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### 1NC T – Quid Pro Quo

#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

## Politics

### 1NC DA

#### Comprehensive immigration reform will pass – Obama is pushing.

Elizabeth Liorente, 9-06-2013, politics editor, Fox News Latino, “Already Facing Uphill Battle, Immigration Reform Could Be Doomed By Syrian Conflict,” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/09/06/already-facing-uphill-battle-immigration-reform-could-be-doomed-by-syrian/>

“It looks like a lot of excuses for not passing immigration reform,” said Audrey Singer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C., think tank. “But the pressure is on. I don’t think this Congress wants to be blamed for not moving things forward on immigration.” Singer said although immigration efforts have been underway before — such as in 2007, when Bush was heavily involved, and veteran political leaders Sen. John McCain, an Arizona Republican, and Sen. Ted Kennedy, a Massachusetts Democrat, spearheaded the work in Congress — and then failed, this time is different. “We are not seeing a huge push against moving forward with immigration reform like we saw in 2007,” Singer said. “That includes key people in leadership positions, who were talking about immigration reform in 2007 in not a positive way.” Anastasia Mann, a visiting associate for the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, said that this time, there is too large a groundswell of support for an overhaul to immigration — particularly the aspect that would bring many of the nation’s undocumented immigrants out of the shadows. “Business people need reform to happen, workers need this to happen,” she said. Obama administration officials, meanwhile, adamantly rejected the notion that immigration reform is in peril. They insisted President Obama is not giving up on immigration. “An American president has to be able to walk, chew gum and juggle at the same time,” Dan Pfeiffer, a senior adviser to Obama, told The New York Times. “The president and his team will do everything they can to implement his overall agenda while this [Syria] debate happens.” Frank Sharry, the executive director of America’s Voice, a pro-immigrant lobby group that is regular contact with lawmakers over immigration reform measures, remained optimistic that a comprehensive could still pass before the end of the year.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico kills CIR – sparks mass Republican backlash.

Michael Shear, 5-5-2013, NYT White House correspondent, “In Latin America, US Shifts Focus from Drug War to Economy,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted.” “Drugs today are not very important to the U.S. public over all,” she added, “but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.” Representative Michael T. McCaul, a Texas Republican who is chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against the danger of drug cartels forming alliances with terrorist groups. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division.

#### Political capital is key to immigration reform.

Thomas Barr1 and Iam Bloom2, 8-30-2013, writer and activist whose work has been featured on CNN.com and other locations across the net1, writer for Guardian Express2, “Will Obama Save Immigration Reform?” <http://guardianlv.com/2013/08/will-obama-save-immigration-reform-video/>

Will Obama save immigration reform and issue an executive order to placate the movement? “Some people feel like we need to cut our losses, legalize as many people as we can,” Juanita Molina, of Humane Boarder, told the National Journal. Proponents are now looking to an alternate method to pass some type of legislation to push along the reform movement. “Organizers think long term, so they know that legislation is one way, but that DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program), has proven that the administration can provide another way,” said Richard Morales, director of deportation prevention for the PICO National Network. He had reached out to faith based organizations by email and cultivated support for an alternative approach. Critics contend that the Republicans are sandbagging the issue and truly would like for the reform issue to fail. “The only solution to this problem is for Congress to fix the broken immigration system by passing comprehensive reform,” a spokesman said. “The White House cuts off the conversation whenever it comes up. They want to keep the pressure on Republicans to pass legislation, as do we,” said Frank Sharry of America’s Voice. “Our goal is legislation that will put the 11 million (current undocumented immigrants) on an eventual path to citizenship. That’s permanent protection for millions of people,” said Sharry. Sharry’s group is intent on winning the legislative fight and pushing for movement on the issue. It is believed that Sharry also supports white house action on the issue if it is called for. Will it come down to White House support and Obama saving immigration reform garnering the support of the growing Hispanic base? Many believe that it may occur, if not the threat could force the hand of the Republicans to take action.

#### Immigration reform is key to US agricultural production and exports.

Bruce Nelson1 and Anthony Preite2, 8-22-2013, a fourth-generation Montanan and wheat farmer, serves as state executive director of the USDA Montana Farm Service Agency1, serves as state director of USDA Rural Development in Montana2, “Comprehensive immigration reform: Pro-growth and pro-agriculture,” <http://www.minnesotafarmguide.com/news/opinion/comprehensive-immigration-reform-pro-growth-and-pro-agriculture/article_03173f1c-0aaa-11e3-9b82-0019bb2963f4.html>

Earlier this year, the U.S. Senate passed a commonsense immigration reform measure in a strongly bipartisan fashion. This was an important step in the right direction – especially for producers, farm workers and rural communities. The historic legislation passed by the Senate provides a pathway to earned citizenship for the 11 million people who are in our country today without authorization. They will have to go to the back of the line, pay fines and settle taxes they owe our nation. It would modernize the system that we use to bring skilled workers into the United States. And it would put in place the toughest border security plan that America has ever seen – building on steps that have reduced illegal border crossings to their lowest level in decades. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office found that the Senate bill would reduce the deficit over the next 20 years by nearly $850 billion, and the Social Security Administration estimates that this immigration bill would add nearly $300 billion to the Social Security system in the next decade. This bill is also important for rural America. Recently, the White House economic team released a new report highlighting the positive economic benefits that commonsense immigration reform would provide for agriculture and rural communities. The report highlights research showing that without a stable workforce, America’s record agricultural productivity will decline in coming years. In Montana, for example, eliminating the immigrant labor force would cost more than $12.5 million in short-term production losses. The Senate bill addresses this concern by taking much-needed steps to ensure a stable agricultural workforce, and a fair system for U.S. producers and farm workers. In particular, it would give qualifying farm workers an expedited path to earned citizenship, as long as they continue to work in agriculture. A new temporary worker program would replace the current H-2A visa program over time, and allow farm workers a three-year visa to work year-round in any agricultural job. This commonsense system wouldn’t just prevent a decline in production – it would grow the economy. Research highlighted in the White House report projects that an expanded temporary worker program would increase both production and exports across our agriculture sector. Under the Senate proposal, USDA would play a greater role in implementing farm labor programs and ensuring that farmers and ranchers have all the information they need. As Congress continues to work on this issue, Secretary Vilsack and all of us at USDA are committed to working with lawmakers to be sure they have any technical assistance they might need to finalize these proposals. Immigration reform is very important for farmers, farm workers and communities across rural America. The majority of our agriculture workforce is made up of immigrants, and their hard work has helped America's farmers and ranchers lead the world. To remain competitive and keep driving economic growth in rural America, we need rules that work. Rural America needs Congress to act as soon as possible to carry forward the work of the U.S. Senate and fix today's broken immigration system.

#### Increased US food production solves global price shocks – brink is now.

Suzanne Goldberg, 7-24-2012, US environment correspondent of the Guardian, “US Drought Could Spell Another Global Food Crisis,” <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2012/07/us-drought-global-food-crisis>

America is the world's largest producer of corn, dominating the market. Corn is also connected to many food items—as feed for dairy cows or for hogs and beef cattle, as a component in processed food—expanding the impact of those price rises. That means the effects of the drought will travel far beyond the Midwestern states baking under triple-digit temperatures, said Robert Thompson, a food security expert at the Chicago Council of Global Affairs. "What happens to the US supply has an immense impact around the world. If the price of corn rises high enough, it also pulls up the price of wheat," he said. He went on: "I think we are in for a very serious situation worldwide." Some analysts are predicting a repetition of the 2008 protests that swept across Africa and the Middle East, including countries like Egypt, because of food prices. In 2008, the food shock was due to rising prices for rice and wheat. This time, it's because of corn and soybeans, and there were no signs of shortfall in rice or wheat production. But the full effects of the American drought will likely take several months to emerge. Its severity will be determined by a number of additional risk factors. Global grain stocks have reached a new low, with the US and other countries running down their reserves. "There are no reserves of these foods in the US anymore," said Sophia Murphy, a fellow at the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. That means there is no room for maneuver for countries forced to import grains. Thompson also warned that countries could make matters worse by stockpiling—putting further pressure on prices. That was the pattern during the 2008 food crisis when Russia, Ukraine, India, and Argentina all cut off grain exports. It was unclear as well whether America's demand for ethanol would further limit the amount of corn on the world market. About 40 percent of America's corn is used for ethanol—which helps drive up the price of corn, analysts say. But there were some reports that American ethanol plants were in shutdown across the Midwest, because high corn prices made production uneconomic. "What's difficult is that we see a drought happen today but people really are going to be feeling that six months from now, possibly a year from now," said Marie Brill, a policy analyst at ActionAid. But she said it was already clear the reduced supply and high prices of corn and soybeans were set to cause serious hardship—especially among poor people in poor countries which depend on imported grain. Countries that are net importers of corn could be hit the hardest, including South Korea, Japan, Peru, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Columbia. Much of East Africa will be badly affected, she said. Even those African countries that produce their own corn will suffer because they are locked into the higher global prices, she said. West Africa is already in food crisis. "If supply is as awful as the US government is predicting we're going to see another round of high prices and another increase in hunger," Murphy said.

