura Shepherd’s words, discourses are “systems of meaning-production rather than simply statements or language, systems that ‘fix’ meaning, however temporarily, and enable us to make sense of the world.” Social construction is a discursive process through which power relations are produced, reproduced, and contested. In short, “discourses are productive. They produce subjects, objects, and the relations among them.” An effective genealogy requires thorough empirical investigation as much, if not more so, as it requires theoretical probing. Analysis of a discursive field is necessarily analysis of discourse in action, tracing its deployment by and production of specific actors in specific contexts. For Foucault: Discourse must not be referred to the distant presence of the origin, but treated as and when it occurs… we must grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show what other forms of statements it excludes. My primary concern in choosing texts was to ensure coverage of dominant discourses—in this case, those associated with feminist and religious abolitionism. Immersion in abolitionist literature, news media reports, speeches, congressional hearings, and web sites allowed me to identify key texts—those frequently cross-referenced or cited, or given particular emphasis by the actors themselves—that serve as the backbones of the following three chapters. Multiple readings of these texts, seen in concert with one another, are required to account for the principle of intertextuality, or the notion that statements and actions are always within a broader text that give them intersubjective meaning, and this single text itself is in meaning-giving and meaning-taking relationships with other texts. Determination of texts as key is an inductive, recursive, and reflexive process; key texts were not chosen before the study but discovered as part of it through a process of reading that is ongoing, repeated, and subject to feedback and revision. I judged coverage to have been reached once key texts and basic discourses began to reappear without major changes or additions.

#### A crisis focused ethic is wrong – attention to isolated instances of warfare ignores the daily horrors of structural violence. This is the precondition for any war to happen

**Cuomo 96** – PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati (Chris, Hypatia Fall 1996. Vol. 11, Issue 3, pg 30)

In "Gender and `Postmodern' War," Robin Schott introduces some of the ways in which war is currently best seen not as an event but as a presence (Schott 1995). Schott argues that postmodern understandings of persons, states, and politics, as well as the high-tech nature of much contemporary warfare and the preponderance of civil and nationalist wars, render an eventbased conception of war inadequate, especially insofar as gender is taken into account. In this essay, I will expand upon her argument by showing that accounts of war that only focus on events are impoverished in a number of ways, and therefore feminist consideration of the political, ethical, and ontological dimensions of war and the possibilities for resistance demand a much more complicated approach. I take Schott's characterization of war as presence as a point of departure, though I am not committed to the idea that the constancy of militarism, the fact of its omnipresence in human experience, and the paucity of an event-based account of war are exclusive to contemporary postmodern or postcolonial circumstances.(1) Theory that does not investigate or even notice the **omnipresence of militarism** cannot represent or address the depth and specificity of the everyday effects of militarism on women, on people living in occupied territories, on members of military institutions, and on the environment. These effects are relevant to feminists in a number of ways because military practices and institutions help construct gendered and national identity, and because they justify the destruction of natural nonhuman entities and communities **during peacetime.** Lack of attention to these aspects of the business of making or preventing military violence in an extremely technologized world **results in theory that cannot accommodate the connections** among the constant presence of militarism, declared wars, and other closely related social phenomena, such as nationalistic glorifications of motherhood, media violence, and current ideological gravitations to military solutions for social problems. Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states **lead to crisis-based politics and analyses**. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they **distract attention** from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the **false belief** that the **absence of declared armed conflicts is peace**, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, **creates forms of resistance** to militarism that are merely e**xercises in crisis control.** Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually **keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism**. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. **Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies** concerning war and military violence also **enables consideration** of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns. I propose that the constancy of militarism and its effects on social reality be reintroduced as a crucial locus of contemporary feminist attentions, and that feminists emphasize how wars are eruptions and manifestations of omnipresent militarism that is a product and tool of multiply oppressive, corporate, technocratic states.(2) Feminists should be particularly interested in making this shift because it better allows consideration of the effects of war and militarism on women, subjugated peoples, and environments. While giving attention to the constancy of militarism in contemporary life we need not neglect the importance of addressing the specific qualities of direct, large-scale, declared military conflicts. But the dramatic nature of declared, large-scale conflicts should not obfuscate the ways in which military violence pervades most societies in increasingly technologically sophisticated ways and the significance of military institutions and everyday **practices in shaping reality.** Philosophical discussions that focus only on the ethics of declaring and fighting wars miss these connections, and also miss the ways in which even declared military conflicts are often experienced as omnipresent horrors. These approaches also leave unquestioned tendencies to **suspend or distort moral judgement** in the face of what appears to be the inevitability of war and militarism.

#### Predictions of international relations fail

**Tetlock and Gardner, 11** professor of organizational behavior at the Haas Business School at the University of California-Berkeley and columnist and senior writer (Dan Gardner and Philip Tetlock, 7/11/11, “Overcoming Our Aversion to Acknowledging Our Ignorance”, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/11/dan-gardner-philip-tetlock/overcoming-our-aversion-acknowledging-our-ignorance)//EM>

The editors may regret that short shelf-life some years, but surely not this one. Even now, only halfway through the year, The World in 2011 bears little resemblance to the world in 2011. Of the political turmoil in the Middle East—the revolutionary movements in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Bahrain, and Syria—we find no hint in The Economist’s forecast. Nor do we find a word about the earthquake/tsunami and consequent disasters in Japan or the spillover effects on the viability of nuclear power around the world. Or the killing of Osama bin Laden and the spillover effects for al Qaeda and Pakistani and Afghan politics. So each of the top three global events of the first half of 2011 were as unforeseen by The Economist as the next great asteroid strike. This is not to mock The Economist, which has an unusually deep bench of well-connected observers and analytical talent. A vast array of other individuals and organizations issued forecasts for 2011 and none, to the best of our knowledge, correctly predicted the top three global events of the first half of the year. None predicted two of the events. Or even one. No doubt, there are sporadic exceptions of which we’re unaware. So many pundits make so many predictions that a few are bound to be bull’s eyes. But it is a fact that almost all the best and brightest—in governments, universities, corporations, and intelligence agencies—were taken by surprise. Repeatedly. That is all too typical. Despite massive investments of money, effort, and ingenuity, our ability to predict human affairs is impressive only in its mediocrity. With metronomic regularity, what is expected does not come to pass, while what isn’t, does. In the most comprehensive analysis of expert prediction ever conducted, Philip Tetlock assembled a group of some 280 anonymous volunteers—economists, political scientists, intelligence analysts, journalists—whose work involved forecasting to some degree or other. These experts were then asked about a wide array of subjects. Will inflation rise, fall, or stay the same? Will the presidential election be won by a Republican or Democrat? Will there be open war on the Korean peninsula? Time frames varied. So did the relative turbulence of the moment when the questions were asked, as the experiment went on for years. In all, the experts made some 28,000 predictions. Time passed, the veracity of the predictions was determined, the data analyzed, and the average expert’s forecasts were revealed to be only slightly more accurate than random guessing—or, to put more harshly, only a bit better than the proverbial dart-throwing chimpanzee. And the average expert performed slightly worse than a still more mindless competition: simple extrapolation algorithms that automatically predicted more of the same.

