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#### Iran deal will succeed---but Obama needs capital to stop a second round of sanctions

Parsi 11/20 (Trita Parsi is founder and president of the National Iranian American Council and an expert on US-Iranian relations, Iranian foreign politics, and the geopolitics of the Middle East, “Negotiations with Iran show promise, but true test comes later,” http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2013/11/iran-us-negotiationsgenevanuclearprogram.html)

After objections by France caused a momentary disruption, the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany (P5+1) are once again united and meeting in Geneva this week with Iranian representatives to strike a deal on Iran's nuclear program. The prospects for success appear favorable. However, it is also clear that the real hurdles to an enduring deal will not be encountered now, but after the first agreement has been concluded. This is partly because Washington's ability to give concessions has not been truly tested yet. The misinformation spread by Israeli cabinet ministers and opponents of President Barack Obama in the U.S. Congress notwithstanding, most of concessions in the first phase of the deal currently being negotiated in Geneva will be provided by Tehran. In return, the United States and European Union are offering very little. The sanctions relief is minimal and carefully avoids congressional approval. Obama has spent a lot of political capital in the past two weeks simply to convince Congress not to adopt new sanctions. If a deal is reached this week in Geneva, Obama will be faced with the much taller order of getting Congress to actually roll back existing sanctions. Unfortunately, negotiations on Iran’s nuclear program have in the past passed the first hurdle, only to fall apart during the second step, when a final deal must be concluded. Eagerness and pressure to reach a first deal, combined with lack of common clarity on what exactly had been agreed upon, contributed to this.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico is politically divisive despite supporters

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

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing renaissance is underway in North America and bilateral trade is booming, the United States and Mexico have an important choice to make: sit back and reap the moderate and perhaps temporal benefits coming naturally from the evolving global context , or implement a robust agenda to improve the competitiveness of North America for the long term . Given that job creation and economic growth in both the United States and Mexico are at stake, the choice should be simple, but a limited understanding about the magnitude, nature and depth of the U.S.-Mexico economic relationship among the public and many policymakers has made serious action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.

#### Capital is key---its on the brink and failure risks middle east war

Merry 11/19 (Robert W. Merry is political editor of The National Interest and the author of books on American history and foreign policy, “Obama and Netanyahu Go to War,” http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/obama-netanyahu-go-war-9420?page=1)

President Obama finds himself in a weakened state. His health care law is sapping his political strength and generating intense anxiety among his Democratic troops in Congress. His performance rating is at an all-time low. His trust with the American people is deteriorating badly, as reflected in a recent Quinnipiac University poll. His political capital is ebbing. And into this dire political situation comes a new challenge that will test the president’s resolve and mettle in a big way. If he wants to save his high-stakes effort to foster a negotiated agreement with Iran over its nuclear program, he must take on, directly, Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the Israel lobby in the United States. If he doesn’t, Congress will kill his effort; the opportunity to find a peaceful solution will be lost; and chances for war with Iran will rise ominously. Indeed, administration officials have warned that the current congressional push for new sanctions on Iran, in the midst of his delicate efforts, would constitute "a march to war."

#### Middle east war goes global and nuclear

Primakov 9 - Doctor of Economics, Professor, executive member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Head of the Center for Situational Analysis at the Russian Academy of Sciences

Yevgeny Primakov is President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation; Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs. The Fundamental Conflict: The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations. Russia in Global Affairs Vol 7 No 3. 2009. http://kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/105702/ichaptersection\_singledocument/71a40dca-23cb-411d-9c5d-a7ce495e2522/en/12.pdf

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS Liberty was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict. The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

## 1NC – Kritik

#### Neoliberal engagement of Latin America results in loss of value to life, political oppression, military intervention, and environmental destruction – makes extinction inevitable

Makwana 06 **–** (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization

The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.

The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.

There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.

The neoliberal experiment has **failed to combat extreme poverty**, has **exacerbated global inequality**, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.

Introduction

After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.

Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.

The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.

There is a **consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes** in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.

There is a **huge discrepancy** between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)

Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).

The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.

The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.

According to Maria Páez Victor:

“Since 1846 the United States has carried out **no fewer than 50 military invasions** and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of **perceived threats to its economic control** and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”

As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.

So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.

However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.

The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.

Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, **the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast**. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.

Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.

Economic Growth

Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.

Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.

Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.

The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.

Free Trade

Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.

With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, **increased inequality** and **caused environmental destruction**.

In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.

The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.

These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly **biased** in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.

Liberalization

The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.

According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.

Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely **destroys local industries**. It **creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices** as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and **economic crisis** in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.

A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.

#### The alternative is to refuse funding and building a micro-financing bank utilizing a feminist perspective.

Munck 03 **–** professor of Globalization and Social Exclusion(Ronaldo, Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work Studies and Globalisation and Social Exclusion Unit, University of Liverpool, “Neoliberalism, necessitarianism and alternatives in Latin America: there is no alternative (TINA)?”, Third World Quarterly, Vol 24, No 3, pp 495–511, 2003, <http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism,%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf>, ZBurdette)

Taking as its point of departure the position that **there are or must be alternatives to neoliberalism**, this article explores the issue in relation to some examples from Latin America. The 2001–02 virtual collapse of the economy of Argentina and the recent victory of Workers Party candidate, Lula, in Brazil highlight, in very different ways, the **need for a viable alternative democratic economic strategy for Latin America**. Many progressive analysts seem to be paralysed by a false ‘necessitarianism’ which grants more coherence and solidity to the neoliberal project than it merits. Argentina puts paid to that illusion. Will the exciting experience of Porto Alegre’s ‘participatory budget’ in Brazil now be scaled up to the national level or does ‘globalisation’ block this option? Do the old questions of imperialism and dependency now come to the fore again after being left dormant under the spell of globalisation? We may not have all the answers yet but Latin America is back in the foreground of thinking and practice around alternative economic theories.

**There is no alternative** (TINA) was an oft-repeated expression of Margaret Thatcher’s, **used to dismiss any plausible alternatives** to her brand of hard-nosed neoliberalism. One imagines that her friend General Pinochet, with whom she shared tea during his enforced stay in London, would agree with her. What is more surprising is the influence the TINA philosophy has had on social science analysis of neoliberalism in Latin America since Pinochet. What I propose is a radically anti-necessitarian approach to neoliberalism, inspired by the work of Roberto Mangabeira Unger. Things are not always how they are because they have to be so. **There is life beyond neoliberalism.** There are alternatives taking shape all the time at all levels of society in Latin America. The so-called Washington Consensus is no longer so consensual even in Washington and there is growing recognition that globalisation requires global governance. We therefore need to return to the rise of neoliberalism and globalisation in a nonnecessitarian spirit and examine the whole horizon of possibilities that is now opening up in Latin America as elsewhere. If the virtual collapse of Argentina in 2001–02 shows that ‘actually existing’ neoliberalism simply **does not work even on its own terms**, the exciting but also challenging prospects now opening up in Brazil under Lula underline the urgency of developing a credible and viable alternative to its policies.

## 1NC – Counterplan

#### Text: The European Union will substantially increase its economic engagement towards Mexico by funding and building a micro-financing bank from a feminist perspective.

#### EU solves – engagement with Mexico is successful and allows for Europe engagement with Latin America at large.

Secchi 08

Carlo Secchi, spring-xx-2008, Professor Senior, Department of Policy Analysis and Public Management @ Bocconi University, “Latin America is Europe’s next big missed business opportunity,” http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home\_old/Article/tabid/191/ArticleType/ArticleView/ArticleID/21072/language/en-US/Default.aspx

Brazil and Mexico are the key Latin American countries. The EU’s association agreement with Mexico is 10 years old, but it doesn’t yet have a strategic partnership with Brazil. This is partly because of the never-ending negotiation process with Mercosur, the troubled Latin American customs union that is still incomplete. The EU is currently negotiating trade liberalisation deals with all of Latin America’s regional blocs; as well as Mercosur, these are the Caribbean Community, the Central America Common Market and the Andean Community. The EU therefore needs to urge its Latin American partners towards further integration. If they were to adopt a common “rule of origin” for their products this would be an incentive to further liberalise their international trade, and thus increase it. Full trade liberalisation in Latin America, although difficult to achieve, must be made central to the European strategy. Greater trade openness would be beneficial for economic growth. But even if tariffs and quotas are progressively reduced, trade flows may remain low if other trade costs remain high. EU co-operation should be directed to lowering trade costs. The crucial issue is market access. Most Latin American countries still get poor results from their export efforts towards Europe, the exceptions being raw materials and energy sources. After the establishment of the EU-Chile free trade area, Chilean exports to the EU were substantially increased. But in the case of EU-Mexico trade liberalisation, the growth of imports from the EU has exceeded the growth of exports to Europe, resulting in a widening Mexican trade deficit with the EU. Ever since the 1999 Rio summit, the European Union has proclaimed that Latin America is a vital strategic political and economic partner. But a huge gap has remained between its words and its actions. An abrupt change in the European approach is now needed if a strategic bi-regional partnership is to be created. The European Commission apparently understands this. Although the EU does not have a strategic partnership with Brazil, its intention is to push ahead with one as fast as possible. In mid-2007 the Commission confirmed that it will be revisiting the EU’s 10-year dialogue with Mercosur, with the aim of giving new impetus to the negotiations. But there is also a keen awareness that the EU’s hope for a special relationship with Brazil must not be allowed to hinder regional integration in South America, or worsen asymmetries and imbalances within the bloc. If Latin America is to become more important as a strategic partner for the EU in the global economy, and as a more attractive market for European companies, European institutions must become more open to the needs of countries in the region. The new start by the EU, focused on the two most important players, Brazil and Mexico, could prove a promising one, because of the “pull” effect it might have on the other countries. However, this must be accompanied by measures to keep all Latin American countries on board. Otherwise, Latin America may well prove to be Europe’s next missed business opportunity.