#### Price spikes cause global instability – collapses Russia and China – highest risk of war.

Matthey Lynn, 1-26-2013, financial journalist based in London, “Food prices may be catalyst for 2013 revolutions,” <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/food-prices-may-be-catalyst-for-2013-revolutions-2013-01-16>

LONDON (MarketWatch) — What is the trigger for a revolution? Sometimes it a brutal act of repression. Sometimes it a lost war, or a natural catastrophe, that exposes the failings of a regime. But more often than not, it is soaring food prices. The easiest prediction to make for 2013 is that everything we eat will once again rise sharply in price. So where will the revolutions start this year? Keep an eye on Algeria and Greece — and if you want to feel very nervous, Russia and China. And if you are smart, keep your money out of those countries as well. The link between the cost of feeding your family and political turmoil is too well-established to be ignored. We saw it most recently with the Arab Spring of 2011. The uprisings that deposed the autocracies of the Middle East had their roots in food inflation. Most of the Middle East countries import 50% or more of their food, making them acutely vulnerable to rising commodity prices. In Egypt the food inflation rate hit 19% in early 2011. For President Hosni Mubarak that was game over. The regime was finished. It goes back much further than that, however. Failed harvests in France in 1788 and 1789 meant that the cost of bread soared. From taking 50% of the average working man’s wages it went up to 88%. The result? The French Revolution. The economists Helge Berger and Mark Spoerer have pinned the European revolutions of 1848 on the soaring price of wheat. Likewise, a shortage of food and soaring prices led to strikes in Petrograd in 1917 — and sparked the Russian Revolution. So there isn’t any question that food inflation can create revolts. There are other factors at play as well, of course. The Swiss don’t take to the barricades when the price of fondue goes through the roof. It usually takes a repressive regime, a rising middle class, a lot of unemployment and an aging leader who has gotten out of touch to complete the picture. But soaring food prices are often the spark: once that is lit, the flames take hold. Nor can it be disputed that food is rising in price right now. The U.S. is set to have a poor harvest this year because of a widespread drought. So will Russia and the Ukraine, both massive wheat producers. Europe, not a particularly major agricultural power, had the opposite problem. Too much rain, even by drizzly British standards, has wreaked havoc on basic crops such as potatoes. The price of chips is now going through the roof right across Europe. In France, for example, potato prices have gone from $40 a ton to $330, an eight-fold increase. Other major food markets are just as bad. Corn and soybean prices already hit record highs last year, and, even if they have fallen back a little in recent weeks, they could easily start climbing again in the summer. The United Nations food agency has already warned that 2013 is likely to see dangerous rises in food prices. That comes against the backdrop of an increasing long-term shortage of food. A surge in global population and the increasing wealth of many developing nations — richer people eat more, and they eat more meat as well, which increases demand for animal feed — means the long term trend in food is upwards. Against that backdrop, it doesn’t take much tightening of supply to send prices rocketing. So if you figure that rising food prices create revolts, and prices will rocket this year, then where might we see political turmoil? It is a question that matters to investors, because a revolution means a collapse in stock-markets. Just take a look at Egypt in 2011 — the Cairo index plunged from 7,200 to 3,600 as the regime fell. If the revolt is big enough, markets may tumble globally. Algeria is one obvious candidate. It was the one country that didn’t get caught up in the Arab Spring. But it has many of the same issues as Libya and Egypt. Don’t be surprised to see demonstrations on the streets there. Morocco may well get caught up in the turmoil. And food shortages may spell the end for President Bashar Assad in Syria. Greece is the second possibility. Unemployment is now at 27%. Many people are on the breadline — and bread is about to get a lot costlier. There are increasing reports of people having to rely on food handout in Athens and other major cities. Taxes are constantly being pushed higher to meet the deficit targets and wages are still being cut and jobs slashed. More expensive food could easily be the spark for an extremist party to seize power and take the country out of the euro. More worrying still, Russia. There have already been protests against the autocratic rule of Vladimir Putin. Rising grain prices have toppled Russian leaders in the past — Putin could follow the czars into oblivion. It is the Russian grain harvest that has been especially badly hit, and this is still a country where poverty is widespread. Putin has stayed in power thanks to rising living standards. If they drop, his regime will be under pressure. Or, most seriously of all, China. It has grown much richer, but there are millions and millions of people who have moved to the new cities — if they start to go hungry that could prompt a wave of rebellions. Cold weather is playing havoc with food supplies there. Usually, it could import more food if it needed it. But this year that won’t be possible — or at least only at huge cost. Minor revolts in the Middle East don’t have the potential to knock more than local markets. Egypt was the major stock market in the region, and that has already been through a regime change. But a Greek exit from the euro, or a Russian or Chinese political rebellion, would massively destabilize the global economy — and send equity, bond and currency markets into turmoil. Whichever nation it is, it looks like food may be the most likely cause of turmoil in the markets this year.

## Elections Reform Conditions CP

### 1NC CP

[CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought to offer to negotiate as an economic partner with Mexico in the Trans-Pacific Partnership if, and only if, the government of Mexico instates re-election procedures within the Mexican federal government, establishes and enforces term limits, strengthens the independent electoral system, standardizes electoral practices at state and local levels, and implement an improved law enforcement system to prevent electoral, police and judicial fraud and coercion.]

#### Conditioning economic ties on election and law reform solves the case and eliminates political corruption in Mexico.

Alex Velez-Green et al, 10-19-2012, writer for the Harvard Political Review, author for the Harvard Institute of Politics National Security Student Policy Group, Robin Reyes, graduated from the University of Alabama with a degree in International Business and International Studies, organized the 2011 Emprende tu México summit on creating a climate for investment and entrepreneurship in Mexico, Master’s in the field of Government from Harvard University, studied at Harvard Business School and the Kennedy School of Government, Anthony Ramicone, Institute of Politics @ Harvard University, “Governmental, Judicial and Police Corruption,” <http://www.iop.harvard.edu/sites/default/files_new/research-policy-papers/TheWarOnMexicanCartels.pdf>

One way to reduce political corruption is to instate reelection procedures within the Mexican federal government. Within the current system, politicians are unable to seek a second term in office, and thus make decisions without fear of electoral repercussions. By giving politicians a chance at reelection, these procedures would make politicians more responsive to voters since voters can punish politicians whom they deem corrupt. Given Mexico’s history under the dictator Porfirio Diaz, it would be difficult to convince the Mexican public to support this kind of measure.30 Therefore, for this system to be effective, term limits would have to be established and enforced. Furthermore, Mexico would have to strengthen the independent electoral system (IFE), standardize electoral practices at state and local levels, and implement other mechanisms—including an improved law enforcement system—to prevent electoral fraud and coercion. Altering the mechanisms of funding between the Mexican federal and state governments would decrease corruption as well. Recently, the federal government has begun to provide performance-based funding; money is allocated to states for a specific purpose, and future funding depends on whether states have met said goals. The federal government should attempt to expand this policy. It should prepare counter-drug policies—such as restructuring municipal police forces—as goals for the state; as these goals are met, more money would be allocated to sustain these efforts and accommodate state-chosen projects. The federal government should make it clear that if the goals are met, then, more funding will be provided to states for uses of their choosing as long as they are transparent with the use of these funds. The above-mentioned proposals center upon steps to be taken by the Mexican government. To encourage these changes within Mexico, the United States should use American financial assistance, such as the Merida Initiative, as leverage over the Mexican legislature. Specifically, the U.S. should attach conditions mandating progress towards the above goals with assistance payments. To influence state and local policies in a more direct way, the U.S. should apply targeted funding on a much more individualized and localized basis. It can target funding, stipulating that as certain programs or policies are implemented by municipalities, such as restructuring the local police system, they would receive additional funding. These policies and programs should require independent oversight. This type of direct pressure at a local level should be done, as it will require much less bureaucracy and will produce more direct results.