#### No war – international institutions and societal shifts

**Contreras, 12** – Fellow, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University (Dominic, citing Steven Pinker, Harvard College Professor and Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University, citing Joshua A. Goldstein, Professor Emeritus, School of International Service, American University, February 1, 2012, “Winning the War on War?”, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/21707/winning\_the\_war\_on\_war.html?breadcrumb=%2Fproject%2F52%2Fintrastate\_conflict\_program, Hensel)

In a jointly authored December 2011 op-ed in the New York Times, Pinker and Goldstein wrote that “the departure of the last American troops from Iraq brings relief to a nation that has endured its most painful war since Vietnam. But the event is momentous for another reason. The invasion of Iraq was the most recent example of an all-out war between two national armies. And it could very well be the last one.” Speaking at the forum, both echoed their assessment that war is less and less often being used as a tool for societies and states to resolve conflicts, but they differed in their views of what brought about this change. Speaking to the main argument of his book “Winning the War on War: the Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide,” Goldstein, professor emeritus of international relations at American University, largely credited international institutions for the pacification of the international community, stating that “After World War II we did something new…we founded the United Nations…and we’ve developed this tool, peacekeeping…that has successively, progressively, over a number of years, made it possible to resolve more conflicts without violence, to reduce violence when it has already occurred, and to sustain peace when you’re able to negotiate a peace agreement.” “The international community is not an oxymoron,” Goldstein said, “it actually works.” Pinker, the Johnstone family professor of psychology at Harvard and author of the much heralded book “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” concurred with Goldstein’s assessment of a new peace taking hold. But he went a step further, arguing that in addition to the international community promoting peace, interpersonal norms and the development of social restraints have fostered a shift away from violence. Pinker cited “psychological changes through cosmopolitanism and literacy… [and the] expansion of empathy and the consideration of others,” as driving forces in the societal tilt away from war. He also pointed to changing attitudes towards violence as explaining this shift. “Violence is seen as something to be solved and something we can throw our wits against… society sees it as a problem, not a solution,” Pinker said. Pinker and Goldstein both declared that they are not optimists and had approached trends in warfare as pessimists, only reaching their conclusions through rigorous scholarly analysis. Toft and Walt, however, were not so easily convinced that the data bear out the hopeful view. Toft, an associate professor of public policy at the Kennedy School and director of the Belfer Center’s Initiative on Religion in International Affairs, praised both authors and their books, but pointed to what she perceived as a Eurocentric tilt in their data pools. She also cited changing global power dynamics, and wondered if the trend would hold. Responding to Pinker’s argument that societies have become more civilized Walt, the Robert and Renee Belfer professor of international affairs and faculty chair of the Belfer Center’s International Security Program, said, “It’s not obvious to me that the civilizing instinct at the interpersonal level translates to more civilized behavior between states or between states and other people.” Walt pointed to Bosnia and Iraq as examples of cases in which boundary conditions change and violence quickly emerges from seemingly peaceful societies. Devoid of a strong central state, both Yugoslavia after the fall of Tito, and Iraq after the toppling of Saddam both descended into civil war as competing groups vied for control and power. Furthermore, Walt pointed to the post-Cold War U.S. that has gone to war four times through democratic processes and has choosen warfare as a rational and preferred option. The panel largely agreed that global war on the scale of World War I and II is unlikely to occur again, because, according to Goldstein, “trade is now basis of prosperity [whereas] conquering land used to be.” However, they agreed, modern exceptions abound; in some cases the United Nations, which is charged with upholding peace, can sanction war, and in others, states can decide that war is in their interest. Whether or not war is on the way out in the long-term is up for debate, but according to Pinker, “you can’t miss the trend line.”

#### “Any risk” paralyzes action on real issues

**Meskill, 9** (David Meskill, 12/9/9, “The "One Percent Doctrine" and Environmental Faith”, http://davidmeskill.blogspot.com/2009/12/one-percent-doctrine-and-environmental.html)//EM

Tom Friedman's piece today in the Times on the environment (<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/09/opinion/09friedman.html?_r=1>) is one of the flimsiest pieces by a major columnist that I can remember ever reading. He applies Cheney's "one percent doctrine" (which is similar to the environmentalists' "precautionary principle") to the risk of environmental armageddon. But this doctrine is both intellectually incoherent and practically irrelevant. It is intellectually incoherent because it cannot be applied consistently in a world with many potential disaster scenarios. In addition to the global-warming risk, there's also the asteroid-hitting-the-earth risk, the terrorists-with-nuclear-weapons risk (Cheney's original scenario), the super-duper-pandemic risk, etc. Since each of these risks, on the "one percent doctrine," would deserve all of our attention, we cannot address all of them simultaneously. That is, even within the one-percent mentality, we'd have to begin prioritizing, making choices and trade-offs. But why then should we only make these trade-offs between responses to disaster scenarios? Why not also choose between them and other, much more cotidien, things we value? Why treat the unlikely but cataclysmic event as somehow fundamentally different, something that cannot be integrated into all the other calculations we make? And in fact, this is how we behave all the time. We get into our cars in order to buy a cup of coffee, even though there's some chance we will be killed on the way to the coffee shop. We are constantly risking death, if slightly, in order to pursue the things we value. Any creature that adopted the "precautionary principle" would sit at home - no, not even there, since there is some chance the building might collapse. That creature would neither be able to act, nor not act, since it would nowhere discover perfect safety. Friedman's approach reminds me somehow of Pascal's wager - quasi-religious faith masquerading as rational deliberation (as Hans Albert has pointed out, Pascal's wager itself doesn't add up: there may be a God, in fact, but it may turn out that He dislikes, and even damns, people who believe in him because they've calculated it's in their best interest to do so). As my friend James points out, it's striking how descriptions of the environmental risk always describe the situation as if it were five to midnight. It must be near midnight, since otherwise there would be no need to act. But it can never be five \*past\* midnight, since then acting would be pointless and we might as well party like it was 2099. Many religious movements - for example the early Jesus movement - have exhibited precisely this combination of traits: the looming apocalypse, with the time (just barely) to take action. None of this is to deny - at least this is my current sense - that human action is contributing to global warming. But what our response to this news should be is another matter entirely.

#### Utilitarian problem solving and consequentialist ethics justify mass atrocity and turns its own end

#### Weizman 11 (Eyal Weizman, professor of visual and spatial cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London, 2011, “The Least of All Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Arendt to Gaza,” pp 8-10)

The theological origins of the lesser evil argument cast a long shadow on the present. In fact the idiom has become so deeply ingrained, and is invoked in such a staggeringly diverse set of contexts – from individual situational ethics and international relations, to attempts to govern the economics of violence in the context ofthe ‘war on terror’ and the efforts of human rights and humanitarian activists to manoeuvre through the paradoxes of aid – that it seems to have altogether taken the place previously reserved for the ‘good’. Moreover, the very evocation of the ‘good’ seems to everywhere invoke the utopian tragedies of modernity, in which evil seemed lurking in a horrible manichaeistic inversion. If no hope is offered in the future, all that remains is to insure ourselves against the risks that it poses, to moderate and lessen the collateral effects of necessary acts, and tend to those who have suffered as a result. In relation to the ‘war on terror,’ the terms of the lesser evil were most clearly and prominently articulated by former human rights scholar and leader of Canada’s Liberal Party Michael Ignatieff. In his book *The Lesser Evil*, Ignatieff suggested that in ‘balancing liberty against security’ liberal states establish mechanisms to regulate the breach of some human rights and legal norms, and allow their security services to engage in forms of extrajudicial violence – which he saw as lesser evils – in order to fend off or minimize potential greater evils, such as terror attacks on civilians of western states.11 If governments need to violate rights in a terrorist emergency, this should be done, he thought, only as an exception and according to a process of adversarial scrutiny. ‘Exceptions’, Ignatieff states, ‘do not destroy the rule but save it, provided that they are temporary, publicly justified, and deployed as a last resort.’12 The lesser evil emerges here as a pragmatist compromise, a ‘tolerated sin’ that functions as the very justification for the notion of exception. State violence in this model takes part in a necro-economy in which various types of destructive measure are weighed in a utilitarian fashion, not only in relation to the damage they produce, but to the harm they purportedly prevent and even in relation to the more brutal measures they may help restrain. In this logic, the problem of contemporary state violence resembles indeed an all-too-human version of the mathematical minimum problem of the divine calculations previously mentioned, one tasked with determining the smallest level of violence necessary to avert the greater harm. For the architects of contemporary war this balance is trapped between two poles: keeping violence at a low enough level to limit civilian suffering, and at a level high enough to bring a decisive end to the war and bring peace.13 More recent works by legal scholars and legal advisers to states and militaries have sought to extend the inherent elasticity of the system of legal exception proposed by Ignatieff into ways of rewriting the laws of armed conflict themselves.14 Lesser evilarguments are now used to defend anything from targeted assassinations and mercy killings, house demolitions, deportation, torture,15 to the use of (sometimes) non-lethal chemical weapons, the use of human shields, and even ‘the intentional targeting of some civilians if it could save more innocent lives than they cost.’16 In one of its more macabre moments it was suggested that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima might also be tolerated under the defence of the lesser evil. Faced with a humanitarian A-bomb, one might wonder what, in fact, might come under the definition of a greater evil. Perhaps it is time for the differential accounting of the lesser evil to replace the mechanical bureaucracy of the ‘banality of evil’ as the idiom to describe the most extreme manifestations of violence. Indeed, it is through this use of the lesser evil that societies that see themselves as democratic canmaintain regimes of occupation and neo-colonization. Beyond state agents, those practitioners of lesser evils, as this book claims, must also include the members of independent nongovernmental organizations that make up the ecology of contemporary war and crisis zones. The lesser evil is the argument of the humanitarian agent that seeks military permission to provide medicines and aid in places where it is in fact the duty of the occupying military power to do so, thus saving the military limited resources. The lesser evil is often the justification of the military officer who attempts to administer life (and death) in an ‘enlightened’ manner; it is sometimes, too, the brief of the security contractor who introduces new and more efficient weapons and spatio-technological means of domination, and advertises them as ‘humanitarian technology’. In these cases the logic of the lesser evil opens up a thick political field of participation belonging together otherwise opposing fields of action, to the extent that it might obscure thefundamental moral differences between these various groups. But, even according to the terms of an economy of losses and gains, the conception of the lesser evil risks becoming counterproductive: less brutal measures are also those that may be more easily naturalized, accepted and tolerated – and hence more frequently used, with the result that a greater evil may be reached cumulatively, Such observations amongst other paradoxes are unpacked in one of the most powerful challenges to ideas such as Ignatieff’s – Adi Ophir’s philosophical essay *The Order of Evils*. In this book Ophir developed an ethical system that is similarly not grounded in a search for the ‘good’ but the systemic logic of an economy of violence – the possibility of a lesser means and the risk of more damage – but insists that questions of violence are forever unpredictable and will always escape the capacity to calculate them. Inherent in Ophir’s insistence on the necessity of calculating is, he posits, the impossibility of doing so. The demand of his ethics are grounded in this impossibility.17