## 1NC – Disad

#### **China-Mexico bilat increasing – we assume your collapse warrants**

The Economist 6/6 – The Economist Magazine, (“Why has China snubbed Cuba and Venezuela?”, Article Written for The Economist, 6/6/13, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2013/06/economist-explains-3>, AW)

In terms of funding, Kevin Gallagher of Boston University says China has provided more loans to Latin America since 2005 than the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank combined. The visits to Mexico and Costa Rica may also represent a pivot of sorts in terms of the type of economic relationship China has with Latin America. Up until now, China has hoovered up the region’s commodities, importing soya, copper, iron, oil and other raw materials, particularly from Brazil, Chile and Venezuela, while flooding the region with its manufactured goods. But its relations with Mexico, a rival in low-cost manufacturing, have been frosty: China accounts for only about 0.05% of Mexican foreign direct investment, and it exports ten times as much to Mexico as it imports. But as wages in China have increased and high energy prices have raised the cost of shipping goods from China to America, Beijing may be looking for bases such as Mexico and Costa Rica where it can relocate Chinese factories and benefit from free-trade agreements with the United States. This idea thrills the Mexican government, but does it pose an immediate threat to Venezuela and Cuba? Probably not: China will continue to need their staunch ideological support over issues like Taiwan, for one thing. But it does suggest that China’s economic interest in the region is broadening, especially along the Pacific coast.

#### Plan crowds out China – gives US preferential trade agreements

Regenstreif 12, Gary, Reuters, 6/12/12, (“The looming U.S.-China rivalry over Latin America”, <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/06/12/the-looming-u-s-china-rivalry-over-latin-america/>, AW)

Though the U.S. and Chinese presidents heralded a “new model” of cooperation at their weekend summit, a growing competition looks more likely. The whirlwind of activity before President Barack Obama met with President Xi Jinping in the California desert revealed that Beijing and Washington’s sights are set on a similar prize — and face differing challenges to attain it.

Their focus is Latin America and the prize is increased trade and investment opportunities in a region where economic reforms have pulled millions out of poverty and into the middle class. Latin America is rich in the commodities and energy that both China and the United States need, largely stable politically and eager to do deals.

Consider the travel itinerary: Obama visited Mexico and Costa Rica last month. Vice President Joe Biden recently went to Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago and Brazil. Chile’s president paid Obama a visit last week, Peru’s leader arrived Tuesday and Brazil’s is due in October. Meanwhile, just after Biden left Trinidad, Xi arrived, part of a tour that also took him to Costa Rica and Mexico to promote trade and cooperation. Both U.S. and Chinese officials, however, are finding a more self-confident Latin America, able to leverage its new strength to forge better agreements and find multiple trading partners. That will likely force Washington to work harder to maintain its leading trade position against China — which has money to burn in the region. “There is a more energetic [U.S.] tone, a more optimistic mood about economic agenda in second term than [the] first time,” Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington policy group, told me. “There’s something happening in the region and the U.S. wants to be part of it. Whether there’s a well-thought-out vision or policy remains a question. But there is more of an affirmation of the region and a willingness to engage.” The United States, Latin America’s largest trading partner throughout much of its history, still retains this position. Washington has now signed free trade agreements with more than a third of the hemisphere’s nations and annually exchanges more than $800 billion in goods and services with Latin America — more than three times the region’s commerce with China. In Obama’s first term, however, the administration was widely viewed as neglecting Latin America. And China has moved in fast. China built its annual trade with the region from virtually nothing in 2000 to about $260 billion in 2012. In 2009, it overtook the United States as the largest trading partner of Brazil, the region’s powerhouse — largely through massive purchases of iron ore and soy. Other data is telling: In 1995, for example, the United States accounted for 37 percent of Brazil’s foreign direct investment. That dropped to 10 percent in 2011, according to the Council of the Americas, which seeks to foster hemispheric ties.

Washington’s renewed ardor is at least partly because of the fear that China will repeat in Latin America the economic success it has built in Africa. China has been able to present itself as a benevolent partner there, which has played well against the West’s history of meddling in domestic affairs.

“It’s about influence and leverage,” said Eric Farnsworth, vice president of the Council of the Americas, “…The region matured and expects to be treated in real partnership rather than [in the] patronizing way it happened in the past.”

The challenges facing Beijing and Washington lie in how each approaches the region. Washington confronts lingering resentment about its historic regional interference, stretching back to the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, and its continuing desire to mix business with policy — which muddies its approach to trade and investment. Washington’s domestic problems, its pivot to Asia and a host of global crises, also serve as distractions that could keep its actions in Latin America from matching its words — as has happened before.

China, meanwhile, is largely viewed in the region as unencumbered by ideology. It approaches opportunities almost exclusively on commercial terms there.

Biden, in a May 29 speech in Rio de Janeiro, gushed about the progress made by Latin America and trumpeted the region’s growing international stature.

“In the U.S.,” Biden said, “the discussion is no longer what it was when I was first elected as a young man: What could we do for the Americas? That’s long since gone. The issue now is: What can we do together? We want to engage more. We think there’s great opportunity. We’re optimistic.”

As with many new starts, a recognition of past mistakes is in order. “For many in Brazil,” Biden said, “the United States doesn’t start with a clean slate. There’s some good reason for that skepticism. That skepticism still exists and it’s understandable. But the world has changed. We’re moving past old alignments, leaving behind old suspicions and building new relationships.”

China has particular interest in Mexico, the region’s second-largest market. Beijing has been competing with Mexico to supply the U.S. market with manufactured goods. But China is now looking to work with Mexico City — investing in infrastructure, mining and energy because of the expected reforms that would open the oil industry to foreign investment.

There are obstacles ahead. One irritation that President Enrique Peña Nieto shared with Xi is that though Mexico posted a trade surplus with its global partners, it ran a big deficit with China.

China is looking for even more however. It is eager to pursue a free trade agreement with Mexico, but Mexico City said last week it was too soon. Meanwhile, Mexico’s trade with the United States continues to flourish and it is due to displace Canada as the largest U.S. trade partner by the end of the decade, according to the Dialogue.

#### Lack of US economic engagement spurs China’s growth.

Erikson & Chen ‘7 – (Daniel is a Senior Associate of US Policy at the Inter-American Dialogue. Janice is a degree candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. “China, Taiwan, and the Battle for Latin America,” Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Vol. 31:2, Summer 2007, pg. 71)

China’s economic engagement with Latin America responds to the requirements of a booming Chinese economy that has been growing at nearly 10 percent per year for the past quarter century. The economic figures are impressive: in the past six years, Chinese imports from Latin America have grown more than six-fold, at a pace of some 60 percent a year, to an estimated $60 billion in 2006. China has become a major consumer of food, mineral, and other primary products from Latin America, benefiting principally the commodity-producing countries of South America-par- ticularly Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Chile. Chinese investment in Latin America remains relatively small at some $6.5 billion through 2004, but that amount represents half of China's foreign investment overseas.9 China's Xinhua News agency reported that Chinese trade with the Caribbean ex- ceeded $2 billion in 2004, a 40 percent increase from the previous year.10 China has promised to increase its investments in Latin America to $100 billion by 2014, although government officials have since backed away from that pledge and several proposed investments are already showing signs of falling short in Brazil, Argentina, and elsewhere. For their part, Latin Americans are intrigued by the idea of China as a potential partner for trade and investment. As a rising superpower with- out a colonial or "imperialist" history in the Western Hemisphere, China is in many ways more politically attractive than either the United States or the European Union, especially for politicians confronted with constituen- cies that are increasingly anti-American and skeptical of Western inten- tions. 12 Nevertheless, most analysts recognize that Latin America's embrace of China-to the extent that this has actually occurred-is intimately linked to its perception of neglect and disinterest from the United States. Nervousness about Chinas rise runs deeper among the smaller economies such as those of Central America, which do not enjoy Brazil's or Argentina's abundance in export commodities and are inclined to view the competi- tion posed by the endless supply of cheap Chinese labor as a menace to their nascent manufacturing sectors. But even as China seeks to reassure the United States that its interests in South America are purely economic, Beijing has begun enlisting regional powers like Mexico to aid its effort to woo Central American diplomats. Pressure is also being placed on Paraguay by Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, its partners in the South American Common Market (Mercosur), which places certain constraints on member states' bilateral foreign policy prerogatives. Despite its avowals to Washington, China appears to be using its economic might as a means to achieve the patently political objective of stripping Taiwan of its democratic allies in the Western Hemisphere.