#### Election reform is key to solve corruption – inaction collapses Mexican democracy.

NYT, 6-24-2009, the New York Times, American daily newspaper, has won 112 Pulitzer Prizes, more than any other news organization, “Crime Threatens Democracy, Mexico’s President Warns,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/25/world/americas/25mexico.html>

President Felipe Calderón said Wednesday that the future of democracy in Mexico was at stake in the government’s fight against official corruption and organized crime. He also criticized politicians whom he accused of wanting to return to the era when drug gangs were tolerated. Mr. Calderón also called for making legislators more accountable to the public. He proposed reducing the number of federal lawmakers and allowing them to serve more than one term, making them eligible to face the judgment of voters by running for re-election. Speaking at a conference on security, the president gave a scathing appraisal about how far corruption had reached into the Mexican government. “What is at stake today is not just the result of an election, but rather the future of democracy, of representative institutions,” he said. For many years, Mr. Calderón said, “crime was allowed to grow, expand and penetrate.” “Perhaps people thought it was a manageable thing,” he added. Mr. Calderón said that Mexico, where more than 10,800 people have died in violence connected with the illicit drug trade and other forms of organized crime since he took office in December 2006, “is at a historical crossroads.” “To turn one’s head, to act as if you don’t see the crime in front of you, as some politicians want to do, is no option for Mexico,” he said. Midterm elections are scheduled to be held on July 5. Mr. Calderón painted a grim picture of the security situation in some of the most violent parts of the country, noting that crime gangs and drug cartels were carrying out “an interminable recruitment of young people without hope, family, opportunities, future, beliefs or convictions.” He added, “They turn up dead in some morgue, and nobody claims their bodies, as happens with more than 30 percent of the bodies in the most violent cities, like Ciudad Juárez,” across the border from El Paso. In Ciudad Juárez on Wednesday, unidentified assailants tossed gasoline bombs into a billiard hall and a money exchange office. More than 30 businesses were burned in the city last year; threats of arson in Ciudad Juárez are often made by extortionists linked to drug gangs. Mr. Calderón repeated calls he made earlier in his political career as a member of Mexico’s Congress for reducing the number of federal legislators. There are now 500 seats in the Chamber of Deputies and 128 in the Senate. He did not propose specific numbers, but he contended that having fewer lawmakers would make it easier to hold them accountable for the quality of their work. He also said that permitting legislators run for re-election would make them more accountable to their constituents. In the current system, elected officials from the president to federal lawmakers to town officials can serve in a specific post for only a single term, which is generally three or six years. As Mr. Calderón warned about corruption, the authorities in the northern city of Monterrey said Wednesday that soldiers who raided a modest illicit drug lab had found a list suggesting possible links between the police and organized crime.

#### Mexican democracy collapse kills global democracy – effective transition causes modeling.

Shannon K. O’Neal, 4-29-2013, a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization, “Two Nations Indivisible: Mexico, the United States, and the Road Ahead,” <http://mexidata.info/id3609.html>

Diplomatically, we also need to rethink the United States' approach in light of Mexico's ongoing political transformation. A stronger partnership provides the best platform for a prominent U.S. twenty-first century foreign policy priority: democracy promotion. Despite frequent misunderstand¬ings our long shared history, intertwined economies, and strong personal and community links provide the constant multilayered interaction necessary to work together toward the complex goal of strengthening democracy. Joint economic development initiatives, support for local citizen organiza¬tions, and efforts to increase transparency and strengthen courts and police forces will all benefit from the strong links that already exist between our two nations. Mexico, not the Middle East, should be the test case for solidifying market-based democracy. It is not only much more likely to succeed, but also arguably much more likely to hurt the United States if it fails. Mexico's success is more probable because it has already taken many tough steps, all on its own. After seventy years of one-party rule, Mexicans used their votes to usher in an opposition party president. Abandoning a long history of ballot-box stuffing, Mexico's parties now compete in quite clean and trans-parent elections. The country's over 100 million citizens dream of—and are already working hard to create—a vibrant and prosperous political system where their voices can be heard and their hard work rewarded. If successful, Mexico would provide a positive example of a newly consolidated democracy, offering lessons for others worldwide. Nevertheless, it still faces considerable challenges. Many in fact worry that Mexico’s democratic gains may be lost, overcome by political bosses, special interests, and drug-related violence. And Mexico’s failure would lead to disastrous consequences for U.S. foreign policy, not to mention America’s economic, political, and social well-being at home. The United States’ focus elsewhere—particularly in Asia and the Middle East—has distracted us from the game-changing importance of political choices being made just next door.

#### Democracy solves extinction.

Larry Diamond, 1995, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

## China Advantage CP

### 1NC – CP

#### CP TEXT: The United States federal government should intensify negotiations for a U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty, invite China to engage on the TPP when Beijing feels it is able to do so, direct the Department of Commerce and the and the U.S. Trade Representative to establish a consultative arm to help Chinese firms understand the pertinent U.S. investment laws and regulations; and indicating U.S. interest in working with China at the Clean Energy Ministerial to develop cooperative ways for major emitters to improve their capacity to deal with climate change.

#### Solves the relations advantage

Kenneth G. Lieberthal, 1-17-13 (Memorandum to the President, Brookings Institute, “Bringing Beijing Back In”, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2013/01/bringing-beijing-back-in?cid=gADs\_BBBS\_Search-BBBS-BB-US\_Beijing-China\_20025869795&gclid=CNq3z7SN37YCFaYDOgode3MAAg :)

China’s leadership change presents an opportunity. Xi Jinping fears serious challenges to the Chinese system if he cannot improve relations with a population that has become increasingly vocal, critical and nationalistic. Xi knows he must significantly alter a development model that is exacerbating social and political tensions, even as the rate of growth slows. Early indications are that Xi is more open and politically agile than was Hu Jintao, but his specific priorities and capacity to effect change are not yet known. He may take a strong stance on regional issues to signal China’s determination or he may welcome a chance to tamp down international tensions to focus more on domestic transformation. You should give him a clear option to pursue the latter approach. Specifically, you should offer Xi a game-changing opportunity to put U.S.- China relations on a more predictable long-term footing that protects critical Chinese equities but also requires that China engage more positively on key bilateral, regional and global issues. Any U.S. policy that moves the needle on China’s behavior will be welcome throughout Asia. Beijing is bureaucratically incapable of taking the initiative to suggest the ideas recommended below. Xi will want the United States to put cards on the table to which he can then respond — and then the real negotiation will begin. That lets you shape the opening agenda. The strategy is to offer Xi full good-faith efforts to deal with key irritants, provided China works with your administration on the areas of major U.S. concern indicated below. You can do important things to change Beijing’s calculus of American intentions while also advancing specific U.S. interests. I recommend that you engage with Xi Jinping early on in order to establish a strong personal relationship with him. Use this to propose working out a four-year framework for U.S.-China relations that establishes a solid foundation of trust for the next one-to-two decades and provides substance to China’s mantra of “a new type of major power relationship.” Suggest that at least four times per year you and he hold half-day summits – not onehour bilaterals — on the margins of multilateral events. Substantively, you might raise the following for consideration: • The current Strategic & Economic Dialog (S&ED) is structurally very awkward for China and has never produced a sustained dialogue across the economic and foreign policy spheres. Propose that it be repackaged into a political and military (pol/mil) dialogue that is sustained (rather than a brief annual meeting) and a separate economic dialogue that closely parallels the Strategic Economic Dialogue that former Treasury Secretary Paulson led. • For the pol/mil dialogue, suggest an enhanced Strategic Security Dialogue (SSD) that convenes four day-long meetings a year, with each side establishing a working group for ongoing liaison. The Strategic Security Dialogue, which met briefly twice under the S&ED, is the only formal U.S.-China dialogue that brings together military and foreign policy leaders in the same room. At least two of the enhanced SSD meetings should exclusively address overall U.S. and Chinese security postures in Asia a decade hence – basic thinking, pertinent doctrine, core concerns/interests, and areas where mutual restraint may benefit both sides. The United States has never held such discussions with China, and they may be critical for building strategic trust. U.S.-China military-to-military (mil-mil) relations lag far behind those of their civilian counterparts. Suggest several initiatives to relieve some of the strain in that sphere. The PLA sees restrictions on inviting them to military exercises as indicative of hostile U.S. expectations of the relationship. You can indicate the possibility you will use your waiver authority to permit PLA participation in various future U.S.- organized military exercises (Defense Secretary Panetta has already done this for RIMPAC 2014). You might also offer serious discussions on military cooperation to assure better the ongoing flow of reasonably-priced oil from the Persian Gulf. Relatedly, maritime territorial disputes are feeding China’s wariness about U.S. strategy in the region. You can offer to clarify authoritatively our principles to reduce Chinese suspicions. Such clarification would make clear that: The United States will take no position on sovereignty in territorial disputes to which it is not a party; the United States supports an ASEAN collective negotiation with China on a Code of Conduct in order to reduce the potential for territorial disputes to escalate, but does not seek Chinese negotiation with all of ASEAN on resolving territorial disputes; and the United States will adhere to its core principles of peaceful management of disputes, freedom of navigation (including in Exclusive Economic Zones), and normal commercial access for American and other firms to maritime resources. You can suggest various initiatives to enhance economic cooperation. These might include, for example, intensifying negotiations for a U.S.- China Bilateral Investment Treaty; inviting China to engage on the TPP when Beijing feels it is able to do so; completing the years-long technology export policy review, which can help U.S. business while also removing serious irritants in U.S.-China economic relations; directing the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative to establish a consultative arm to help Chinese firms understand the pertinent U.S. investment laws and regulations; and indicating U.S. interest in working with China at the Clean Energy Ministerial to develop cooperative ways for major emitters to improve their capacity to deal with climate change. The above highlights the scope and some of the content of what you might indicate to Xi that you are prepared to move forward on as a package, if Xi will put together a comparable level of efforts on the following issues: • Mitigation of tensions over maritime territorial disputes • More extensive U.S.-China mil-mil engagement and discussion of longterm strategic postures in Asia • North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs • Opening additional areas of the Chinese economy (especially in the service sector) to American investment • Strengthening enforcement of intellectual property protections and engaging on cyber-security threats • Joint initiatives on climate change Conclusion: Xi may be unable or unwilling to respond significantly to your offer. But taking this wide-ranging initiative early on costs little or nothing, since you would be seeking to begin a reciprocal negotiation, not to commit the United States to unilateral actions. The payoff is potentially very large in reshaping Chinese and American behavior in ways that will make our overall rebalancing strategy a long-term region-wide success.