**Nuclear war doesn’t cause extinction – prefer models**

**Seitz 6 -** former associate of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs (Russell, “The' Nuclear Winter ' Meltdown Photoshopping the Apocalypse”, <http://adamant.typepad.com/seitz/2006/12/preherein_honor.html>)//AM

All that remains of Sagan's Big Chill are curves such as this , but history is full of prophets of doom who fail to deliver, not all are without honor in their own land. The 1983 'Nuclear Winter " papers inScience were so politicized that even the eminently liberal President of The Council for a Liveable World called "The worst example ofthe misrepesentation of science to the public in my memory." Among the authors was Stanford President Donald Kennedy. Today he edits Science , the nation's major arbiter of climate science--and policy.¶ Below, a case illustrating the mid-range of the ~.7 to ~1.6 degree C maximum cooling the 2006 studies suggest is superimposed in color on the Blackly Apocalyptic predictions published in Science Vol. 222, 1983 . They're worth comparing, because the range of soot concentrations in the new models overlaps with cases assumed to have dire climatic consequences in the widely publicized 1983 scenarios --"Apocalyptic predictions require, to be taken seriously,higher standards of evidence than do assertions on other matters where the stakes are not as great." wrote Sagan in Foreign Affairs , Winter 1983 -84. But that "evidence" was never forthcoming.'Nuclear Winter' never existed outside of a computer except as [air-brushed animation](http://www.atomicarchive.com/Movies/Movie6.shtml) commissioned by the a PR firm - Porter Novelli Inc. Yet Sagan predicted "the extinction of the human species " as temperatures plummeted 35 degrees C and the world froze in the aftermath of a nuclear holocaust. Last year, Sagan's cohort tried to reanimate the ghost in a machine anti-nuclear activists invoked in the depths of the Cold War, by re-running equally arbitrary scenarios on a modern interactive Global Circulation Model. But the Cold War is history in more ways than one. It is a credit to post-modern computer climate simulations that [they do not reproduce the apocalyptic results](http://www.copernicus.org/EGU/acp/acpd/6/11817/acpd-6-11817_p.pdf) of what Sagan oxymoronically termed "a sophisticated one dimensional model." The subzero 'baseline case' has melted down into a tepid 1.3 degrees of average cooling- [grey skies do not a Ragnarok make](http://whyfiles.org/shorties/222nuclear/images/BCabsoptdaily.gif) . What remains is just not the stuff that End of the World myths are made of.¶ It is hard to exaggerate how seriously " nuclear winter "was once taken by policy analysts who ought to have known better. Many were taken aback by the sheer force of Sagan's rhetoric Remarkably, Science's news coverage of the new results fails to graphically compare them with the old ones Editor Kennedy and other recent executives of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, once proudly co-authored and helped to publicize.¶ You can't say they didn't try to reproduce this Cold War icon. Once again, soot from ¶ imaginary software materializes in midair by the megaton , flying higher than Mount Everest . This is not physics, but a crude exercise in ' garbage in, gospel out' parameter forcing designed to maximize and extend the cooling an aeosol can generate, by sparing it from realistic attrition by rainout in the lower atmosphere. Despite decades of progress in modeling atmospheric chemistry , there is none in this computer simulation, and ignoring photochemistry further extends its impact. Fortunately , the history of science is as hard to erase as it is easy to ignore. Their past mastery of semantic agression cannot spare the authors of "Nuclear Winter Lite " direct comparison of their new results and their old.¶ Dark smoke clouds in the lower atmosphere don't last long enough to spread across the globe. Cloud droplets and rainfall remove them. rapidly washing them out of the sky in a matter of days to weeks- not long enough to sustain a global pall. Real world weather brings down particles much as soot is scrubbed out of power plant smoke by the water sprays in smoke stack scrubbers Robock acknowledges this- not even a single degree of cooling results when soot is released at lower elevations in he models . The workaround is to inject the imaginary aerosol at truly Himalayan elevations - pressure altitudes of 300 millibar and higher , where the computer model's vertical transport function modules pass it off to their even higher neighbors in the stratosphere , where it does not rain and particles linger.. The new studies like the old suffer from the disconnect between a desire to paint the sky black and the vicissitudes of natural history. As with many exercise in worst case models both at invoke rare phenomena as commonplace, claiming it prudent to assume the worst.

### Tea

**We meet –the plan regulates the trafficking market**

**GAO, 10** (Gergana, US GAO; and Frank, International Organization for Migration, International Migration 48:4, Wiley Online Library)

Individuals participate in the economy by providing labour services, receiving income in return, and buying goods and services supplied by firms. With complete information on job openings at various locations, and free movement of labour, individuals provide labour services to firms regardless of firms’ location so as to maximize individual well-being. If individuals choose to move from one location to another over a certain time period, they do so if the return for their skills and services is higher, which enables them to afford a larger set of goods and services as well as to acquire new skills, technology and human capital. The financial market facilitates the flow of funds by channelling remittances back home and opening access to credit for those who need it. Long-standing tradition and cultural factors, as well as new ones, such as transition to a market economy and a burgeoning underground economy, lead to labour and financial market imperfections, which increase people’s vulnerability, particularly for those at the bottom end of the income distribution. Trafficking networks could exploit that vulnerability at any stage of the trafficking cycle by, for example, recruiting and deceptively promising employment or other gains to individuals in need of sustainable livelihoods. In such instances trafficking could be viewed as a form of exchange between individual recruiters and firm owners hiring trafficked labour for production. This exchange may or may not take place in a market with an explicit price mechanism that equilibrates supply and demand. The networks earn profits channelled through financial markets for the perpetuation of the crime or other related criminal activities such as money laundering, drug trafficking and human smuggling. The networks allow limited or no remuneration for the labour services of trafficking victims, thus largely eliminating the remittances channel to household members at home. The imperfections in the labour and financial markets, as well as the absence of accurate labour market information restrict individual access to resources and thus relative individual poverty, which is often viewed as the “root cause” of human trafficking. Poverty is usually listed first on any list of trafficking vulnerability factors in the developing world. “If the trafficking of people is to be prevented, its root causes – such as poverty, discrimination against women and girls and inequality need to be addressed” (DFID, 2007:7); “UNDP looks at trafficking not just as a human rights issue but also a development issue and poverty has been identified as one of the root causes of trafficking” (UNDP, 2003). In this context, poverty is viewed as a broader concept with financial and non-financial aspects including access to both social and economic capital (see discussion of human development in the previous subsection). An understanding of the noneconomic elements of poverty -- lack of human capital and gender discrimination -- also helps identify the most vulnerable to marginalization from the development process (ADB, 2003).