#### Collase causes social unrest – results in great power war

Kane 01 – [Thomas Kane, PhD in Security Studies from the University of Hull & Lawrence Serewicz, Autumn, <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/01autumn/Kane.htm>]

Despite China's problems with its food supply, the Chinese do not appear to be in danger of widespread starvation. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the prospect entirely, especially if the earth's climate actually is getting warmer. The consequences of general famine in a country with over a billion people clearly would be catastrophic. The effects of oil shortages and industrial stagnation would be less lurid, but economic collapse would endanger China's political stability whether that collapse came with a bang or a whimper. PRC society has become dangerously fractured. As the coastal cities grow richer and more cosmopolitan while the rural inland provinces grow poorer, the political interests of the two regions become ever less compatible. Increasing the prospects for division yet further, Deng Xiaoping's administrative reforms have strengthened regional potentates at the expense of central authority. As Kent Calder observes, In part, this change [erosion of power at the center] is a conscious devolution, initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1991 to outflank conservative opponents of economic reforms in Beijing nomenclature. But devolution has fed on itself, spurred by the natural desire of local authorities in the affluent and increasingly powerful coastal provinces to appropriate more and more of the fruits of growth to themselves alone.[ 49] Other social and economic developments deepen the rifts in Chinese society. The one-child policy, for instance, is disrupting traditional family life, with unknowable consequences for Chinese mores and social cohesion.[ 50] As families resort to abortion or infanticide to ensure that their one child is a son, the population may come to include an unprecedented preponderance of young, single men. If common gender prejudices have any basis in fact, these males are unlikely to be a source of social stability. Under these circumstances, China is vulnerable to unrest of many kinds. Unemployment or severe hardship, not to mention actual starvation, could easily trigger popular uprisings. Provincial leaders might be tempted to secede, perhaps openly or perhaps by quietly ceasing to obey Beijing's directives. China's leaders, in turn, might adopt drastic measures to forestall such developments. If faced with internal strife, supporters of China's existing regime may return to a more overt form of communist dictatorship. The PRC has, after all, oscillated between experimentation and orthodoxy continually throughout its existence. Spectacular examples include Mao's Hundred Flowers campaign and the return to conventional Marxism-Leninism after the leftist experiments of the Cultural Revolution, but the process continued throughout the 1980s, when the Chinese referred to it as the "fang-shou cycle." (Fang means to loosen one's grip; shou means to tighten it.)[ 51] If order broke down, the Chinese would not be the only people to suffer. Civil unrest in the PRC would disrupt trade relationships, send refugees flowing across borders, and force outside powers to consider intervention. If different countries chose to intervene on different sides, China's struggle could lead to major war. In a less apocalyptic but still grim scenario, China's government might try to ward off its demise by attacking adjacent countries.

#### Collapse of the Chinese government causes border conflict with Russia

Lo and Rothman 6 [Bobo Lo and Andy Rothman, May 2006, Asian Geopolitics, special report http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_7057/is\_2\_9/ai\_n28498825/pg\_17/]

The second scenario for strategic conflict is predicated on a general collapse of law and order in China. With no effective central authority to contain the anarchy, millions of Chinese could cross the border into the Russian Far East. This would lead to tensions and clashes, at first sporadic and random, but subsequently escalating into interstate conflict.

#### Nuclear winter

Sharavin 01[Alexander, What the Papers Say, 10-3-01, The Third Threat]

Russia may face the “wonderful” prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia’s entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become less strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such “trifles” like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia’s armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the “Chechen” and the “Balkan” variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

## 1NC – Case

#### The ends justify the means

Isaac 2 – (Jeffrey, Professor of PoliSci @ Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD Yale, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol 49 Issue 2)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law [it] can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### In the face of extinction you have to weigh consequences - outweighs all else

Bok 88 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy @ Brandeis University, 1988, Applied Ethical Theory, ed. Rosenthal and Shehadi, pg. 203)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy,” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences.

#### This is particularly true for policymakers

Ignatieff 4 (Michael, Carr Professor of Human Rights @ Harvard, Lesser Evils, p. 18-19)

As for moral perfectionism, this would be the doctrine that a liberal state should never have truck with dubious moral means and should spare its officials the hazard of having to decide between lesser and greater evils. A moral perfectionist position also holds that states can spare their officials this hazard simply by adhering to the universal moral standards set out in human rights conventions and the laws of war. There are two problems with a perfectionist stance, leaving aside the question of whether it is realistic. The first is that articulating nonrevocable, nonderogable moral standards is relatively easy. The problem is deciding how to apply them in specific cases. What is the line between interrogation and torture, between targeted killing and unlawful assassination, between preemption and aggression? Even when legal and moral distinctions between these are clear in the abstract, abstractions are less than helpful when political leaders have to choose between them in practice. Furthermore, the problem with perfectionist standards is that they contradict each other. The same person who shudders, rightly, at the prospect of torturing a suspect might be prepared to kill the same suspect in a preemptive attack on a terrorist base. Equally, the perfectionist commitment to the right to life might preclude such attacks altogether and restrict our response to judicial pursuit of offenders through process of law. Judicial responses to the problem of terror have their place, but they are no substitute for military operations when terrorists possess bases, training camps, and heavy weapons. To stick to a perfectionist commitment to the right to life when under terrorist attack might achieve moral consistency at the price of leaving us defenseless in the face of evildoers. Security, moreover, is a human right, and thus respect for one right might lead us to betray another.

#### Reject engagement with human rights abusers — *moral duty* to shun.

Beversluis 89 — Eric H. Beversluis, Professor of Philosophy and Economics at Aquinas College, holds an A.B. in Philosophy and German from Calvin College, an M.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University, an M.A. in Economics from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. in the Philosophy of Education from Northwestern University, 1989 (“On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 2, April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 17-19)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger I want to smash your [end page 17] face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict.

But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions?¶ We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing … morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order.¶ Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in.¶ Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order.¶ An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the [end page 18] weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentant sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this?¶ First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his call for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.)¶ Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force."¶ Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it.¶ Yet not every immoral action requires that we shun. As noted above, we live in a fallen world. None of us is perfect. If the argument implied that we may have nothing to do with anyone who is immoral, it would consist of a reductio of the very notion of shunning. To isolate a person, to shun him, to give him the "silent treatment," is a serious thing. Nothing strikes at a person's wellbeing as person more directly than such ostracism. Furthermore, not every immoral act is an attack on the moral order. Actions which are repented and actions which are done out of weakness of will clearly violate but do not attack the moral order. Thus because of the serious nature of shunning, it is defined as a response not just to any violation of the moral order, but to attacks on the moral order itself through flagrant, willful, and persistent wrongdoing. ¶ We can also now see why failure to shun can under certain circumstances suggest complicity. But it is not that we have a duty to shun because failure to do so suggests complicity. Rather, because we have an obligation to shun in certain circumstances, when we fail to do so others may interpret our failure as tacit complicity in the willful, persistent, and flagrant immorality.