## Trade Advantage

### 1NC Trade

#### Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace

MARTIN et al ‘8 (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Trade conflicts won’t escalate

NYE ‘96 (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

#### Interdependence causes war and protectionism solves this

Friedman and Friedman, ’96 [George and Meredith, Founder and Chairman of Stratfor, *The Future of War*, p. 7-9]

The argument that interdependence gives rise to peace is flawed in theory as well as in practice. Conflicts arise from friction, particularly friction involving the fundamental interests of different nations. The less interdependence there is, the fewer the areas of serious friction. The more interdependence there is, the greater the areas of friction, and, therefore, the greater the potential for conflict. Two widely separated nations that trade little with each other are unlikely to go to war—Brazil is unlikely to fight Madagascar precisely because they have so little to do with each other. France and Germany, on the other hand, which have engaged in extensive trade and transnational finance, have fought three wars with each other over about seventy years. Interdependence was the root of the conflicts, not the deterrent. There are, of course, cases of interdependence in which one country effectively absorbs the other or in which their interests match so precisely that the two countries simply merge. In other cases, interdependence remains peaceful because the economic, military, and political power of one country is overwhelming and inevitable. In relations between advanced industrialized countries and third-world countries, for example, this sort of asymmetrical relationship can frequently be seen. All such relationships have a quality of unease built into them, particularly when the level of interdependence is great. When one or both nations attempt, intentionally or unintentionally, to shift the balance of power, the result is often tremendous anxiety and, sometimes, real pain. Each side sees the other’s actions as an attempt to gain advantage and becomes frightened. In the end, precisely because the level of interdependence is so great, the relationship can, and frequently does, spiral out of control. Consider the seemingly miraculous ability of the United States and Soviet Union to be rivals and yet avoid open warfare. These two powers could forgo extreme measures because they were not interdependent. Neither relied on the other for its economic well-being, and therefore, its social stability. This provided considerable room for maneuvering. Because there were few economic linkages, neither nation felt irresistible pressure to bring the relationship under control; neither felt any time constraint. Had one country been dependent on the other for something as important as oil or long-term investment, there would have been enormous fear of being held hostage economically. Each would have sought to dominate the relationship, and the result would have been catastrophic. In the years before World War I, as a result of European interdependence, control of key national issues fell into the hands of foreign governments. Thus, decisions made in Paris had tremendous impact on Austria, and decisions made in London determined growth rates in the Ruhr. Each government sought to take charge of its own destiny by shift­ing the pattern of interdependence in its favor. Where economic means proved insufficient, political and military strategies were tried. The international system following the Cold War resembles the pre—World War I system in some fundamental ways. First, there is a gen­eral prosperity. That is to say, the international economic system appears to be functioning extremely well, in spite of the normal cyclical down­turns of the early 1990s. Second, almost no fundamental ideological issues divide the major powers; one could say there is general agreement on matters of political principle. Third, there is a long-standing pattern of interdependence, measured in both trade and financial flows—capital has become transuational. Fourth, and perhaps most important, beneath the apparent prosperity and stability there is a sense within each great power of a real and growing vulnerability to the actions of others. Some nations fear that growing protectionism will shift the balance of the sys­tem against them, while others are convinced that maintaining the cur­rent system will be devastating to their interests. Today, observers focus on the first three phenomena, as they did prior to World War I, and argue that there is no economic basis for polit­ical conflict. What they miss is that the subsurface sense of insecurity— experienced by Japan, the United States, and Europe—marks the beginning of such conflict. Thus, the argument that war is obsolete because of growing inter­dependence is unsupportable. War may be obsolete, but, if it is, it is not because of interdependence. As we have seen, World War I broke out at a time when interdependence was substantially higher than it is today; indeed, in all likelihood war broke out because interdependence was so high. Today, war remains not only possible but, as a simple statistical matter, highly likely.

#### Trade allows restricted access to HIV medication causing massive spread

Robert Weissman, editor of Multinational Monitor magazine and codirector of Essential Action, a corporate accountability group Volume 7, Number 7  
June 2002 http://www.fpif.org/briefs/vol7/v7n07aids\_body.html