**We meet – the plan allows for flow of remittances**

**C/I – economic engagement is increasing bilateral relations**

**Department of State, 8** (Department of State, 2008, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/105904.pdf>) KD

The U.S. strategy of Total Economic Engagement pursues economic reform, rule of law, and global economic integration, including countries with predominantly Muslim populations. Total Economic Engagement includes: Regular bilateral discussions on these topics with host government officials, with both U.S. Embassy officials and officials from a wide range of U.S. agencies participating; Formal structured dialogues, high-level Economic Dialogues, and Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA) Councils; U.S. bilateral and multilateral assistance programs for economic reform, trade capacitybuilding, and rule of law managed chiefly through USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and the State Department's Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI). Programs are often complemented with technical assistance provided by specialized U.S. agencies and offices; Coordinated multilateral policies and assistance strategies to advance reform goals by working with such international organizations as the (IMF, WB, World Trade Organization (WTO), and OECD (MENA-OECD Investment), and other multilateral donors; and Working with NGOs, such as Transparency International, and U.S. and foreign business associations, such as American Chambers of Commerce and Business Councils, to advance reform issues of mutual concern

**Precision –government definitions key to a predictable bright-line for debate – academic defs are inconsistent**

**Over-limiting is bad –tanks aff ground and prevents a diversity of education on multiple affs – justifies the C/I theirs plus our aff**

**Lit and disclosure check – other words like substantially check ground**

**Small affs are key to topic generics – those are a unique education base**

**Can’t solve limits – everything is linked to the economy – commerce clause proves**

**They exclude us – that’s bad**

Peterson, **91** professor of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies at the University of Cincinnati and Professor of International Relations School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona (Anne Sisson and V Spike, “The Radical Future of Realism: Feminist Subversions of IR Theory”, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political 16:1, Winter 1991, JSTOR)//AS

Feminists are not alone in directing critical attention to the state nor in targeting liberal mystifications of the state as "a neutral arbiter, which mediates disinterestedly between different social groups."94 Recent historical-sociological studies of the state offer especially rich analyses of the mutual constitution of state governance (centralized political authority), militarism (war-making and domestic social control), and accumulation (extraction of goods and services).95 But however much recent theorists have illuminated the coercive and exploitative dynamics of states and the state system, their continued omission of women produces inaccurate and inadequate accounts. It is simply not possible to understand how power works in the world without explaining women's exclusion from the top of all economic, religious, political, and military systems of power.96 This is neither an accident nor irrelevant; contemporary power relations depend upon sustaining certain notions of masculinity and femininity, notions of what is expected in regard to men's and women's lives.97 But the received understanding of politics pretends that women's exclusion from power is not a political matter, that it is not in and of itself a fundamental and extensive form of power inequality, that is, domination.

**Reasonability – competing interpretations is infinitely regressive – they’ll always move the goal post**

**CICEP, 13** (The Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness and Economic Prosperity (CICEP) is a working group of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). Through regular workshops and meetings, the Commission works on building tools, resources, and standards of practice that universities can use to make the most effective contributions to innovation and economic growth, and to communicate their value in these areas. Members of CICEP include representatives from APLU institution's offices of: academic affairs; research and graduate administration; public and governmental affairs; business and engineering departments; outreach and economic development; technology transfer; and entrepreneurship programs; <http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=4431>) KD

I just javaed the date still camp ev

A university conducts its economic development work in a geographic footprint. Sometimes we refer to this geographic footprint as community or region, or we modify it with words like local, state, national, or international to help clarify the geographic area being served. This document will use the word ‘community’ to define the geographic area being served, recognizing that the service area specified for or assumed by the institution (i.e., the city, county, region, state(s), nation, or world) varies by institution and by the specific program or economic development activity. Similarly, the term “economic engagement” has various interpretations across the higher education community. Its use in this tool is meant to help guide campus conversations, not prescribe a particular view of how an institution defines its contributions to its community.

### 2ac anthro

**The role of the ballot is determining whether a topical plan is better than the status quo or a competitive ethical policy option**

**a) Key to plan focus debate- vital internal link into topic specific education and in-depth clash**

**b) Aff ground is destroyed when we can’t get access to the 1AC- the foundation of the affirmative**

**c) Vague alts- They can not specify what their alternative does, which is a voting issue because they can dodge all of our ground.**

**Discourse first - we are a pre-requisite to the changes the alt wants to make. This was conceded in the 1NC. You must evaluate a discussion of dehumanization to prevent violence and corrupt ethics- that’s Dragiewicz and Lobasz from the 1AC**

**The plan is neccessar yto solve nature**

Fasching 1993 (Darrell J., Professor of Religious Studies at University of South Florida, The Ethical Challenge of Auschwitz and Hiroshima, Pp. 134-135) Bankey

Our world, says Peter Berger, is socially constructed through conversation, through which "man not only produces a world, but he also. . . . produces himself in a world." Indeed, "what appears at any particular historical moment as 'human nature' is itself a product of ~~man's~~ [humanity’s] world-building activity."9 The modern self, therefore, is exis­tential or technological. As Gabriel Vahanian has argued, the techno logical self "far from being a robot . . . is the man who makes him­self."10 And the modern managerial understanding of society is its sociological correlate. To live self-consciously in the world of culture is to realize that the primary milieu in which we dwell is not nature but language, the world of mediated meaning." Our capacity for language, for culture, and for technology is one and the same. For through language hu­mans alter the world of nature. "Poetically dwells man upon this earth," says Holderlin. Indeed, the Greek root of poeisis suggests the power "to make, or do, or bring forth," which expresses the skill or techne of the human.12 The ritual tellings and enactings of the earliest creation myths are poetic acts of primal technological skill—transforming chaos into cosmos. The metatechnological act, which provides the foundation for all other techniques, is the creation of a symbolic universe in which to dwell, a cultural world of mediated meaning. In the very mythological mimesis of nature, human beings were unconsciously creating an artificial world in which to dwell. "Myth has not brought man back to nature," says Gabriel Vahanian, "so much as it has sought to settle him in culture. . . . The mythique of man has always included a technique of the human."13

**Their critique misses the boat**

Elizabeth Jane **Sutherland** B.A., Trent University, **1996** The Concept of ‘Suffering’ in Human Rights Discourse: A Response to Richard Rorty’s “Human Rights, Rationality and Sentimentality”

Michael Ignatieff is another leading defender of a universalist theory of human rights. In The Rights Revolution, Ignatieff explores what it means to have rights and why we claim to have them: “[R]ights regimes exist not to define how lives should be led, but to define the condition for any kind of life at all, the basic freedoms necessary to the enjoyment of any kind of agency, . . . [meaning] the capacity of individuals to set themselves goals and accomplish them as they see fit.”5 In keeping with Donnelly and Gewirth, Ignatieff argues that rights require human agency to be respected above all else. Ignatieff sees the modern-day system of human rights and civic (citizenship) rights as derived from two complementary sources: residual rights of agreement (social contract rights) and human rights, i.e., those rights which people everywhere in all times have possessed even when they have not been recognized as such. “Constitutions do not create our rights; they recognize and codify the ones we already have, and provide means for their protection. We already possess our rights in two senses: either because our ancestors secured them or because they are inherent in the very idea of being human.”6 In Ignatieff’s view, inherent human rights are a “residual system of entitlement” upon which people may rely when their other rights fail them. As a typical liberal, Ignatieff argues that human rights discourse does not ‘promote’ a particular political philosophy; it simply provides a neutral framework for arbitrating between competing claims. “Rights aren’t intrinsically in the service of either progressive causes or conservative ones. They’re just there to keep our arguments orderly.” Human rights essentially provide individuals with a moral claim against the state, a claim which is recognized internationally as ‘overriding’ the system of state laws, or the rights of the state. Some nation-states do not agree with this override, and therefore refuse to ratify international human rights conventions. Ignatieff defends universal human rights, however, by arguing that they offer a way of protecting individuals from the tyranny of majority rule. At the same time, Ignatieff moderates his universalist approach to human rights by recognizing that it is not the place of the West to ‘impose’ human rights on other cultures. While human rights themselves may be universal, it is still a matter of negotiation to determine how they may be implemented. Human rights are not the trump cards that end arguments. In the real business of moral life, there are no trumps. There are only reasons, and some are more convincing than others. If this is true, then the legitimacy of human-rights interventions – the large ones that marshal armies and the small ones that intercede in personal lives – can only ever be limited and conditional.8 Thus Ignatieff argues that human rights cannot be used to justify imperialism; they can only be used as a framework for negotiating between competing conceptions of the good. While human rights themselves are universal, their application must always be subject to reasoned argument and arbitration.