#### No reason aff – Mexico is doing fine

Veronica Navarro Espinosa and Eric Martin, Senior Members of the Brookings Institute, 3/12/13, (“Mexico Rating Outlook Raised to Positive From Stable by S&P”, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-03-12/mexico-s-rating-outlook-raised-to-positive-from-stable-by-s-p.html>) ALLEN

Mexico had the outlook on its credit rating raised by Standard & Poor’s on the prospect that proposed legal changes will boost growth in Latin America’s second-largest economy. The outlook on the BBB rating, the second-lowest investment grade, was changed to positive from stable, meaning it is more likely to be raised than lowered. Mexico’s currency advanced to its strongest level in more than a year while yields on benchmark peso bonds fell to a record. “The prospects for the passage of policies that further strengthen the country’s fiscal room for maneuver and medium- term growth have improved under” the administration of President Enrique Pena Nieto, who took office Dec. 1, S&P analyst Lisa Schineller wrote today in a report. Pena Nieto won support from his party last week to advance an agenda that includes ending state-owned Petroleos Mexicanos’s 75-year monopoly on the oil industry. The party also removed its opposition to taxing food and medicine, giving Pena Nieto the option to propose such a strategy to raise revenue. He already signed a bill to improve education by making teachers more accountable for performance, and last year as president-elect helped pass a labor-system overhaul designed to boost productivity. Finance Minister Luis Videgaray said today in a post on Twitter that S&P’s change in outlook is “good news and motivates us to keep working.” Peso Rallies The peso extended gains after the announcement, rallying 0.8 percent, the most among major emerging-market currencies, to 12.4451 per U.S. dollar, the strongest level since September 2011. Yields on peso bonds due in December 2024 fell nine basis points, or 0.09 percentage point, to 4.92 percent, the lowest on a closing basis since they were issued in 2005, according to data compiled by Bloomberg. Mexican central bank Deputy Governor Manuel Sanchez, in a report dated March 11, said it’s “necessary” that investors and banks take into account that interest rates will rise sooner or later. “A challenge to confidence in Mexico is the prudent management of capital inflows,” he said. “The possibility of a reversal of capital flows requires prudence.” Rate Cut The central bank cut its benchmark interest rate 50 basis points, or 0.5 percentage point, to 4 percent on March 8, the first reduction in more than three years after Sanchez in a Feb. 27 interview said he didn’t see a case for a rate cut because inflation and inflation expectations have remained above the central bank’s 3 percent target. S&P and Fitch Ratings lowered Mexico’s rating one level in November and December 2009, respectively, as the economy contracted 6.2 percent and crude oil output from Petroleos Mexicanos declined. Moody’s Investors Service has kept Mexico’s Baa1 rating unchanged since 2005. In a telephone interview today, Schineller said that passage of Mexico’s key economic bills must precede any upgrade in the nation’s credit rating. “We want to see passage and evaluation of the likely impact of any kind of reform” before an upgrade can be considered, she said. Yields on sovereign securities moved in the opposite direction of what ratings suggested in 53 percent of 32 increases, decreases and changes in credit outlook last year, according to data compiled by Bloomberg published in December. Investors ignored 56 percent of Moody’s rating and outlook changes and 50 percent of those by S&P. That’s worse than the longer-term average of 47 percent, based on more than 300 changes since 1974. Mexico’s BBB rating from S&P is five levels below Chile’s AA- rating. Moody’s rates Mexico one level higher at Baa1. Mexico last received an upgrade from S&P in October 2007.

#### Microfinance reinforces gender discrimination

Momaya 9 (Masum, Curator of International Museum for Women, Honors Bachelor’s degree in Public Policy and Feminist Studies from Stanford University, master's in Education and a doctorate in Human Development and Psychology from Harvard University, on the board of the Third Wave Foundation; 10/14/2009; “More than Microfinance;” <http://www.imow.org/economica/stories/viewStory?storyid=3660>//NDW)

Research shows that women repay their loans in higher rates than men and that while men often spend loan money on themselves, women are more likely to use their loans to improve their businesses(4). Women also tend to spend their income on healthcare, education, their families and their children--all spending priorities that help alleviate poverty(5). As a result, women have become the top targets of microfinance institutions (MFIs). However, this attention has proved a mixed blessing. Unscrupulous lenders may exploit women’s "dependability" by charging very high interest rates and encouraging them to take out larger loans than necessary to finance their businesses. Moreover, because of their better access to credit, some women are expected to earn a living while still assuming traditional caretaking duties--and while still being excluded from major household decisions. Without accompanying changes in social beliefs and attitudes, access to economic opportunities doesn’t guarantee that women’s situations will improve.

#### Microfinance fails – privatization, corruption, and exclusion

Momaya 9 (Masum, Curator of International Museum for Women, Honors Bachelor’s degree in Public Policy and Feminist Studies from Stanford University, master's in Education and a doctorate in Human Development and Psychology from Harvard University, on the board of the Third Wave Foundation; 10/14/2009; “More than Microfinance;” <http://www.imow.org/economica/stories/viewStory?storyid=3660>//NDW)

Political science researcher Matthew Ruben points out that "the popularity of microfinance has the potential to distract from other vital antipoverty measures. It is easy for donors and governments to create and fund credit programs and ignore other, potentially more serious problems faced by the rural poor. Microfinance by itself does not solve the need for medical services, infrastructure, education and land reform"(6). These are needs that poor women and families cannot be expected to fulfill for themselves; rather, they need resources from governments, the private sector and civil society organizations. In many countries, however, governments, banks and the private sector are either failing to step forward, highly corrupt or offering "solutions" that only serve to entrench poverty rather than dismantle it. For example, the privatization of social welfare programs in most countries means that MFIs are often expected to provide necessary services for the poor--services that were once the responsibility of governments. This is not problematic in and of itself, but there is little incentive for private groups to actually do so, and privatized services may place profit over access and affordability. Even in cases where governments are ready to step in and, for example, build and maintain schools, roads, utility services, job training programs, health clinics and the like, their own financial vulnerability often compromises their ability to make significant, long-term investments. Poorer countries usually borrow money for structural improvements at very high interest rates and under very constraining conditions from other governments, as well as from international financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. This increases governments’ debt and ultimately handicaps their efforts, since many of the resources go to loan negotiation and repayments rather than building infrastructure or providing services. Moreover, due to rampant corruption within many governments, much of the money from these loans is pocketed well before it makes it into the hands of those who need it most. The loans also come with multiple restrictions about who gets money and for what, most often leaving women out. Community-based activists, including women, are routinely excluded from high-level discussions between finance ministers and loan officers; plans for use of the money are frequently top-down, unrealistic and ineffective. Even efforts that begin with the best intentions can go sour, and resources are then lost. Many experts also fear we are becoming overly reliant on microfinance as the primary vehicle for global poverty alleviation. Scholars like Heloise Weber at the University of Aberdeen, for example, have argued that the dominance of microfinance as a strategy could pave the way for banks to take over the roles of governments--and make huge profits in the process. This has major implications for future access to microfinance and the affordability of repayments.

#### **No root cause of conflicts—prefer specificity**

Moore 4 (John Norton, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia He formerly served as the first Chairman of the Board of the United States Institute of Peace and as the Counselor on International Law to the Department of State, Winter, “Beyond the Democratic Peace: Solving the War Puzzle”, 44 Va. J. Int'l L. 341, Lexis Law)

If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty and social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, perceptions of "honor," and many other factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these factors may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high-risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling armed conflict. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents. [n158](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1329520437445&returnToKey=20_T13973620735&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.647208.6119287203#n158) Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war that is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may doom us to war for generations to come.

#### War is a cause of gender, not vise versa

**Martin**, Brian 19**90**. Professor of Social Sciences in the [School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication](http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/ssmac/index.html) at the University of Wollongong. “Uprooting War.” <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/90uw/uw10.html>

While these connections between war and male domination are suggestive, they do not amount to a clearly defined link between the two. It is too simplistic to say that male violence against women leads directly to organised mass warfare. Many soldiers kill in combat but are tender with their families; many male doctors are dedicated professionally to relieving suffering but batter their wives. The problem of war cannot be reduced to the problem of individual violence. Rather, social relations are structured to promote particular kinds of violence in particular circumstances. While there are some important connections between individual male violence and collective violence in war (rape in war is a notable one), these connections are more symptoms than causes of the relationship between patriarchy and other war-linked structures.

**Isolating gender as the root cause essentializes women and reinforces oppression**  
Ticker, prof of IR, 92**—**professor at the School of International Relations, USC. B.A. in History, U London. M.A. in IR, Yale. PhD in pol sci, Brandeis U (Ann, Gender in International Relations Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, AMiles)Building on the notion of hegemonic masculinity, the notion of the citizen-warrior depends on a devalued femininity for its construction. In international relations, this devalued femininity is bound up with myths about women as victims in need of protection; the protector/protected myth contributes to the legitimation of a militarized version of citizenship that results in unequal gender relations that can precipitate violence against women. Certain feminists have called for the construction of an enriched version of citizenship that would depend less on military values and more on an equal recognition of women's contributions to society. Such a notion of citizenship cannot come about, however, until myths that perpetuate views of women as victims rather than agents are eliminated.  
One such myth is the association of women with peace, an association that has been invalidated through considerable evidence of women's support for men's wars in many societies. 79 In spite of a gender gap, a plurality of- women generally support war and national security policies; Bernice Carroll suggests that the association of women and peace is one that has been imposed on women by their disarmed condition. 80 In the West, this association grew out of the Victorian ideology of women's moral superiority and the glorification of motherhood. This ideal was expressed by- feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman whose book Herland was first serialized in The Forerunner in 1915. Gilman glorified women as caring and nurturing mothers whose private sphere skills could benefit the world at large. 81 Most turn-of-the-century feminists shared Gilman's ideas. But if the implication of this view -was that women were disqualified from participating in the corrupt world of political and economic power by virtue of their moral superiority, the result could only be the perpetuation of male dominance. Many contemporary feminists see dangers in the continuation of these essentializing myths that can only result in the perpetuation of women's subordination and reinforce dualisms that serve to make men more powerful. The association of femininity with peace lends support to an idealized masculinity that depends on constructing women as passive victims in need of protection. It also contributes to the claim that women are naive in matters relating to international politics. An enriched, less militarized notion of citizenship- cannot be built on such a weak foundation.