For millions of HIV-infected people, there is a crying need to make lifesaving drugs more available—and quickly. It is crucial that rich countries provide adequate funding for the new Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. The fund has made an initial round of grants, pledging $1.5 billion in support for projects over a five-year period—the bulk of the $1.9 billion currently at the Global Fund’s disposal for this time period. Yet this amount is puny compared to the need: The Global Fund needs roughly $10 billion a year to address the AIDS pandemic and other infectious diseases wracking Africa and poor countries elsewhere, according to public health experts. With pharmaceuticals constituting such a huge component of the cost of treating people with HIV, the price of drugs will remain a crucial factor in determining whether, and how many, people with HIV/AIDS receive treatment, irrespective of the level of donor support for the Global Fund to fight AIDS. Brand-name drug companies have responded to negative publicity on drug pricing by announcing some concessionary deals on some of their products. But these price reductions are limited in scope and have done little to make drugs available to HIV-positive people in poor countries.A vital tool to help achieve affordability of essential medicines is the option of compulsory licensing. Compulsory licensing enables any government to instruct a patent holder to license the right to use its patent to a company, government agency, or other party. Zimbabwe, for example, could issue a license to a local company for an HIV/AIDS drug manufactured by Bristol-Myers Squibb. The Zimbabwean firm would then manufacture the drug for sale in Zimbabwe under a generic name, and it would pay a reasonable royalty to Bristol-Myers Squibb on each sale.Compulsory licensing lowers prices to consumers by creating competition in the market for the patented good. Its impact is similar to the introduction of generic competition at the end of a drug’s patent term—prices come tumbling down. Compulsory licensing can lower the price of medicines by 95% or more.Compulsory licensing is permitted under the international trade rules established by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and administered by the World Trade Organization (WTO). It is regularly used in industrialized countries, including the United States. One of the GATT agreements, the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), contains the international rules that the WTO enforces regarding intellectual property (patents, copyrights, and trademarks). Industry, especially the pharmaceutical sector, exercised heavy influence over the TRIPS agreement negotiations, and many public interest advocates generally believe that the TRIPS agreement inappropriately favors corporations.In general, the TRIPS agreement requires countries to adopt U.S.-style patent systems, which apply both to products and processes and last for 20 years. This has compelled many developing countries—which had followed the lead of virtually every industrialized country in enacting weak patent rules while they were still industrializing (many European countries did not recognize patents until the 1970s)—to refashion their patent rules dramatically. But despite the TRIPS document’s biases and the requirements that it imposes on signatory countries, the agreement does permit compulsory licensing. Even so, multinational pharmaceutical companies object to the practice, which they perceive as curtailing corporate profits. Under pressure, the Clinton administration retreated from its longstanding, aggressive opposition to developing country efforts to undertake compulsory licensing. The Bush administration has continued the revised Clinton policy but, like the Clinton administration, continues to pose serious obstacles to effective utilization of this crucial policy instrument.Problems with Current U.S. PolicyKey Problems The inclusion of intellectual property provisions in multiple-country trade agreements makes it much harder to advance public health priorities. Washington continues to work to limit developing countries’ options to adopt intellectual property policies that could make HIV/AIDS drugs more affordable. The U.S. government itheys seeking to renege on commitments, made at the WTO Ministerial meeting in Doha, Qatar, to facilitate poor countries’ access to essential medicines. Despite the legality of compulsory licensing and despite the public health emergency enveloping much of the developing world, until mid-1999 the U.S. actively opposed developing country efforts to implement compulsory licensing or other measures to make HIV/AIDS drugs more affordable and available in low-income countries. The U.S. position suddenly changed in June 1999, following AIDS activist protests that disrupted the early presidential campaign of Al Gore. During the November-December 1999 WTO meetings in Seattle, the Clinton administration announced it would offer special treatment for health-related intellectual property disputes, taking into account health issues as well as commercial concerns. However, efforts to incorporate the new Clinton policy into the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act floundered and even threatened to impede passage of the act. So the Clinton administration issued an executive order stipulating that the U.S. would not challenge TRIPS-compliant policy measures to make AIDS medicines available anywhere in Africa.In February 2001, with ever-heightening attention on the AIDS crisis and growing interest in what posture President Bush would adopt regarding controversial intellectual property issues, the new administration indicated that it would continue the Clinton administration’s policy of permitting initiatives to make AIDS medicines more available, as long as those efforts were TRIPS-compliant. But Clinton’s executive order is limited to sub-Saharan Africa and only covers AIDS medicines. This illustrates a pervasive problem in Washington’s position, even after the 1999 policy shift: the treatment of compulsory licensing as an exceptional policy tool to be used only in emergency circumstances, even though the WTO TRIPS agreement considers compulsory licensing a standard part of the intellectual property regime.Despite the executive order, both Clinton and Bush have exerted direct pressure on countries seeking to advance compulsory licensing and related policies. The mixed messages conveyed by U.S. actions, along with confusion fostered by the pharmaceutical industry over what is permissible under WTO rules, has intimidated most developing countries and left them wary of political consequences if they exercise their right to promote compulsory licensing.In June 2001, African countries at the TRIPS governing body (known as the TRIPS Council) forced a historic discussion on intellectual property and access to health technologies. That meeting created momentum for a declaration on TRIPS and public health, which was eventually issued at the November 2001 WTO Ministerial meeting in Doha, Qatar. In the Doha Declaration, countries “affirmed that the [TRIPS] Agreement can and should be interpreted and implemented in a manner supportive of WTO members’ right to protect public health and, in particular, to promote access to medicines for all.” The declaration specifically mentioned each country’s right to pursue compulsory licensing.The WTO also pledged at Doha to rectify an irrational TRIPS provision that would particularly undermine a developing country’s ability to institute effective compulsory licensing. Although TRIPS rules permit a country to assign a drug import license to a manufacturer outside the country, the licensee must have both permission to produce the drug in the country where its factory is based and permission to export the drug from that country. Thus, even if Zambia were to issue a compulsory drug license to a manufacturer in Canada, the Canadian manufacturer would be blocked from producing and exporting the drug if a brand-name company had a patent for that drug in Canada. The Doha Declaration obligates TRIPS members to address this problem in 2002. All parties recognize that some kind of exception to this irrational provision will need to be created through clarification, reinterpretation, or amendment of TRIPS rules. However, the U.S. is working aggressively to limit the scope of the exception, suggesting for example that it should only apply to the poorest countries or to those afflicted with the most extreme health care emergencies. If the ultimate resolution reflects the U.S. position, many developing countries will find themselves unable to make effective use of compulsory licensing. (The U.S. position, incidentally, would also inhibit the U.S. or any other rich country’s ability to assign compulsory licenses overseas. This would, for example, have made it much harder for the U.S. to assign a license to Indian producers for the anti-anthrax drug Cipro, something Washington considered doing in the wake of September 11.)The U.S. is also working in diverse international trade negotiating fora to increase the monopoly protections afforded by patents and to diminish the ability of countries to initiate compulsory licensing and parallel importing. For example, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement, completed in fall 2000, sharply limits the grounds for compulsory licensing, and the published summary of the U.S. negotiating position for the intellectual property portion of the proposed Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA) contains a variety of measures that would effectively extend patent terms, interfere with compulsory licensing, and otherwise undermine efforts by poor countries to make medicines more accessible. Generally, the inclusion of intellectual property provisions in multiple-country trade agreements (like the FTAA) makes it much harder to ratchet down international patent protection obligations. Even if changes were made so that the WTO TRIPS agreement became less restrictive, for example, this move would have little impact on countries that had separate intellectual property obligations—if they were equivalent to or more severe than the WTO mandates—under the FTAA or other international trade agreements.

#### AIDS will kill hundreds of millions if not stopped. It threatens to extinguish life on the planet

Mutuma Mathiu, Africa News, July 15, 2000

Every age has its killer. But Aids is without precedent. It is comparable only to the Black Death of the Middle Ages in the terror it evokes and the graves it fills. But unlike the plague, Aids does not come at a time of scientific innocence: It flies in the face of space exploration, the manipulation of genes and the mapping of the human genome. The Black Death - the plague, today easily cured by antibiotics and prevented by vaccines - killed a full 40 million Europeans, a quarter of the population of Europe, between 1347 and 1352. But it was a death that could be avoided by the simple expedient of changing addresses and whose vector could be seen and exterminated. With Aids, the vector is humanity itself, the nice person in the next seat in the bus. There is nowhere to run and nowhere to hide. Every human being who expresses the innate desire to preserve the human genetic pool through the natural mechanism of reproduction is potentially at risk. And whereas death by plague was a merciful five days of agony, HIV is not satisfied until years of stigma and excruciating torture have been wrought on its victim. The plague toll of tens of millions in two decades was a veritable holocaust, but it will be nothing compared to the viral holocaust: So far, 18.8 million people are already dead; 43.3 million infected worldwide (24.5 million of them Africans) carry the seeds of their inevitable demise - unwilling participants in a March of the Damned. Last year alone, 2.8 million lives went down the drain, 85 per cent of them African; as a matter of fact, 6,000 Africans will die today. The daily toll in Kenya is 500. There has never been fought a war on these shores that was so wanton in its thirst for human blood. During the First World War, more than a million lives were lost at the Battle of the Somme alone, setting a trend that was to become fairly common, in which generals would use soldiers as cannon fodder; the lives of 10 million young men were sacrificed for a cause that was judged to be more worthwhile than the dreams - even the mere living out of a lifetime - of a generation. But there was proffered an explanation: It was the honour of bathing a battlefield with young blood, patriotism or simply racial pride. Aids, on the other hand, is a holocaust without even a lame or bigoted justification. It is simply a waste. It is death contracted not in the battlefield but in bedrooms and other venues of furtive intimacy. It is difficult to remember any time in history when the survival of the human race was so hopelessly in jeopardy.

#### Free trade destroys the environment

Lang and Hines, ’93 **[**Tim, Director of Parents for Safe Food and Colin, Coordinator of Greenpeace International’s Economic Unit, *The New Protectionism*, p. 62-63]

The gearing of entire economies to increasing raw material exports for international trade also has its environmental impact at the point of extraction or production, especially in developing countries. Tropical timber is perhaps the best publicized case. Although the massive deforestation of the last decade has a range of causes, including clearing land for agriculture and grazing, mining, fuelwood gathering and trees felled for domestic use, the timber trade represents a significant proportion, about 50 per cent of the total production of industrial hardwood in tropical countries.8 The effect of timber trading on deforestation is larger than the mere numbers of trees cut down for export, since roads built for commercial logging bring in their wake farmers, miners and those seeking fuelwood. In 1991, this tropical timber industry was worth $6 billion, but it is beginning to decline as forests are decimated in one country after another to provide for the needs of Europe, Japan and North America. Thailand and the Philippines, which were once exporters, are now net inporters; Nigeria’s exports have slumped over the last decade and several other countries will soon be in the same position. At its most extreme, Sarawak, which along with Sabah provides more than 90 per cent of Japan’s tropical imports, is predicted by environmentalists to have no trees left for felling in five years time. This would be both an environmental disaster and a human tragedy, since it would destroy the homeland of the local Penan people, who are aggressively fighting this trend.9 The fate of timber in international trade is repeated with other commodities sold by the South. Developing countries exploit resources such as food, fish, minerals and energy for export mostly to repay debts, with often dire adverse environmental effects. Unfortunately when trying to halt the ill-effects of such trade, developing countries can be blocked by the free trade system. Indonesia, for example, banned the export, though not the felling, of raw logs and rattan from its rainforests in 1985. It justified this ban on environmental grounds, but the EC referred this to the GATT surveillance body as the forerunner to a formal challenge to try to overcome the ban.