#### Humans are distinct because we can recognize, control, and reverse instincts – this doesn’t mean humans should be allowed to treat animals unethically, but we’re superior

**Linker, ‘5** – Damon, Animal Rights: Contemporary Issues (Compilation), Thompson-Gale, p. 23-25.

That such arguments have found an audience at this particular cultural moment is not so hard to explain. Our popular and elite media are saturated with scientific and quasi-scientific reports claiming to prove the basic thesis of the animal-rights movement. Having once believed ourselves to be made in the image of God, we now learnfrom the human genome project, the speculations of evolutionary psychologists, and numerous other sources-that humankind, too, is determined by genetic predispositions and the drive to reproduce. We are cleverer than other animals, to be sure, but the difference is one of degree, not of kind. As Verlyn Klinkenborg wrote on the editorial page of the New York Times, "Again and again, after starting from an ancient premise of radical differences between humans and other creatures, scientists have discovered profound similarities." But have they? Genetics and evolutionary biology may be, indeed, extremely effective at identifying the traits we share with other species. But chemistry, for its part, can tell us about the ways in which we resemble chunks of charcoal, and physics can point to fundamental similarities between a man and all the matter in the universe. The problem with these observations is not that they are untrue. It is that they shed no light whatsoever on, or rather they are designed to obfuscate, what makes humanity unique as a species-the point on which an answer to the likes of Peter Singer and Steven Wise must hinge. For his part, Singer commits the same error that John Stuart Mill found in the system of Jeremy Bentham: he makes no distinction among kinds of pleasure and pain. That animals feel emotions can hardly be doubted; but human beings experience life, even at its most "animalistic" level, in a way that fundamentally differs from other creatures. Thus, Singer can account for the pain that humans and animals alike experience when they are hungry and the pleasure they feel when they eat, but he cannot explain, for example, a person's choice to starve himself for a cause. He understands that human beings, like animals, derive pleasure from sex and sometimes endure pangs of longing when they are deprived of it, but he cannot explain how or why, unlike animals, some choose to embrace celibacy for the sake of its noble purity. He is certainly attuned to the tendency we share with animals to fear and avoid pain and bodily harm, but he is incapable of understanding a man's willingness to face certain death on the battlefield when called upon to do so by his country. Still less can he explain why stories of such sacrifice sometimes move us to tears. In much the same way, the evidence adduced by Steven Wise to suggest that primates are capable of forming rudimentary plans and expectations fails to demonstrate they are equal to human beings in any significant sense. Men and women use their "autonomy" in a world defined not by the simple imperatives of survival but by ideas of virtue and vice, beauty and ugliness, right and wrong. Modern scientific methods, including those of evolutionary psychology, have so far proved incapable of detecting and measuring this world, but that does not make any less real the experience that takes place within it. Western civilization has tended to regard animals as resembling things more than human beings precisely because, like jnanimate objects, and unlike the authors of the real Magna Carta, animals have no perception of morality. Until the day when a single animal stands up and, led by a love of justice and a sense of self-worth, insists that the world recognize and respect its dignity, all the philosophical gyrations of the activists will remain so much sophistry. Putting Human Interests First **None of this**, of course, **exempts human beings from behaving decently toward animals**, but it does provide a foundation, when necessary, for giving pride of place to the interests of human beings. This has particular relevance for biomedical research. Among the most vociferous critics of the USDA's capitulation to the animal-rights movement were the nation's leading centers of medical science. The National Association for BiOlnedical Research estimated that the new regulations would cost universities alone as much as $280 million a year. Nor is the issue simply one of dollars. As Estelle Fishbein, counsel for Johns Hopkins University, recently argued in the SHOULD ANIMALS HAVE THE SAME STATUS AS PEOPLE? Journal of the American Medical Association, Genetic research promises to bring new therapies to alleviate human suffering from the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, Parkinson's disease and other neurological diseases, and virtually all other human and animal diseases. However, the promise of this new era of medical research is highly dependent on the ready availability of mice, rats, and birds. 2S Far from being a mere administrative hassle, she concluded, the new regulations would "divert scarce grant funds from actual research use, distract researchers from their scientific work, and overload them with documentation requirements. II Serious as this threat is, a still more troubling one is the effect that the arguments of animal-rights proponents may have, in the long term, on our regard for human life itself. Peter Singer's apPOintment at Princeton caused a stir not because of his writings about animals but because of his endorsement of euthanasia, unrestricted abortion, and, in some instances, infanticide. But all of his views, as he himself maintains, are of a piece. The idea that "human infants and retarded adults II are superior to animaLs can only be based, he writes, on "a bare-faced-and morally indefensible-prejudice for members of our own species. II In much the same way, Steven Wise urges us to reject absolute demarcations between species and instead focus on the capacities of individual humans and individual apes. If we do that, we will find that many adult chimpanzees and bonobos are far more "human" than newborn and mentally disabled human beings, and thus just as worthy of being recognized as IIpersons." Though Wise's inference is the opposite of Singer's-he does not wish to deprive underdeveloped humans of rights so much as to extend those rights to primates-he is playing the same game of baitand- switch: in this case projecting the noblest human attributes onto animals while quietly limiting his sample of human beings to newborns and the mentally disabled. When raising animals to our level proves to be impossible, as it inevitably must, equal consideration can only be won by attempting to lower us to theirs.

#### No link --- the 1ac doesn’t preclude the value of non-humans --- the perm also resolves the omission links

#### There is anthropocentrism in the status quo --- they have to prove the plan makes it worse

#### Permutation do the plan and < > - embracing environmental prudence is best

**Plumwood, 02** [PF PHILOSOPHY - UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, VAL, Environmental Culture: The ecological crisis of reason, p. 126-9]