#### Challenges to gender norms results in backlash – domestic violence

**Cheston and Kuhn 2**[Susy Cheston, Senior Vice President, Policy and Research, Opportunity , International, and Executive Director Emeritus of the Women’s Opportunity Fund. Lisa Kuhn, Program Analyst, Opportunity International Research sponsored by the Women’s Opportunity Fund and its funding partners: Elizabeth Foster and Michael Walsh, Gems of Hope USA, and the Morrow Charitable Trust. Publication sponsored by UNIFEM. “Empowering Women through Microfinance” http://storage.globalcitizen.net/data/topic/knowledge/uploads/201101311419705.pdf 7/8/2]//DLi

Impact on Family Relationships and Domestic Violence Although there have been a few studies44 that have asserted that women’s participation in microfinance leads to an increase in domestic violence, most practitioners have reported the opposite experience. The concerns arise over a “backlash effect” that may occur as a result of women challenging gender norms and asserting their rights. Microfinance programs can strengthen women’s economic autonomy and give them the means to pursue nontraditional activities. In some cases, women who begin to assert themselves 42 Kabeer, Conditions and Consequences, 20. 43 From surveys conducted by ADAPTE loan officers in October–December 2001 on behalf of the authors. 44 See, for example, Anne Marie Goetz and Rina Sen Gupta, “Who Takes the Credit? Gender, Power, and Control over Loan Use in Rural Credit Programs in Bangladesh,” World Development 24, no. 1 (1996): 45– 63.1 and their opinions in their households incur the wrath of angry husbands who feel their authority and sometimes their reputations are being threatened by their wives’ behavior. Although there are many good reasons for MFIs to be watchful for potential rises in domestic violence, the bulk of the evidence and experience thus far seems to point to the conclusion that participation in microfinance strengthens and improves family relationships rather than destroying them. Poverty, scarcity, and feelings of helplessness take an undeniable toll on personal relationships. Many practitioners have found that family relationships can be strengthened when the home becomes a more comfortable place to be, and when each member of the family feels secure in his or her ability to contribute productively to the family. Women at Sinapi Aba Trust in Ghana, for example, clearly attributed the increase in respect from their husband and the reduction in arguments to their economic contribution and a reduction in scarcity. Naila Kabeer’s study of SEDP shows women making a direct causal link between their contribution to the household and a reduction in abuse. For example, one client of SEDP quoted by Kabeer states: He gives me more value since the loan. I know, because now he hands all his earnings to me. If I had not gone to the meeting, not taken a loan, not learnt the work, I would not get the value I have, I would have to continue to ask my husband for every taka I needed. . . . Before, my husband used to beat me when I asked him for money, now, even if he doesn’t earn enough every day, I can work, we don’t have to suffer.45 Balbina, a client of ASPIRE, Opportunity’s partner in the Dominican Republic, described the frustration that she and her husband felt about their poverty and their inability to work productively to change their situation. That changed when she used her first loan to invest in a business making and selling chicharrones (pork rind snacks) together with her husband. She talked about the difference within their home as a result of having productive work and greater assets: “We were fighting tooth and nail because my husband was unemployed and we had nothing to do. Now we work together, and each of us has something productive to do and a way to direct our energies.”46 Hashemi et al. found fewer incidences of violence against women among women who were members of credit organizations than they found among the general population. Although fear of public exposure clearly played a role in the reduction of violence, there is considerable anecdotal evidence of women attributing the reduction of abuse directly to their access to credit and their economic contribution to the household. Another study by Schuler et al. suggests that the level of women’s economic contribution to the family may also be significant.47 45 Kabeer, ‘Money Can’t Buy Me Love’? 44. 46 Personal interview. 47 S. M. Hashemi, R. R. Schuler, and A. P. Riley, “Rural Credit Programs and Women’s Empowerment in Bangladesh,” World Development 24, no. 4 (1996): 635–53; S. R. Schuler, S. M. Hashemi, A. P. Riley, and A. Akhter, “Credit Programs, Patriarchy and Men’s Violence against Women in Rural Bangladesh,” Social Science and Medicine 43, no. 12 (1996): 1729-42. 2 Evidence suggests that participation in microfinance programs may give women the means to escape from abusive relationships or limit abuse in their relationships. Working Women’s Forum found that 40.9 percent of its members who had experienced domestic violence stopped it because of their personal empowerment, while 28.7 percent were able to stop it through group action.48 CSD in Nepal also noticed a greater resistance to wife beatings and alcoholism among its clients.49 And in Bangladesh, where social pressure to remain married is high, Kabeer found that several women in abusive relationships were able to establish spheres of autonomy for themselves within their marriage so that they would have to depend on their husbands as little as possible.50 There is anecdotal evidence of reducing domestic violence against children as well. For example, Sabina Cutiba, a client of ADEMCOL, Opportunity’s partner in Bogotá, Colombia, had experienced a lifetime of abusive relationships but learned a new way to interact with her children as a result of her Trust Bank program. “I used to fight, complain a lot, be negative. I would complain to friends of mine and cry out with my frustrations. . . . This lady who has been giving these conferences and talking with me has really strengthened me. I’ve had a total change. . . . Before I used to beat my children. I hit them a lot. But not anymore—now I’m a different person.” In spite of fears by some that giving loans to women could disrupt social order and destroy families,51 there is little evidence of this occurring. In her study of both male and female clients of SEDP, Naila Kabeer found that women were much more likely to seek the strengthening of their relative position within an interdependent relationship with their husbands than they were to seek independence and autonomy.52

#### Microfinance fails without welfare programs

Latin American Bureau 12 (7/16/12; “An Overview of Microfinance in Latin America;” <http://lab.org.uk/an-overview-of-microfinance-in-latin-america//NDW>)

The fact that the poor have turned out to confound prejudice and been extremely good at managing and making money, given minimal opportunities, is paradoxically a reminder that many are too poor to be helped by small loans. In 95% of cases, repayments are met, showing those receiving these loans are very capable of managing risk considering their limited resources. While microfinance can help those who can absorb credit into an existing activity, this still leaves many people too poor to help themselves. For them, social policy experts are calling for a simple recipe: just give money to the poor. The effects of cash transfers, as they are called, have been similar to microfinance across the region. Recipients have invested the cash in welfare and education to rise above the poverty line. These programmes are a reminder that there is still a role for the state in distribution and welfare, before market solutions such as microfinance can be workable.

#### Mexican microfinance fails to be used for empowerment

Abbott 12

Kate Abbott, graduate from Stanford, worker for Bloomberg, 7/10/12, “A Microfinance 'Heretic' on How to Fix the Industry,” http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-07-10/a-microfinance-heretic-on-how-to-fix-the-industry

When did you begin to see problems with microfinance?¶ We saw problems from the very beginning. In Mexico it was very clear that a lot of the clients weren’t engaging in entrepreneurial activity. Interest rates were pretty high, and poverty reduction was underwhelming. Money was rarely being used to help anyone. It was going to buying new TVs.