#### Environmental collapse causes extinction

**Diner 94** ["The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom" l/n]

By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems.   As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure.   The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues.   Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined effects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction.   Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss. ([ ] = correction)

#### Free trade causes a wealth gap between the North and South

Nyerere, ’90 [Julius, Former President of Tanzania, February, Recolonization GATT, the Uruguay Round & the Third World, p. 21-22]

Unfortunately, such people do not know - or do not understand - the realities of power which underlie the op­erations of most of these institutions, and which wage constant and too often -successful war with the purposes and ideals for which they were set up. Most ordinary people have heard about Aid. It is from the rich countries in the Economic North to the poor countries of the Economic South. They have never heard of ‘Aid’ from the South to the North. What these innocent people do not realise is that through the workings of the present international economic arrangements, wealth flows almost all the time from the poor ‘devel­oping’ countries of the Third World to the industrialised and rich countries of the developed world. It flows from the primary producers to the industrialised countries, from the ignorant to the knowledgeable. How could they know these things? Virtually nothing in the Northern media gives them such information. Yet that is the reality. The facts can be extracted from the statistics of all the international organisations; sometimes they are even mentioned in their Annual or Specialised Reports. Tens of billions of dollars flow every year from the Economic South to the Economic North through movements in the terms of trade which have been adverse to the underdeveloped countries almost continually since the 1950’s. The prices of primary commodities like cotton, coffee, cocoa, copper etc. etc. - which are the major export prod­ucts of the Third World - go down in relation to the prices of machinery, lorries, capital investments of all kinds, and most manufactured goods. To an ever increasing extent, Third World countries sell cheap and buy dear. Wealth flows also from South to North through financial mechanisms. For example: in the last decade poor nations have found that the Interest Rates on loans they incurred earlier have been increased by their creditors without consul­tation. They borrow to meet these ‘obligations’. And so get further and further into debt even as they transfer huge amounts to their creditors in debt service. Again, wealth flows through the South’s purchase of knowledge - through fees for education and training, through the purchase of books, through subscriptions to vital infor­mation agencies, and through payment for the use of patents, or trade marks, or production licences. And so on. Yet the poor nations of the Third World borrow money, or buy knowledge, or produce primary products for export rather than food for themselves, in order to invest in development - in a less poor future - or to meet their basic human requirements after natural or economic disaster has hit them. It is these purposes which are frustrated when they make a net export of resources to developed coun­tries. This they have been doing for the last six years on account of debt servicing alone, without taking into account the permanent drain constituted by the unfair trading sys­tem.

#### North-South disparity causes nuclear terrorism and proliferation

Lown, ’96 Bernard, MD Co-Founder, IPPNW, http://www.ippnw.org/, Crude Nuclear Weapons Proliferation and the Terrorist Threat]

Nuclear apartheid cannot endure. The stimulus to proliferation derives largely from an inequitable world order and the growing economic divide between rich and poor countries. One fifth of the world lives on the edge of subsistence. At a time of potential abundance, more people are hungry than ever before. We end the century with far more desperately poor, illiterate, homeless, starving, and sick than we began. Nowhere are the inequities more in evidence than in the health sector. Eight hundred million people are without any health care at all. One-third of the world’s population lives in countries whose health care expenditures are far less than $12 per person per year (the bare minimum recommended by the World Bank) while the industrialized North spends more than $1,000 for health per person annually. Recent UN figures indicate that from 1960 to 1990, per capita income rose eight-fold in the North while increasing only half as much in the deprived lands of the South. This divide is likely to widen further while accelerating over-consumption in the North and burgeoning population pressures in the developing countries. As vital raw materials, scarce minerals, fossil fuels, and especially water become depleted, Northern affluence will be sustained by imposed belt tightening of impoverished multitudes struggling for mere subsistence. This is an agenda for endless conflict and colossal violence. The global pressure cooker will further superheat by the ongoing worldwide information revolution that exposes everyone to the promissory note of unlimited consumption, there by instilling impatience and igniting more embers of social upheaval. If desperation grows, the deprived will be tempted to challenge the affluent in the only conceivable way that can make an impact, namely by going nuclear. Their possession enables the weak to inflict unacceptable damage on the strong. Desperation and hopelessness breed religious fundamentalism and provide endless recruits ready to wreak vengeance, if necessary by self immolation in the process of inflicting unspeakable violence on others. A nuclear bomb affords “the cheapest and biggest bang for the buck.” No blackmail is as compelling as holding an entire city hostage. No other destructive device can cause greater societal disruption or exact a larger human toll. Terrorists will soon raise their sights to vaporizing a metropolitan area rather than merely pulverizing a building.

Terrorism sparks global nuclear war

Speice, ‘6 [Patrick, J.D. Candidate 2006, Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, “NEGLIGENCE AND NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION: ELIMINATING THE CURRENT LIABILITY BARRIER TO BILATERAL U.S.-RUSSIAN NONPROLIFERATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS,” William & Mary Law Review, Feb, l/n]

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. 51 This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. 53

#### Prolif causes extinction

Utgoff, ‘2 [Victor, Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the

Institute for Defense Analyses, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, V. 44, Summer]

First, the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent’s nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. Second, as the world approaches complete proliferation, the hazards posed by nuclear weapons today will be magnified many times over. Fifty or more nations capable of launching nuclear weapons means that the risk of nuclear accidents that could cause serious damage not only to their own populations and environments, but those of others, is hugely increased. The chances of such weapons falling into the hands of renegade military units or terrorists is far greater, as is the number of nations carrying out hazardous manufacturing and storage activities. Increased prospects for the occasional nuclear shootout Worse still, in a highly proliferated world there would be more frequent opportunities for the use of nuclear weapons. And more frequent opportunities means shorter expected times between conflicts in which nuclear weapons get used, unless the probability of use at any opportunity is actually zero. To be sure, some theorists on nuclear deterrence appear to think that in any confrontation between two states known to have reliable nuclear capabilities, the probability of nuclear weapons being used is zero.3 These theorists think that such states will be so fearful of escalation to nuclear war that they would always avoid or terminate confrontations between them, short of even conventional war. They believe this to be true even if the two states have different cultures or leaders with very eccentric personalities. History and human nature, however, suggest that they are almost surely wrong. History includes instances in which states known to possess nuclear weapons did engage in direct conventional conflict. China and Russia fought battles along their common border even after both had nuclear weapons.Moreover, logic suggests that if states with nuclear weapons always avoided conflict with one another, surely states without nuclear weapons would avoid conflict with states that had them. Again, history provides counter-examples. Egypt attacked Israel in 1973 even though it saw Israel as a nuclear power at the time. Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands and fought Britain’s efforts to take them back, even though Britain had nuclear weapons. Those who claim that two states with reliable nuclear capabilities to devastate each other will not engage in conventional conflict risking nuclear war also assume that any leader from any culture would not choose suicide for his nation. But history provides unhappy examples of states whose leaders were ready to choose suicide for themselves and their fellow citizens. Hitler tried to impose a ‘victory or destruction’ policy on his people as Nazi Germany was going down to defeat.4 And Japan’s war minister, during debates on how to respond to the American atomic bombing, suggested ‘Would it not be wondrous for the whole nation to be destroyed like a beautiful flower?’5 If leaders are willing to engage in conflict with nuclear-armed nations, use of nuclear weapons in any particular instance may not be likely, but its probability would still be dangerously significant. In particular, human nature suggests that the threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons is not a reliable guarantee against a disastrous first use of these weapons. While national leaders and their advisors everywhere are usually talented and experienced people, even their most important decisions cannot be counted on to be the product of well-informed and thorough assessments of all options from all relevant points of view. This is especially so when the stakes are so large as to defy assessment and there are substantial pressures to act quickly, as could be expected in intense and fast-moving crises between nuclear-armed states.6 Instead, like other human beings, national leaders can be seduced by wishful thinking. They can misinterpret the words or actions of opposing leaders. Their advisors may produce answers that they think the leader wants to hear, or coalesce around what they know is an inferior decision because the group urgently needs the confidence or the sharing of responsibility that results from settling on something. Moreover, leaders may not recognise clearly where their personal or party interests diverge from those of their citizens. Under great stress, human beings can lose their ability to think carefully. They can refuse to believe that the worst could really happen, oversimplify the problem at hand, think in terms of simplistic analogies and play hunches. The intuitive rules for how individuals should respond to insults or signs of weakness in an opponent may too readily suggest a rash course of action. Anger, fear, greed, ambition and pride can all lead to bad decisions. The desire for a decisive solution to the problem at hand may lead to an unnecessarily extreme course of action. We can almost hear the kinds of words that could flow from discussions in nuclear crises or war. ‘These people are not willing to die for this interest’. ‘No sane person would actually use such weapons’. ‘Perhaps the opponent will back down if we show him we mean business by demonstrating a willingness to use nuclear weapons’. ‘If I don’t hit them back really hard, I am going to be driven from office, if not killed’. Whether right or wrong, in the stressful atmosphere of a nuclear crisis or war, such words from others, or silently from within, might resonate too readily with a harried leader. Thus, both history and human nature suggest that nuclear deterrence can be expected to fail from time to time, and we are fortunate it has not happened yet. But the threat of nuclear war is not just a matter of a few weapons being used. It could get much worse. Once a conflict reaches the point where nuclear weapons are employed, the stresses felt by the leaderships would rise enormously. These stresses can be expected to further degrade their decision-making. The pressures to force the enemy to stop fighting or to surrender could argue for more forceful and decisive military action, which might be the right thing to do in the circumstances, but maybe not. And the horrors of the carnage already suffered may be seen as justification for visiting the most devastating punishment possible on the enemy.7 Again, history demonstrates how intense conflict can lead the combatants to escalate violence to the maximum possible levels. In the Second World War, early promises not to bomb cities soon gave way to essentially indiscriminate bombing of civilians. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other’s cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants beforehand.8 Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear ‘six-shooters’ on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