It is sometimes argued, against any concern with human-centredness, that an ethic based on human interests is not only all that is needed for the conservation of nature but all that is conceivable. 6 We are humans; we cannot avoid thinking in terms of our own interests. In fact, if somehow we actually could put our own interests completely aside, we would be left with a totally useless ethics. No one would find it compelling. An ethics that considered only effects on nature and ignored humans would be irrelevant to the practical politics of environmental activism and would cut itself off from real policy debates. 7 This objection certainly has to be taken seriously. We do need. as humans. to take good care of ourselves. not leaving ourselves unsafe, unprotected or unprovided for. in short. to be prudent. 'Prudential' argument in this context then would be argument for avoidine: certain environmental practices which considers the effect of those practices on the safety, survival and welfare of human beings. Ozone depletion and pollution harm human health, overfishing destroys resources for future humans, global warming could unleash potentially catastrophic climatic change and extremes. and so on. If the core theoretical distinctions of environmental philosophy indeed must tell us that it is human-centred to take good care of human interests, if they force us to condemn as human-centred all such prudential criticisms of our treatment of nature that refer to the damage its degradation does to human beings, then they would make the ideal of escaping human- centeredness quite impractical. And if, as some critics go on to argue, the ideal of avoiding human- centredness also provides only vague alternative reasons for avoiding environmentally-degrading actions, it is a real liability for practical action. But are we in fact forced to condemn as human-centred all prudential types of environmental argument? I think this is a misinterpretation of human-centredness as well as a misinterpretation of prudence. Consider for a moment the parallel case of egocentrism. We would usually say that someone was egocentric if, among other things, that person consulted only their own outcomes, welfare or interests in deciding what courses of action to follow, and ignored outcomes for others or failed to consider them as presenting reasons for or against the action being considered (this is the extreme case - often we would say someone was egocentric when they just gave other people's interests excessively low weight). But the definition of prudence as taking care of and protecting yourself does not imply that you cannot also take care of others, any more than your taking care of orange trees means that you cannot also take care of lemon trees. Considering your own interests does not imply that you cannot also consider others' interests as well as, or as related to, your own. Prudence does not consist of counting only one's own interests as reasons for acting or not acting, as in this case, but in taking one's own interests into account in a consistent way, and counting injury to them as among your reasons for avoiding an action. The idea of prudence says nothing about consulting your own interests to the exclusion of others. That is not prudence any more than it is rationality - it is selfishness, or egocentrism. Similarly, the ideal of avoiding human-centredness does not imply at all that humans should not be prudent, or that we cannot consider the effect of environmental damage on our own human interests along with the effect of our actions on other species and on nature generally. The critics' obiection rests on identifying prudence with something much stronger - with a kind of species selfishness that treats other beings solely as means to our own. human ends. Kant tells us that humans are to be conceived as ends-in themselves and cannot be treated as merely means to our ends, and though Kant himself restricted this kind of standing to humans, environmental philosophy typically proposes to generalise it. But the crucial phrase here is 'no more than'. We must inevitably treat the natural world to some degree as a means. for example. as a means to food. shelter and other materials we need in order to survive. iust as we must treat other people to some degree as means. In the circus, the performers may make use of one another by standing on one anothers' shoulders, for example, as a means of reaching the trapeze, but our obligation to avoid using others solely as means (or instrumentalising them, as philosophers term it) does not imply banning the circus. What is prohibited is unconstrained or total use of others as no more than means. reducing: others to means - tying some of the performers up permanently, for example, to use as steps 8. In short. then. prudential reasons and non- prudential reasons for action are not mutually exclusive; prudential and non-prudential reasons can combine and reinforce one another. and may not always be sharply separate. since any normal situation of choice always involves a mixture. The problem lies rather in the refusal to go beyond questions of human well-being and the (exclusion of non-humans from morality and value as no more than tools. unworthy of any moral consideration in their own right. Only by identifying prudence with this radical kind of species selfishness can critics discover a malaise in en vironmental ethics. There is a difference between prudence and egocentrisrn between a sensible concern which considers our own interests, perhaps together with the interests of others and a selfish and exclusive preoccupation with our own interests which fails to consult the interests of others at all. (One can see why the dominant global order might have wanted us to confuse them, and in whose interests it would be to do so). To be prudent in our dealings with nature is both essential and benign from the perspective both of nature and of ourselves; while to be governed by egocentrism or by instrumentalism in our dealings with nature is damaging but far from inevitable.

**Permutation do the plan an all other instances**

#### Abandonment of humanist values leaves us unable to act to stop atrocities and threatens the survival of the universe

**Ketels, 96** [Violet B, Associate Professor of English at Temple University “‘Havel to the Castle’ The Power of the Word,” 548 Annals 45, November, Sage]

In the Germany of the 1930s, a demonic idea was born in a demented brain; the word went forth; orders were given, repeated, widely broadcast; and men, women, and children were herded into death camps. Their offshore signals, cries for help, did not summon us to rescue. We had become inured to the reality of human suffering. We could no longer hear what the words meant or did not credit them or not enough of us joined the chorus. Shrieking victims perished in the cold blankness of inhumane silence.

We were deaf to the apocalyptic urgency in Solzhenitsyn's declaration from the Gulag that we must check the disastrous course of history. We were heedless of the lesson of his experience that only the unbending strength of the human spirit, fully taking its stand on the shifting frontier of encroaching violence and declaring "not one step further," though death may be the end of it—only this unwavering firmness offers any genuine defense of peace for the individual, of genuine peace for mankind at large.2

In past human crises, writers and thinkers strained language to the breaking point to keep alive the memory of the unimaginable, to keep the human conscience from forgetting. In the current context, however, intellectuals seem more devoted to abstract assaults on values than to thoughtful probing of the moral dimensions of human experience.

"Heirs of the ancient possessions of higher knowledge and literacy skills,"3 we seem to have lost our nerve, and not only because of Holocaust history and its tragic aftermath. We feel insecure before the empirical absolutes of hard science. We are intimidated by the "high modernist rage against mimesis and content,"\* monstrous progeny of the union between Nietzsche and philosophical formalism, the grim proposal we have bought into that there is no truth, no objectivity, and no disinterested knowledge.5

Less certain about the power of language, that "oldest flame of the humanist soul,"6 to frame a credo to live by or criteria to judge by, we are vulnerable even to the discredited Paul de Man's indecent hint that "wars and revolutions are not empirical events . . . but 'texts' masquerading as facts."7 Truth and reality seem more elusive than they ever were in the past; values are pronounced to be mere fictions of ruling elites to retain power. We are embarrassed by virtue.

Words collide and crack under these new skeptical strains, dissolving into banalities the colossal enormity of what must be expressed lest we forget. Remembering for the future has become doubly dispiriting by our having to remember for the present, too, our having to register and confront what is wrong here and now.

The reality to be fixed in memory shifts as we seek words for it; the memory we set down is flawed by our subjectivities. It is selective, deceptive, partial, unreliable, and amoral. It plays tricks and can be invented. It stops up its ears to shut out what it does not dare to face.8

Lodged in our brains, such axioms, certified by science and statistics, tempt us to concede the final irrelevance of words and memory. We have to get on with our lives. Besides, memories reconstructed in words, even when they are documented by evidence, have not often changed the world or fended off the powerful seductions to silence, forgetting, or denying.

Especially denying, which, in the case of the Holocaust, has become an obscene industry competing in the open market of ideas for control of our sense of the past. It is said that the Holocaust never happened. Revisionist history with a vengeance is purveyed in words; something in words must be set against it. Yet what? How do we nerve to the task when we are increasingly disposed to cast both words and memory in a condition of cryogenic dubiety?

Not only before but also since 1945, the criminality of governments, paraded as politics and fattening on linguistic manipulation and deliberately reimplanted memory of past real or imagined grievance, has spread calamity across the planet. The cancer that has eaten at the entrails of Yugoslavia since Tito's death [hasj Kosovo for its locus," but not merely as a piece of land. The country's rogue adventurers use the word "Kosovo" to reinvokc as sacred the land where Serbs were defeated by Turks in 1389!9 Memory of bloody massacres in 1389, sloganized and distorted in 1989, demands the bloody revenge of new massacres and returns civilization not to its past glory but to its gory tribal wars. As Matija Beckovic, the bard of Serb nationalism, writes, "It is as if the Serbian people waged only one battle—by widening the Kosovo charnel-house, by adding wailing upon wailing, by counting new martyrs to the martyrs of Kosovo.... Kosovo is the Serbian-ized history of the Flood—the Serbian New Testament."10

A cover of Siiddeutsche Zeitung in 1994 was printed with blood donated by refugee women from Bosnia in an eerily perverse afterbirth of violence revisited."We stand benumbed before multiplying horrors. As Vaclav Havel warned more than a decade ago, regimes that generate them "are the avant garde of a global crisis in civilization." The depersonalization of power in "system, ideology and appa-rat," pathological suspicions about human motives and meanings, the loosening of individual responsibility, the swiftness by which disastrous events follow one upon another "have deprived us of our conscience, of our common sense and natural speech and thereby, of our actual humanity."12 Nothing less than the transformation of human consciousness is likely to rescue us.