# Block

## CP

**EU soft power can work in Mexico – civil society reforms prove**

**Reed ’12** (John Reed, 2/12, Issue 14-ofi press magazine, <http://theofipress.webs.com/eumexicorelations.htm>)

 The other major political development contained in the Global Agreement was the human rights conditionality clause.  This clause is a fundamental part of the projection of EU soft power, and was the first time the EU had successfully done so.  Mexico signed the Global Agreement with the full understanding that it could be suspended in the face of serious human rights abuses.  For some this was seen as a violation of sovereignty, but it clearly was a new political frontier, from which all future dialogue was based. (Szymanski & Smith, 2005)The one area where there have been substantial efforts has been engagement with Civil Society, most visible through a series of four EU-Mexico Civil Society Forums that have taken place over the years, the last one being in October 2010 in Mexico.  Discussions have been wide and varied, and there has been considerable EU influence in the establishment of a Mexican civil society, given that Mexico has no direct equivalent of the institutionalised European Economic and Social Committee. (EESC)  The continual conclusion of the Civil Society forums has been the need for an EESC equivalent, but this has not yet come to pass. (Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 2010)

### A2– Perm to Both

Plan crowds out Europe---natural US advantages

Rubio Rios 13 (Luis Arnoldo Rubio-Rios, xx-xx-2013, Universidad Estatal a Distancia (UNED), Costa Rica, “Europe Interest in Latin America,” http://euce.org/eusa/2013/browse.php?sort=author)

The first question we have to ask is if Latin America is a region of interest for European Trade? The answer to this question is Yes. It's true that Latin America has been traditionally an area of influence by the United States of America, but these days, in times of globalization, competing for new markets and a strong currency is only natural. This effort has been reflected since the 70´s and 80´s, during the Central American crisis. In addition, the EU has always been interested to develop integration in Latin America and its policy of engagement within the region as counterweight to other programs that the U.S. has in this area. It’s important to understand that the partnership that the EU has with the U.S. is contradictory. Geographical proximity of the United States with Latin America and the role of the US dollar in capital flows, have been decisive to consolidate its commercial, economical, financial and political influence throughout the region.

## Mexico

**Economic collapse turns the aff**

Friedman 6 (Benjamin, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, “THE MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH,” February 6, http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/friedman/files/The%20Moral%20Consequences%20of%20Economic%20Growth.pdf)

I believe this thinking is seriously, in some circum- stances dangerously, incomplete. The value of a rising standard of living lies not just in the concrete improve- ments it brings to how individuals live but in how it shapes the social, political and, ultimately, the moral character of a people. Economic growth—meaning a rising standard of liv- ing for the clear majority of citizens—more often than not fosters greater opportunity, tolerance of diversity, social mobility, commitment to fairness, and dedication to democracy. Ever since the Enlightenment, Western thinking has regarded each of these tendencies positively, and in explicitly moral terms. Even societies that have already made great advances in these very dimensions, for example, most of today’s Western democracies, are more likely to make still further progress when their living standards rise. But when living standards stagnate or decline, most societies make little if any progress toward any of these goals, and in all too many instances they plainly retrogress. Many countries with highly developed economies, including the United States, have experienced alternating eras of economic growth and stagnation in which their demo- cratic values have strengthened or weakened accord- ingly.

Nuclear War amplifies social tensions and creates violence- evacuation

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, Pg 73]

Ikte recognized the potential for conflict between rural and suburban populations and urban evacuees. He believed that despite rural resistance, the overwhelming numbers of evacuees would force a grudging sharing of goods. However, this may not be the case. Limited nuclear war is strongly biased by its very nature to create the potential for these conflicts. Moreover, the problem is likely to be exaggerated in the United States. If the central city population is evacuated to the suburban and rural areas, the racial composition of the population will change. Almost 25 percent of the population in the central cities of the 157 SMSAs discussed above is nonwhite, while only 6 percent of the suburban and rural population is nonwhite. Moreover, the income distribution is very different, with the inner cities generally being poorer. Thus a combination of class and racial conf1ict may exacerbate the social tensions that existed in a situation similar to England in World War II. This will be particularly true if the war remains unterminated for any substantial period of time. This type of emerging racial conflict arose in Japan at the end of World War II: "The Koreans, who have been imported for labor, are feared and suspected of plotting against the Japanese .... Rumors and recrimination regarding a scapegoat minority such as the Koreans rose especially sharply. Given the changing but still unstable state of relations between white and nonwhite, and rich and poor groups in the United States, a dangerous conflict-laden situation might emerge under the conditions of terror and stress. Add to this the normal urban-suburban rural lifestyle dichotomies, and there is the potential of extreme disruption, perhaps even more long-lasting and threatening to societal stability than the physical damage.

#### Anti-Americanism Link – sparks nationalist backlash – plan’s also a flip-flop

Miroff, 5/14 Correspondent @ Washington post, expertise in Latin America; graduate @ UC Berkeley in Journalism; studied Spanish and Latin American Literature at UC Santa Cruz (Nick, May 14th, 2013 *Washington Post* “In Mexico, restrictions on U.S. agents signal drug war shift” http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-05-14/world/39250614\_1\_calderon-years-mexican-security-forces-better-results)//JES

His move to rein in American agents has been mostly depicted by analysts in terms of Mexican nationalism, consistent with the legacy of Peña Nieto’s Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), which ruled Mexico for most of the 20th century. “The PRI has always had misgivings about Uncle Sam, and every new PRI president has tried to diminish dependence on the U.S.,” said George Grayson, a Mexico scholar who has written extensively about the drug war. “It is traditional PRI nationalism and shouldn’t surprise anyone,” he said. But Peña Nieto officials argue that the centralization of intelligence sharing is a common-sense move intended to streamline coordination among its security forces. And although U.S. officials worked more closely than ever with Mexican counterparts under Calderon, the relationship took several bruises. Among the more trust-damaging was the botched gun-walking scheme dubbed Fast and Furious and other U.S. operations like it, which let hundreds of illegal firearms fall into the hands of Mexican gangsters. American agents also ended up sowing division among Mexico’s security forces by seeming to favor the marines over its army and federal police.

#### Independent link – flips flop PC

**Cohen 97** Jeffrey E. Cohen, professor of political science at Fordham University, 1997(Presidential Responsiveness and Public Policy Making, p. 123)

A president cannot, without good reason, alter his policy stance. And even if he has good reason to change his policy position on an issue, he may have to bear some costs from doing so. The public and other political elites may view him as waffling, indecisive, weak, uncommitted, and/or duplicitous. This seems very much to be one of the major charges against Bill Clinton’s presidency. After abandoning his campaign promise of a middle-class tax cut because of budget deficit pressures, Clinton reoffered a tax cut in the wake of the devastating 1994 midterm elections, in which his party lost control of Congress. From being publicly cool toward the North American Free Trade pact during his presidential election campaign, he became an ardent promoter of that policy once in the Oval Office. From these, and many other occasions, Clinton has developed an image of a waffling politician, one who is forever changing his mind, perennially trying to stake out the most popular position with the public and not necessarily a president who is able to lead.

## Case

#### Economic opportunities without property rights fail – property rights are key to solving gender inequality

Hallward-Driemeier and Tazeen(Mary Hallward-Driemeier and Tazeen Hansen, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/11960/730710PUB0EPI001200pub0date01004012.pdf?sequence=1> //Q)

Expanding opportunities for women has intrinsic value. It is also instrumental in fostering development. Realizing the potential of all people is needed to ¶ ensure growth, productivity, and a vibrant society. Empowering Women: Legal ¶ Rights and Economic Opportunities in Africa brings new data and analysis to ¶ recommend how best to move this agenda forward.¶ Strengthening the incentives and abilities to pursue opportunities expands ¶ women’s economic empowerment. Property rights are central in this process ¶ because they ensure that people can reap the benefi ts of their eff orts. Policy ¶ makers shape property rights through laws and regulations, and the legal system ¶ supports their enforcement. Yet despite their importance, before the publication ¶ of this volume, no study had looked systematically across Sub-Saharan Africa to ¶ examine the impacts on women’s economic empowerment.¶ Assessments of laws and regulations governing the business environment ¶ rarely examine whether they have diff erent impacts on women and men. Th ey ¶ fail to do so partly because they look at issues such as how to register property ¶ or enforce contracts, presuming that everyone can own property or enter into ¶ a contract. A major contribution of this book is to demonstrate that in many ¶ Sub-Saharan countries, economic rights for women and men are not equal. ¶ Areas of family law, inheritance law, and land law are not generally included in ¶ studies of business regulations. But it is precisely these areas of law that defi ne ¶ legal capacity and the ability to own and control assets—and it is in these areas ¶ that explicit gender gaps are most likely.¶ To document the gender gaps in formal economic rights, the book draws ¶ on the Women’s Legal and Economic Empowerment Database for Africa ¶ (Women–LEED–Africa). Covering all 47 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, this ¶ new database provides detailed indicators and links to statutes, constitutions, ¶ and international conventions on issues of legal capacity, marital property, land ¶ ownership, and labor law. Th e book’s recommendations focus not only on specifi c substantive changes to the law but also on ensuring that rights are enforced ¶ and the system of justice is made more accessible. Th e recommendations also ¶ Foreword ¶ xvii