## China Advantage

### 1NC China

#### No effective China-US cooperation – remiliteraization and territorial claims.

Chang 10 [Gordon G., author of Nuclear Showdown: North Korea Takes On the World, released by Random House in January 2006. Showdown focuses on nuclear proliferation in general and the North Korean crisis in particular. His first book is The Coming Collapse of China (Random House, August 2001). He is a columnist at Forbes.com. He lived and worked in China and Hong Kong for almost two decades, most recently in Shanghai, as Counsel to the American law firm Paul Weiss and earlier in Hong Kong as Partner in the international law firm Baker & McKenzie. His writings on China and North Korea have appeared in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, the Far Eastern Economic Review, the International Herald Tribune, Commentary, The Weekly Standard, National Review, and Barron's. He has spoken at Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Yale, and other universities and at The Brookings Institution, The Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, RAND, the American Enterprise Institute, the Council on Foreign Relations, and other institutions. He has given briefings at the National Intelligence Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Pentagon. He has also spoken before industry and investor groups including Bloomberg, Sanford Bernstein, and Credit Lyonnais Securities Asia. Chang has testified before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission and has delivered to the Commission a report on the future of China’s economy. , Trouble in Fishing Waters China’s military provocations. October 11, 2010, Vol. 16, No. 04 http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/trouble-fishing-waters?page=2]

So why did Beijing make the strategic shift from subtle diplomacy to outright confrontation? “China wants to change the rules of the game,” Yuan Peng, a high-level Chinese foreign policy specialist, noted recently. The Communist party had always hoped to do so, but beginning late last year it began to unveil what veteran China watcher Willy Lam calls its “new-look foreign policy.” And why last year? Perhaps because Beijing for the first time thought it had the ability to implement its game-changing ambitions. China’s new policy approach came about the same time Jeffrey Bader of the National Security Council publicly suggested, in remarks delivered in November, that no important issue could be solved without the cooperation of the Chinese. Bader, in effect, gave Beijing a veto over American policy. Soon after Bader made his ill-advised comments, President Obama went to the Chinese capital for his disastrous summit, returning both humiliated and empty-handed. Since then, China has been especially uncooperative. In short, the ruthlessly pragmatic Chinese believed the Obama administration was weak and pressed what they perceived to be an advantage. The president has evidently—and wrongly—believed that relations with China soured because Washington had not tried hard enough to build bridges to Beijing. So as the Chinese acted more belligerently, we became even more friendly. For instance, when the People’s Liberation Army broke off military ties with the Pentagon in the first months of this year, the administration redoubled efforts to reestablish them. Yet that effort looks futile because China’s flag officers, who are evidently calling the tune in Beijing these days, obviously do not want better relations with the United States. During the 1990s, China’s top brass lost influence in top Communist party organs. Yet they recouped much of their losses in the middle of this decade when they essentially acted as arbiters in a low-level political struggle between supremo Hu Jintao and his predecessor, Jiang Zemin, who was trying to linger in the limelight. Top officers at this moment appear to be making further political gains as the party prepares for the next transition, when the so-called Fourth Generation leaders give way to the Fifth, scheduled to occur at the end of 2012. So as the civilians squabble, generals and admirals have been exploiting deep splits in the party’s leadership to gain even more prominence in decision-making circles. Tellingly, senior officers now feel free to speak out on matters once considered the province of civilian officials. The remilitarization of Chinese policy is perhaps the most important factor fueling Beijing’s recent aggressiveness in asserting territorial claims—as well as other matters. Tokyo released Captain Zhan Qixiong on September 24, but that conciliatory gesture only spurred Beijing to issue more demands to the Japanese. As a result, China’s government looks like it is entering a phase where it cannot be placated, appeased, or, to use the term of the moment, “engaged.” In July, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton executed a partial pivot by telling Beijing that the peaceful settlement of competing claims in the South China Sea was a U.S. “national interest.” That was an important start, but Washington still thinks China’s autocrats can be integrated into a liberal international order they had no hand in creating. Recent events demonstrate that the Chinese will not become cooperative members of the global community anytime soon. Beijing’s new militancy means that Washington has fundamentally misunderstood China—and that we now need to adjust our assumptions and our policies fast.

#### No China war.

MacGregor 11 [Lean, Mean Fighting Machine How to slash the Pentagon budget? Declare victory and go home. BY DOUGLAS MACGREGOR | APRIL 26, 2011 http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/04/26/lean\_mean\_fighting\_machine]

For one thing, there is no existential military threat to the United States or to its vital strategic interests. The nuclear arsenals in Russia and China could be used against the United States and its forces, but Russian and Chinese leaders have no incentive to contemplate suicide in a nuclear confrontation with the United States. Russia's diminished million-man armed forces are hard-pressed to modernize, let alone secure their own country, which borders 14 other states. For all its rhetoric, Russia's military focus is on restive Muslim populations in the Caucasus and Central Asia, not on NATO. As for China, its top concern is not military confrontation with the United States, but domestic growing pains, especially the potential for its 1.3 billion people to overwhelm the Communist Party's internal political structures. China's internal focus on modernization and stability militates against external aggression, and this condition is unlikely to change for a very long time. Despite China's ability to steal or buy sophisticated technology, the military establishment cannot quickly or easily translate these technologies into new capabilities, and Beijing knows it.

#### No war - China won’t risk it all.

Bremmer 10 [Ian, president of Eurasia Group and author of “The End of the Free Market” (Portfolio), published in May, China vs America: fight of the century 22 March 2010 Issue 169, http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/03/china-vs-america-fight-of-the-century/]

**China will not mount a military challenge to the US any time soon**. Its economy and living standards have **grown so quickly** over the past two decades that it’s hard to imagine the kind of catastrophic event that could push its leadership to risk it all. Beijing knows that no US government will support Taiwanese independence, and China need not invade an island that it has largely co-opted already by offering Taiwan’s business elite privileged investment opportunities.

# 2NC

## Trade

### 2NC No Solve War

#### Historical evidence proves you wrong.

Mearsheimer 2k (John J., poli sci Professor at the U of Chicago, co-director of the Program on International Security Policy, The Future Of The American Military Presence In Europe, edited by Lloyd Matthews, http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2000/milpres/milpres.pdf)

Implicit in your question and in Professor Kaysen’s answer is the belief that increasing economic interdependence promotes peace. In other words, as states get richer and become more interconnected, there is a substantial decrease in the likelihood of war between them. There is a large international relations literature on this subject and it finds little support for that claim. Before World War I, for example, there was a significant amount of economic interdependence and prosperity in Europe, but war still happened. More recently, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in August 1990 in good part because Kuwait was over-producing its OPEC oil quotas and driving down world oil prices, thus harming the Iraqi economy, which was already in serious trouble from its war against Iran between 1980 and 1988. In short, because of the interdependency of Iraq and Kuwait through their membership in OPEC, Iraq chose to attack its neighbor. Thus, we should at least have reservations about the claim that economic interdependence produces peace.

#### And, they’re confusing causality – free trade doesn’t cause peace, peace allows free trade

Layne, ‘98

[Christopher, Visiting Associate Professor at Naval Postgraduate School, Summer, World Policy Journal, p. 8-28.]