#### Alt doesn’t solve—and if it does its worse for non-humans

**Machan, 04** [Tibor, Distinguished Fellow and Prof. @ Leatherby Center for Entrepreneurship & Business Ethics at Chapman University, “Putting Humans First: Why We Are Nature’s Favorite”, p. 11-13]

Now, one can dispute Hospers, but only by averting one's gaze from the facts. If animals in fact did have rights as you and I understand the concept of rights—rights that entail and mandate a hands-off policy toward other rights possessors—most of the creatures now lurking in lawns and jungles, at the very least all the carnivores, would have to be brought up on murder charges. This is what all the animal rights champions fail to heed, including Ingrid Newkirk, radical leader of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), who holds that it is unacceptable for us to use animals in any way at all.13 This is why they allow themselves such vile thoughts as that "the world would be an infinitely better place without humans in it at all."'4

If the scenario is absurd, it's so not because the concept of animal rights has been unfairly reduced to absurdity but because there is nowhere else to go. The idea of animal rights is impracticable to begin with; any attempt to visualize the denizens of the animal world benefiting from and respecting rights must collapse into fantasy willy-nilly.

The concept of rights emerged with the rise of human civilization precisely because it is needed by and applicable to human beings, given the specifically moral nature of human beings and their ambition to live with each other in mutual harmony and to mutual benefit. Rights have nothing to do with the lives of wolves and turtles because of what animal rights champions themselves admit, namely, the amoral nature of at least the bulk of the animal world.15

Advocates of animal rights in at least one way do admit the vast gulf between animals and humans and that humans alone are equipped to deal with moral issues. When they address us alone about these matters—when they accept all the carnage that is perpetrated by other living things, including what would be infanticide and worse if human beings were to engage in it—they clearly imply that human beings are indeed special. They imply, first and foremost, that people are indeed the only living beings capable of understanding a moral appeal. Only human beings can be implored to do right rather than wrong. Other animals just don't have the capacity for this. And so the environmentalists don't confront them with any moral arguments no matter how politically incorrect the animals may be toward one another.

### At china cp

CP Cant solve—

US Key— [Cross Apply from the case]—close proximity, transparency, US technology, and previous management expertise—China is not a sufficient partner—that’s Farnsworth

Relations—US diplomatic engagement with Venezuela will promote ties with the region—spills over to solve all conflicts—that’s Zedillo

**Can’t solve spillover which is key to stopping trafficking worldwide**

**Chuang, 6** Practitioner-in-Residence, American University Washington College ol' Law. J .D., Harvard Law School; BA., Yale University (Janie A. Chuang, Winter 2006 , “The United States as Global Sheriff: Using Unilateral Sanctions to Combat Human Trafficking”, Michigan Journal of International Law, Vol. 27, No. 2, http://papers.ssrn.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=990098&download=yes)//EM

Once an issue relegated to the margins of international human rights discourse, human trafficking has rapidly become a mainstream political concern, both internationally and domestically. Defined roughly as the recruitment or movement of persons by means of coercion or deception into exploitative labor or slavery-like practices, trafficking is an interna- tional crime and human rights violation. According to the international Labour Organization, approximately 2.5 million people are trafficked within and across borders at any point in time, generating an estimated $32 billion in profits for organized crime.' As the global economy impels more and more people to migrate under circumstances rendering them vulnerable to traffickers, governments worldwide have hastened to pass laws and initiatives to combat the problem. In the midst of this rapidly changing legal environment, the United States has emerged as a domi- nant force, with the political and financial wherewithal to influence how other countries respond to the problem of human trafficking.

**China has a terrible trafficking record—they would just screw up**

**Heavey, 6/19** (Susan Heavey, Reuters, 6/19/13, “U.S. cites Russia, China among worst in human trafficking: report”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/06/19/us-usa-humantrafficking-idUSBRE95I1LC20130619)//EM

While the Chinese government has taken some steps to address the problem, such as vowing to work with international organizations and increasing public awareness, it also has continued to perpetuate the problem in hundreds of its own institutions, the State Department report said. "Despite these modest signs of interest in anti-trafficking reforms, the Chinese government did not demonstrate significant efforts to comprehensively prohibit and punish all forms of trafficking and to prosecute traffickers," U.S. officials wrote. The report said China's one-child policy and preference for sons has led to fewer women in the country, thus increasing demand for women as brides or prostitutes. In Russia, the government "had not established any concrete system for the identification or care of trafficking victims, lacking any formal victim identification and referral mechanism," although there were some "ad hoc efforts," the report said. The citation is likely to further strain the complicated relations between the United States and the two countries, which already have been strained by the handling of the civil war in Syria and cybersecurity, among other issues. While it was not immediately clear what the Obama administration might do given the downgrade, human rights advocates and some U.S. lawmakers urged strong steps such as imposing sanctions or withholding foreign aid. They also called on the Russian and Chinese governments to take action. "China has become the sex and labor trafficking capital of the world," said U.S. Representative Chris Smith, a New Jersey Republican. "Without serious and sustained action by Beijing, it is only going to get worse."

**This corrupts their ethics which should be one of the prior questions in this round- your ballot is an endorsement of the best ethical option.**

**Perm do the plan and include China in the coop- solves China’s track record and the net benefit**

**International Fiat is bad**

**1. Destroys aff ground – they can just do the case without US involvement**

**2. Kills education – they don’t engage us in debate – instead they just have other actors do the plan**

**3. Kills fairness – they moot the 1AC – means we don’t get leverage – straight turning it is hurting ourselves**

**Voter for fairness and education**

**Chinese influence in Latin America morally terrible – US engagement is comparatively superior**

Shaiken et al ‘13[Harley. Prof in the Center for Latin American Studies at UC-Berkeley. And Enrique Peters – Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Miami. And Adrian Hearn – Centro de Estudios China-Mexixo at Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. China and the New Triangular Relationships in the Americas: China and the Future of US-Mexico Relations, 2013. Pg 7-8]

However, closer ties to China also have signifi­cant disadvantages for both Latin America and the United States:¶ Growing trade deficits. Latin American lead­ers who sign trade and investment deals with the PRC have noticed that China's exports are more affordable than their own goods, which contributes to trade deficits. Chinese goods are made by laborers who work for one-third of the wages of Latin American counterparts and who tolerate worse working conditions. Officials in Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico have signaled their unease about trade with such a hot com­petitor. In September 2005, Mexican President Vicente Fox made it clear to visiting President Hu Jintao that dumping electronics and cloth­ing was unacceptable. For every dollar that Mexico makes from exports to China, the PRC makes $31 from exports to Mexico.[9]¶ Disinterest in economic reform. Some ana­lysts believe that the commodities-based trade model used by China will undermine the progress that Latin America has made toward industrialization. While countries like Chile and Brazil have moved beyond raw materials exports, others with powerful presidents or rul­ing oligarchies may be tempted to fall back on plantation economics. Income gaps between the rich and poor may widen as a result. More­over, such narrowly focused economies are vul­nerable to downturns in commodity prices. Some 44 percent of Latin Americans already live below the poverty line. If these countries fail to adopt reforms, social inequality and political instability could depress U.S. exports to the region and increase migration problems.¶ Scramble for resources. To obtain commodi­ties, China offers tempting investments in infra­structure. In contrast, the United States cannot offer direct tie-ins to state industries and can only offer development aid, now in decreasing amounts. Chinese competition may make Mil­lennium Challenge Account (MCA) money a less effective incentive to democratize govern­ments and liberalize markets. The one-to-two year lead time from proposal to disbursement of MCA aid gives volatile governments a chance to back away from market-oriented perfor­mance requirements.¶ Evasion of American-style bottleneck diplo­macy. China's flexibility counters more rigid U.S. approaches. Obtaining any kind of assistance from the United States requires compliance on a battery of restrictions, including observing human rights, protecting the environment, prom­ising not to send U.S. military personnel to the International Criminal Court (ICC),[10] not assist­ing current or former terrorists, and not using U.S.-provided equipment for any other than its stated purpose. American commitments also depend on legislative approval and can be reversed if the mood in the U.S. Congress shifts.¶ Prying eyes on America. From electronic espi­onage facilities in Cuba to port facilities run by Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-Shing's Hutchi­son-Whampoa conglomerate in Panama, China has an eye trained on the United States. U.S. intelligence agencies are aware of this, but Washington's penchant for focusing on one threat at a time, such as the war on terrorism, could leave America vulnerable to Chinese industrial and military espionage.