#### No solvency – no macrofinance, bad usage, and high interest rates

Momaya 9 (Masum, Curator of International Museum for Women, Honors Bachelor’s degree in Public Policy and Feminist Studies from Stanford University, master's in Education and a doctorate in Human Development and Psychology from Harvard University, on the board of the Third Wave Foundation; 10/14/2009; “More than Microfinance;” <http://www.imow.org/economica/stories/viewStory?storyid=3660>//NDW)

In economics, people frequently use terms such as "micro" or "macro." Nowadays, "micro" is generally associated with microcredit or microfinance, two terms that have become synonymous with the popular practice of giving small loans to people--most often women--to start small businesses and make money for themselves and their families. "Macro" sometimes hints at large sums of money, but it can also mean the high-level structural reform of institutions that have deep impacts on the economy, such as banks and governments. A look at microfinance's successes and shortcomings in helping women and their families get out of poverty shows that macro-level structural reforms--not just more microfinance--are needed to help overcome poverty. Does microfinance actually alleviate poverty? On one hand, it gives people who are disenfranchised a chance to earn money and participate financially in society. It offers steady employment and helps individuals establish the verifiable credit histories necessary to secure savings accounts, credit and loans. Microfinance can succeed in generating income for whole families and communities, and sometimes helps local, indigenous industries bloom in places where there is little other economic development. On the other hand, there are a number of challenges and negative repercussions to microcredit, some of them unforeseen. Because of extreme poverty, many borrowers take out loans for household expenses rather than for their businesses(1). In some cases, women even take out loans to pay for their daughters’ dowries; dowry prices can go up when it becomes known that women have access to microcredit(2). Moreover, some microfinance institutions charge exorbitantly high interest rates, causing borrowers to become trapped in cycles of debt. When women don’t have enough income to make payments, they may borrow from within their social network, sell household goods, reduce food consumption and seek out additional work(3). These behaviors are unsustainable, and show that access to credit doesn’t guarantee an end to poverty. Financial inclusion doesn’t necessarily translate into economic independence or empowerment, especially when the burden of poverty alleviation remains on poor women themselves and discriminatory cultural practices further disadvantage women.

#### Microfinance isn’t enough, it’s just one dimension of a complex system

**Cheston and Kuhn 2**[Susy Cheston, Senior Vice President, Policy and Research, Opportunity , International, and Executive Director Emeritus of the Women’s Opportunity Fund. Lisa Kuhn, Program Analyst, Opportunity International Research sponsored by the Women’s Opportunity Fund and its funding partners: Elizabeth Foster and Michael Walsh, Gems of Hope USA, and the Morrow Charitable Trust. Publication sponsored by UNIFEM. “Empowering Women through Microfinance” http://storage.globalcitizen.net/data/topic/knowledge/uploads/201101311419705.pdf 7/8/2]//DLi

Given the enthusiasm that many donors and practitioners have shown for the empowering potential of microfinance, why are many MFIs reluctant to focus on women’s empowerment when designing their systems and programs? Their rationales range from the belief that empowerment will happen naturally as a result of a good microfinance program to the concern that paying attention to empowerment will distract MFIs and their managers from running their institutions sustainably. In this section we explore a few of these concerns. Does Access to Credit Automatically Leads to Empowerment? The basic theory is that microfinance empowers women by putting capital in their hands and allowing them to earn an independent income and contribute financially to their households and communities. This economic empowerment is expected to generate increased self-esteem, respect, and other forms of empowerment for women beneficiaries. Involvement in successful income-generating activities should translate into greater control and empowerment. Closer examination shows us, however, that this equation may not always hold true and that complacency in these assumptions can lead MFIs to overlook both opportunities to empower women more profoundly and failures in empowerment. The ability of a woman to transform her life through access to financial services depends on many factors—some of them linked to her individual situation and abilities, and others dependent upon her environment and the status of women as a group. Control of capital is only one dimension of the complex and ever-changing process by which the cycles of poverty and powerlessness replicate themselves. Women also face disadvantages in accessing information, social networks, and other resources they need to succeed in business and in life. Only by evaluating the needs of women will an MFI be able to maximize its empowerment potential.

#### Microfinance fails without welfare programs

Latin American Bureau 12 (7/16/12; “An Overview of Microfinance in Latin America;” <http://lab.org.uk/an-overview-of-microfinance-in-latin-america//NDW>)

The fact that the poor have turned out to confound prejudice and been extremely good at managing and making money, given minimal opportunities, is paradoxically a reminder that many are too poor to be helped by small loans. In 95% of cases, repayments are met, showing those receiving these loans are very capable of managing risk considering their limited resources. While microfinance can help those who can absorb credit into an existing activity, this still leaves many people too poor to help themselves. For them, social policy experts are calling for a simple recipe: just give money to the poor. The effects of cash transfers, as they are called, have been similar to microfinance across the region. Recipients have invested the cash in welfare and education to rise above the poverty line. These programmes are a reminder that there is still a role for the state in distribution and welfare, before market solutions such as microfinance can be workable.

#### Mexican microfinance fails to be used for empowerment

Abbott 12

Kate Abbott, graduate from Stanford, worker for Bloomberg, 7/10/12, “A Microfinance 'Heretic' on How to Fix the Industry,” http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-07-10/a-microfinance-heretic-on-how-to-fix-the-industry

When did you begin to see problems with microfinance?¶ We saw problems from the very beginning. In Mexico it was very clear that a lot of the clients weren’t engaging in entrepreneurial activity. Interest rates were pretty high, and poverty reduction was underwhelming. Money was rarely being used to help anyone. It was going to buying new TVs.

## 1NR – Overview

#### **Economic downturns fuel more human trafficking – flips the aff**

LaFranchi 9—Howard LaFranchi, staff writer Christian Science Monitor (“Economic downturn fuels human trafficking”, 6/17/09, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/2009/0617/p02s07-usgn.html>, zs)

The economic downturn is adding a new dimension to the global problem of human trafficking – known as modern-day slavery – as workers desperate for income accept increasingly onerous conditions or fall prey to international cheap-labor rings. The result, according to the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons report, is an increase in the number of countries, primarily in the developing world, that are either overlooking rising incidents of trafficking and bondage, or are failing to enforce the laws they've passed to curb the problem. The report, which covers 2008 but which is the Obama administration's first on the issue, places 52 countries and territories on the watch list of countries that are not doing enough to stem human trafficking, up from 40 countries last year. "In a time of economic crisis, workers are more vulnerable … and persons under economic stress are more likely to fall prey to the wiles of traffickers," says Luis CdeBaca, director of the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. The uptick in countries on the US watch list reflects both the increased number of countries included in the ranking this year – up by 20 to a total of 173 countries – and the tighter standards passed by Congress last year for judging a country's performance. But the economic crisis is clearly another factor, says Mr. CdeBaca. As economies have soured, more workers in sectors ranging from agriculture and fishing to construction and domestic services have fallen prey to employers who deny wages, claiming they are owed debts workers are unable to repay, or who use an employee's murky legal status to force them into bondage. Traditionally, human trafficking has been associated with the international sex trade. And forced prostitution of women and children remains a major contributor to trafficking, but CdeBaca notes that the International Labor Organization this year estimates 12.3 million cases of human bondage worldwide, of which just over one-tenth, or 1.5 million, are thought to be cases of sexual servitude. In more evidence that labor trafficking isn't getting enough attention from economically-strapped countries, the State Department notes that of the 2,983 convictions reported worldwide, only 104 were for trafficking in the labor sector. One the bright side, the State Department showcases Nigeria, a country that this year moved up to the elite list of countries that fully comply with the minimum international standards for protecting trafficking victims. Highlighting Nigeria's "political will" to address the issue, CdeBaca says, "I can't talk about it enough" as an example for other countries. Not so encouraging was Malaysia, which suffered a downgrade of its ranking over evidence of increased trafficking of Burmese refugees for servitude in the South Asian country. The downgrade reflects the findings of a US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations report earlier this year that exposed rampant exploitation and trafficking of Burmese migrants and refugees – often with the collaboration of Malaysian officials. Domestic and international anti-slavery organizations have been crucial in highlighting cases and ending abusive practices, says the new US report – the ninth since human trafficking legislation was passed in 2000. One such organization is the Touch a Life Foundation, a Dallas-based organization working to rescue victims ranging from boys enslaved by fishermen on Ghana's Lake Volta to girls and women in sexual servitude in Cambodia. Pam Cope, Touch a Life's cofounder, says the traditional acceptance of servitude in some cultures and lax enforcement of existing laws are contributing to human trafficking as much as the economic downturn. "I don't really see it having so much to do with the poor economy. I just think human trafficking has become a huge money-making industry," she says, adding that too many countries fail to enforce the laws they have to stop it. That's the case of Cambodia, she says, where authorities look the other way as visiting foreigners exploit locals for sex and other services. A different case is Ghana, she says, where her organization is working with local men to rescue small boys enslaved by fishermen and to educate tribal chiefs about the long-term impact of slavery on their communities. "I'm hopeful with Ghana," she says, "because the people we're working with there are really taking this effort to end this slavery and making it their own."

## 1NR – Link

#### Spending offsets guarantee gridlock over *how* to pay

CongressNow, 08 (1/7, lexis)

Lobbyists and think tank experts tell CongressNow that **partisan bickering could stop timely relief** from reaching taxpayers. Several observers suggested Congressional pay-as-you-go budget rules **that** mandate tax cuts and **spending increase be offset could slow action. "If you look at the way the politics** of paygo **works out, it is almost a guarantee of inaction** when issues like this [stimulus package] arise," said Michael Franc, vice president of government relations at the Heritage Foundation. "**It's almost a** guarantee of gridlock**."**

#### NAFTA proves

Villarreal and Fergusson 13 – Specialists in International Trade and Finance (M. Angeles, Ian F., 02/21, “NAFTA at 20: Overview and Trade Effects,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42965.pdf)

NAFTA was controversial when first proposed, mostly because it was the first FTA involving two wealthy, developed countries and a developing country. The political debate surrounding the agreement was divisive with proponents arguing that the agreement would help generate thousands of jobs and reduce income disparit y in the region, while opponents warned that the agreement would cause huge job losses in the United States as companies moved production to Mexico to lower costs. In reality, NAFTA did not cause the huge job losses feared by the critics or the large economic gains predicted by supporters. The net overall effect of NAFTA on the U.S. economy appears to have been relatively modest, primarily because trade with Canada and Mexico account for a small percentage of U.S. GDP. However, there were worker and firm adjustment costs as the three countries adjusted to more open trade and investment among their economies.

#### Engagement with Mexico sparks backlash – Congress doesn’t trust Mexico

AP ‘13

(5/2/13, Associated Press, “Obama to Pitch Immigration Overhaul in Mexico” <http://www.newsmaxworld.com/Newsfront/obama-immigration-mexico-trip/2013/05/02/id/502393>)

For Pena Nieto, Obama's visit is a chance for him to showcase his country's economic gains. After suffering along with the U.S. during the recession, its economy is now growing at a better clip than that of the U.S. Per capita income has gone from an annual $7,900 two years ago to $10,146. ¶ ¶ But Diana Negroponte, a Latin America expert at the Brookings Institution, says corruption remains endemic, human rights are still a problem, and efforts to change and improve the judicial system have been too slow.¶ ¶ "There is concern on our side of the border that greater help needs to be given in order for Mexico to reform its system," she said.¶ ¶ Pena Nieto's changes in the security relationship with the U.S. have prompted some U.S. officials to speculate that the new president might be embracing the policies of his Institutional Revolutionary Party, which long has favored centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ ¶ Among those watching the new steps is Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., who has held up $228 million sought by the Obama administration for Mexico under a security cooperation agreement. Under the agreement, known as the Merida Initiative, Congress has already given Mexico more than $1.9 billion in aid since 2008.¶ ¶ But Leahy, chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the State Department budget, has been a critic of how the money has been used and with the results.¶ ¶ "Congress has been asked for a significant new investment, but it's not clear what the new Mexican government's intensions are," Leahy said in a statement to The Associated Press. "We're in a period of uncertainty until we know enough to be able to reset that part of our relationship. I'm not ready to sign off on more money without a lot more details."

#### More evidence – the PRI and Nieto ensure backlash

Johnson ‘13

[Tim. International Desk for McClatchy Newspapers. “Obama, Mexico’s Leader Link Trade to Immigration” The Miami Herald, 5/2/13 ln]

Yet the return of the PRI, as the ruling party is called here, has caused some unease in Washington as Mexico has reshuffled its public security apparatus and ended a practice of allowing U.S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies to interact directly with their Mexican counterparts. Now, those U.S. agencies must go through a single gatekeeper, the powerful Interior Secretariat.¶ “When he arrived in power, Enrique Pena Nieto took away the ‘all access’ badge. The United States misses the era of (former President Felipe) Calderon,” Carlos Loret de Mola, a prominent newspaper columnist, wrote Thursday in El Universal.

## 1NR – Impact

#### CCP collapse sparks nuclear lashout.

Rexing 5 – (San – Epoch Times International – August 3rd -- http://www.theepochtimes.com/news/5-8-3/30931.html)

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to postpone its life. The CCP, that disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, coupled with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. The “speech,” free of all disguises, lets the public see the CCP for what it really is: with evil filling its every cell, the CCP intends to fight all of mankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. And that is the theme of the “speech.” The theme is murderous and utterly evil. We did witness in China beggars who demanded money from people by threatening to stab themselves with knives or prick their throats on long nails. But we have never, until now, seen a rogue who blackmails the world to die with it by wielding biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. Anyhow, the bloody confession affirmed the CCP’s bloodiness: a monstrous murderer, who has killed 80 million Chinese people, now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

## 1NR – Link

#### Economic integration with Mexico hurts China

Mares and Canovas 10 – [David R. Mares & Gustavo Vega Cánovas, the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (San Diego), the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Center (Washington DC), El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (Tijuana), and El Colegio de México (Mexico City).The U.S.-Mexico Relationship: Towards a New Era?, 2010, <http://usmex.ucsd.edu/assets/024/11635.pdf>]

This chapter begins by briefly characterizing the most recent period of US-Mexico relations, the NAFTA era since 1994. We trace the origins, purposes, and the impact of NAFTA in the two economies and societies. A second section lays out the parameters of a new era in the bilateral relationship, paying particular attention to the challenges to both countries raised by the processes of globalization and democratization. Globalization’s impact on the relationship is best captured in the rise of China and consequent displacement of Mexico in trade relations with the US. Democratization complicates policy responses but improves the likelihood that policy will have some consistency over time. The inadequate manner in which the two countries have responded up to now to these challenges is highlighted. A third section discusses the essence of any appropriate response to these challenges: economic integration. The failure of integration at a regional level is discussed, but we note that Mexico’s long border with the US means that the options open to Brazil, Argentina and Chile in diversifying their economic relations simply are not viable for Mexico. A fourth section evaluates the current relationship and offers suggestions to improve the two countries’ abilities to respond effectively to today’s challenges. Whether Mexico or the US like it or not, they are destined to walk together if they want to be successful in this globalized economy. The conclusion speculates on whether the countries will move towards a more collaborative or distant relationship, thus helping to set the context for the in-depth discussions in subsequent chapters

## 1NR – Trade now

#### **Mexican officials agree – bilat cooperation is good and will continue**

Meade 5/22 – José Antonio Meade, Mexico's secretary of foreign affairs, (“Mexico and China can benefit from stronger relationship”, 5/22/13, <http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1242897/mexico-and-china-can-benefit-stronger-relationship>, AW)

Mexico is in a great moment. Macroeconomic stability and a low debt rate are part of our strengths as one of the world's top 15 economies. We are an economy with a broad social perspective fully inserted into international trade, with an exchange of goods and services that amounts to more than US$700 billion each year. We offer a secure and trustworthy environment for foreign investment. Our political institutions show increasing strength and vitality. Our country has vast amounts of natural resources, a solid industrial basis and increasing innovation, as well as a privileged geographic location. This moment of our history embodies an important promise of well-being and development for Mexican people through structural reforms, key for the country's development. We are a nation determined to transform itself and to grow. From the beginning of his administration, President Enrique Peña Nieto committed to boost a significant national effort aimed at achieving prosperity by means of fighting against poverty and inequality, by providing high-quality education across the country and consolidating Mexico as an actor with global responsibility. To reach national goals, foreign policy will contribute to Mexico's development as never before. At the same time, our country will consolidate its position as an advocate of international order and stability, as a supporter of global free trade, as a friendly and safe destination for foreign investment, and as a responsible state and promoter of peace and human development. Mexico is convinced that no other part of the world today has the growth and dynamism of the Asia-Pacific region. Mexico respects and admires China's universal input. Since the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1972, both nations have forged strong bonds of friendship, solidarity and co-operation with enormous potential mutual benefits. This was recognised by President Peña Nieto and President Xi Jinping during their meeting in April as part of the Boao Forum for Asia when they agreed to raise the relationship to new levels. Progressively but surely, Mexico will have a greater presence in the area of rapid growth, global development and innovation that the Asia-Pacific region has become. Mexico and China have the opportunity to consolidate their ties. Political dialogue, trade, investment, education, science, technology, tourism and culture are priorities in an expanding bilateral agenda. We are countries in motion, in the process of transformation. I am convinced that the people of Mexico and China will benefit from a bilateral relationship sustained on a greater strategic and long-term vision.