Perm do both

Perm do the Plan and then the CP—solves the net benefit

**CP Cant Solve—U.S. leadership and expertise is key**

Snow, 13 --- Washington Editor (4/29/2013, Nick, “US can play constructive Western Hemisphere role, House panel told,” <http://www.ogj.com/articles/print/volume-111/issue-4d/general-interest/us-can-play-constructive-western-hemisphere.html>, JMP)

**\*\*\* Matthew M. Rooney is deputy assistant secretary in the US Department of State's Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs**

"The United States has extensive experience and has developed significant expertise in permitting, regulatory oversight, and incident response planning for conventional and unconventional resource exploration and extraction," Rooney said, adding, "The Obama administration is sharing these environmental, regulatory, legal, and commercial best practices with other countries in the region." Rooney did not mention TransCanada Corp.'s revised crossborder permit application for the Keystone XL project, which the State Department is reviewing. He noted in his written testimony that transparent, effective market structures are essential in the Americas, but major challenges must be overcome. "Countries that have pursued statist, nontransparent energy policies have seen their production decline despite high energy prices over the past couple of years," he said. "These countries have found it difficult to attract the necessary investments, both foreign and domestic, to help their energy production and economies grow. 'Avenue of engagement' Rooney continued, "But our balanced approach of focused technical cooperation and broad policy discussions has provided an avenue of engagement with most countries in the region—even some with which we have significant differences. We continue to advocate open and transparent energy markets, free from corruption and reinforced by strong protections for investments, to help countries enhance output and promote long-term economic growth." He said the US has made clear to Argentina's government that expropriating assets is a bad idea, while Chile and a few others are "fairly clean." Still others "are somewhere in the middle on transparency and anticorruption efforts," Rooney said, adding, "It's clear that in some countries, foreign companies have to have a strong stomach. That said, many US companies do business there." Other witnesses emphasized that the US will need to not make other countries feel it is not interfering in their internal affairs as it offers encouragement and assistance. That may prove difficult as China and other countries from outside the region negotiate resource agreements with teams of state energy companies and national banks, they conceded. "The US still leads the world in energy technology," said David L. Goldwyn, the Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs at the State Department during 2009-11 who now heads Goldwyn Strategies LLC. "It also has a business development model that is more favorable than China's, which is increasingly seen as colonial with employees who keep to themselves and don't work to help develop local economies." Jorge R. Pinon, associate director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at the University of Texas at Austin's Center for International Energy and Environmental Policy, said, "One thing US oil companies have done so well is that they're well separated from the federal government. We have to be careful how the US government becomes involved in US companies' overseas operations." China could realize 600,000 b/d of production from the Western Hemisphere sooner than some people think, he added. "Its companies are partners in several ventures with Statoil and Petrobras, which already have deepwater expertise," Pinon said. 'Deeply complex' Carlos Pascual, who succeeded Goldwyn as Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs at the State Department, said in his written statement that the Western Hemisphere's energy picture "is deeply complex and interconnected, with spectacular opportunities for US jobs, commercial interests, economic development, and energy supply linked to the political perspectives in Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, the Caribbean, and beyond." He noted that as world energy markets transform as a reflection of the US's own energy revolution, it has much to share and to gain from being a formative part of the picture, especially in the Americas. "From building North American energy security and shaping natural gas markets to paving the road for tomorrow's commercial and innovative transformation, the US must continue to lead, to share our best practices and lessons learned, to support transparency and an even playing field, and to give our companies and innovators access to tomorrow's energy markets," Pascual, who formerly was US Ambassador to Mexico, told the subcommittee. He said that Mexico's president, Enrique Pena Nieto, backs comprehensive energy policy reform and is working across three political parties to achieve it. "The goal is to protect Mexico's natural resources while creating conditions that attract foreign investment and participation," Pascual said, adding the country appreciates growing US congressional interest in approving and implementing the 2012 Trans-Boundary Hydrocarbons Agreement. Eric Farnsworth, vice-president of the Council of the Americas in Washington, said, "Approval of legislation to implement the agreement will be seen as a sort of 'proof of concept' to find creative ways to introduce outside investment into Mexico's energy sector. It also creates mechanisms to increase collaboration on environmental protection and disaster response, and will open new avenues for US commercial activity which has been desired for many years." Other witnesses said it's vital that any energy policy changes in Mexico be seen as internally driven, and part of bigger economic reforms. Pinon said this could be difficult since the national oil company, Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex), is only active within Mexico, unlike Brazil's Petrobras and Colombia's Ecopetrol have international operations. Chavez's legacy Witnesses acknowledged that Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez's strategy of giving several countries deep discounts on their purchases of Venezuelan crude oil was having an impact before he died earlier this year. Pascual said it perpetuated some smaller nations' dependence on diesel fuel to generate electricity, making prices in them 4-5 times higher than in the US. "We are working with them to create alternative power generation," he said. "Projects can't run for long on subsidies. They need to compete economically." Rooney conceded that the State Department has concerns about Chavez's discounts and subsidies program: Petro-Caribe. "Several countries bought into it 2-3 years ago because there was a spike in petroleum prices," Pascual said. "I don't think many, if any, did it for ideological reasons." Speaking days before Venezuelans voted to elect Chavez's successor, Rooney said the US plans to watch what happens there in the next 2 years from a distance. "We have had a testy relationship with Venezuela," he told the subcommittee. "We see possibilities to work with them on energy, narcotics, and counterterrorism. Unfortunately, they've been cool to that idea, but we hope it will change." Goldwyn added, "The conversation is going to be difficult for a while, but we need to start talking to Venezuela again. There still may be some senior people at [national oil company Petroleos de Venezuela SA] who could be helpful." Pascual said, "It bothers me that a country with so much of the Western Hemisphere's oil is broke."

**NO Link**

Elizabeth Jane **Sutherland** B.A., Trent University, **1996** The Concept of ‘Suffering’ in Human Rights Discourse: A Response to Richard Rorty’s “Human Rights, Rationality and Sentimentality”

Michael Ignatieff is another leading defender of a universalist theory of human rights. In The Rights Revolution, Ignatieff explores what it means to have rights and why we claim to have them: “[R]ights regimes exist not to define how lives should be led, but to define the condition for any kind of life at all, the basic freedoms necessary to the enjoyment of any kind of agency, . . . [meaning] the capacity of individuals to set themselves goals and accomplish them as they see fit.”5 In keeping with Donnelly and Gewirth, Ignatieff argues that rights require human agency to be respected above all else. Ignatieff sees the modern-day system of human rights and civic (citizenship) rights as derived from two complementary sources: residual rights of agreement (social contract rights) and human rights, i.e., those rights which people everywhere in all times have possessed even when they have not been recognized as such. “Constitutions do not create our rights; they recognize and codify the ones we already have, and provide means for their protection. We already possess our rights in two senses: either because our ancestors secured them or because they are inherent in the very idea of being human.”6 In Ignatieff’s view, inherent human rights are a “residual system of entitlement” upon which people may rely when their other rights fail them. As a typical liberal, Ignatieff argues that human rights discourse does not ‘promote’ a particular political philosophy; it simply provides a neutral framework for arbitrating between competing claims. “Rights aren’t intrinsically in the service of either progressive causes or conservative ones. They’re just there to keep our arguments orderly.” Human rights essentially provide individuals with a moral claim against the state, a claim which is recognized internationally as ‘overriding’ the system of state laws, or the rights of the state. Some nation-states do not agree with this override, and therefore refuse to ratify international human rights conventions. Ignatieff defends universal human rights, however, by arguing that they offer a way of protecting individuals from the tyranny of majority rule. At the same time, Ignatieff moderates his universalist approach to human rights by recognizing that it is not the place of the West to ‘impose’ human rights on other cultures. While human rights themselves may be universal, it is still a matter of negotiation to determine how they may be implemented. Human rights are not the trump cards that end arguments. In the real business of moral life, there are no trumps. There are only reasons, and some are more convincing than others. If this is true, then the legitimacy of human-rights interventions – the large ones that marshal armies and the small ones that intercede in personal lives – can only ever be limited and conditional.8 Thus Ignatieff argues that human rights cannot be used to justify imperialism; they can only be used as a framework for negotiating between competing conceptions of the good. While human rights themselves are universal, their application must always be subject to reasoned argument and arbitration.