These arguments notwithstanding, international economic interdependence does not cause peace. In fact, it has very serious adverse security consequences that its proponents either do not understand or will not acknowledge. Economic relations (whether domestic or international) never take place in a vacuum; on the contrary, they occur within a politically defined framework. International economic interdependence requires certain conditions in order to flourish, including a maximum degree of political order and stability. Just as the market cannot function within a state unless the state creates a stable "security" environment in which economic exchange can occur (by protecting property rights and enforcing contracts), the same is true in international relations. Because there is no world government, it falls to the dominant state to create the conditions under which economic interdependence can take hold (by providing security, rules of the game, and a reserve currency, and by acting as the global economy's banker and lender of last resort). Without a dominant power to perform these tasks, economic interdependence does not happen. Indeed, free trade and interdependence have occurred in the modern international system only during the hegemonies of Victorian Britain and postwar America. International economic interdependence generally occurs when states feel secure, when they do not have to worry that others will transform their economic gains from trade into military advantages. Conversely, when states are concerned about their security, they are less likely to engage in free trade. When security is at issue, states are always measuring themselves in comparison with their actual, or potential, rivals. When states feel secure, they focus on the overall gains to global wealth that flow from trade. Under peaceful international conditions, the distribution of this increased wealth is not a matter of high politics: so long as all states are getting wealthier, trade is looked upon as a good thing. When security is an issue, however, states become intensely concerned about how the gains from trade are being distributed. When security concerns are paramount, the key question no longer is whether everyone is gaining something but rather who is gaining the most. Because economic power is the cornerstone of military strength, when security is an issue states want their economies to be more vigorous and to grow faster than those of their rivals. Also, when war is regarded as a real possibility, states deliberately attempt to reduce their dependence on imported products and raw materials in order to minimize their vulnerability to economic coercion by others. This also impairs economic interdependence. The bottom line here is this: When security in the international system is plentiful, trade flourishes and, so long as they are getting richer themselves, states are untroubled by the fact that others also are getting wealthier. When security in the international system is scarce, however, trade diminishes; states seek to maximize their power (economic and military) over their rivals, and hence attempt to ensure they become richer than their rivals.

#### Real world conditions render trade theory irrelevant

Bernal, ‘93

[Richard, Jamaican Ambassador to the U.S., “Regional Trade Arrangements in the Western Hemisphere,” *The American University Journal of International Law & Policy*, Summer, Lexis]

Free trade theoretically constitutes the most beneficial situation. In the real world, however, conditions prevent the realization of this optimism. Hence, reality compels a resort to second best solutions, one of which is regional integration. Pursuit of this option was encouraged by the protectionism in industrialized countries which

### 2NC Monocultures Impact

#### Free trade causes monocultures

Frawley, No Date [David, Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh, “Western Monoculture and Indic Pluralism,” http://www.hssworld.org/homepage/html/boudhik/articles/vamadev1.html]

Monoculture does quite well with free trade and the spread of global consumerism, which is monoculture economics. Other economic systems are not allowed and are systematically undermined. The economic might of the monoculture levels any economic diversity, moving towards a single financial standard or currency worldwide. A uniform world economy destroys local economies and their rich diversity of expression and interactions based on an organic dependency. The rule of multinational businesses takes the place of local economies. Global corporate solutions are applied to local management issues, often with disastrous results. Corporate agriculture, the new agricultural monoculture, for example, is advertising its ability to feed the world and end world hunger, portraying itself in the benefic aspect of the church or a socialist government selflessly aiding the poor. What it is really doing is undermining the most basic of human rights, the right to feed oneself and to control one’s food sources. What the global agribusiness envisions is control of the world food market, so that it can force entire countries to bow down before it, who cannot even eat without its favor. Among its tools are genetically engineered crops, including terminator seeds that destroy local plant varieties, fertilizers that weaken the soils and breed dependency, and patents on plants that afford corporate ownership to nature’s bounty. Meanwhile, those who oppose the global food business are deemed backwards, causing hunger and starvation in the world, as if apart from the agribusiness no one could feed themselves!

#### The impact is extinction

Fowler and Mooney, ’90 [Cary and Pat, Rural Advancement Fund International, Shattering: Food, Politics, and the Loss of Genetic Diversity, p. ix]

While many may ponder the consequences of global warming, perhaps the biggest single environmental catastrophe in human history is unfolding in the garden. While all are rightly concerned about the possibility of nuclear war, an equally devastating time bomb is ticking away in the fields of farmers all over the world. Loss of genetic diversity in agriculture—silent, rapid, inexorable—is leading us to a rendezvous with extinction—to the doorstep of hunger on a scale we refuse to imagine. To simplify the environment as we have done with agriculture is to destroy the complex interrelationships that hold the natural world together. Reducing the diversity of life, we narrow our options for the future and render our own survival more precarious. It is life at the end of the limb. That is the subject of this book. Agronomists in the Philippines warned of what became known as southern corn leaf blight in 1061.' The disease was reported in Mexico not long after. In the summer of 1968, the first faint hint that the blight was in the United States came from seed growers in the Midwest. The danger was ignored. By the spring of 19701 the disease had taken hold in the Florida corn crop. But it was not until corn prices leapt thirty cents a bushel on the Chicago Board of Trade that the world took notice; by then it was August—and too late. By the close of the year, Americans had lost fifteen percent of their most important crop—more than a billion bushels. Some southern states lost half their harvest and many of their farmers. While consumers suffered in the grocery stores, producers were out a billion dollars in lost yield. And the disaster was not solely domestic. U.S. seed exports may have spread the blight to Africa, Latin America and Asia.

### 2NC Prolif Impact XT

**Increases chances of miscalc by pressuring countries to show resolve – prolif optimists assume static threat perceptions**

**Knopf ‘2**

(Jeffrey W. Knopf, Professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, October 2002, “Recasting the proliferation optimism-pessimism debate,” Security Studies, Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 57-58)

Nuclear weapons can **exacerbate tensions** in two ways: by creating an increased perception of threat and by prompting efforts to limit damage in the event of nuclear war. On the first point, proliferation optimists write as if potential adversaries exist at a given, fixed level of hostility. This is unlikely to be the case. Rather, a state that acquires nuclear weapons is likely to be perceived as more threatening than it was before. This will be partly because of the new, more destructive capabilities at its disposal. In some cases, however, a state’s pursuit of nuclear weapons may also change how other states view its intentions. This is especially likely because new and aspiring nuclear states are not always circumspect in their pronouncements. In Ma

rch 1994, in the midst of a crisis over North Korea’s suspected nuclear weapons program, the North’s chief negotiator threatened his South Korean counterpart that a war could break out in which the South would be turned into “a sea of fire.”47 After the May 1998 nuclear tests in India, Prime Minister Vajpayee wrote President Clinton and explicitly cited a threat from China as a motivation for the tests. Statements by Defense Minister Fernandes shortly before and again shortly after the tests also described China as “potential threat number one” to India.48 Other Indian officials publicly warned Pakistan to end its support for separatist insurgents in Kashmir. Home Minister Advani called on Islamabad to “realize the change in the geostrategic situation” and said that in the new circumstances even the option of “hot pursuit” would not be ruled out.49 Such statements are **bound to be provocative** to the states against which they are directed. States on the receiving end of new, public nuclear threats will likely feel a need to display their toughness as a way to show they will not be intimidated. While nuclear weapons do encourage caution, they can also create pressures to demonstrate resolve, and any such demonstration carries with it some risk of escalation.

## T

### Limits

#### Here’s proof – they allow tons of random unilateral measures

CSG 13 [Cuba Study Group, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprised of business and community leaders of Cuban descent who share a common interest and vision of a free and democratic Cuba, “Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba,” Feb 2013, http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File\_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032]

4. Additional Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba¶ While we wait for Congress to act, the Executive Branch should exercise its licensing authority to further safeguard the flow of contacts and resources into the Island, encourage independent economic and political activity, and further empower the Cuban people. To that end, the Cuba Study Group proposes that the President pursue the following measures:¶ i) Modify Remittance and Export Limitations: Increase the $3,000 limit on remittances that can be carried to Cuba by authorized travelers and expand the types of goods that travelers may legally take to Cuba to support micro entrepreneurs. Fewer limitations in these areas will make it easier for U.S. travelers to provide seed capital and in-kind contributions for start-ups.¶ ii) Authorize Travel by General License for NGOs and Allow Them to Open Cuban Bank Accounts: Regulations enacted on January 28, 2011 allow U.S. full- and part-time university staff to travel to Cuba by general license. These regulations also allow U.S.-based academic institutions to open accounts in Cuban banks with funds to support their educational programs in Cuba. A similar license for foundations and NGOs whose mission involves support for micro and small businesses would also help support this growing segment of civil society.¶ iii) Establish New Licenses for the Provision of Services to Cuban Private Entrepreneurs: The President could build on existing authorizations that allow U.S. persons and institutions to pay individual Cuban scholars musicians and artists for their work. New licenses could extend to additional groups, such as artisans or farmers, and authorize a greater scope of activities such as recording, publication, distribution, etc.¶ iv) Authorize Imports of Certain Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: The President could authorize the importation of limited types of Cuban-origin goods and services under general or specific licenses, particularly when such authorizations could be justified as providing support for the Cuban people or democratic change in Cuba. For example, the President could authorize imports from private producers or allow U.S. persons to directly engage and hire Cuban professionals.¶ v) Authorize Export and Sale of Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: Amend existing licensing policy to establish a presumption of approval for specific items deemed to support the U.S.-stated policy goal of promoting independent economic activity on the Island. Since 2000, legislation has allowed the export of a broad range of agricultural products and a limited range of medicines and medical devices. This should be expanded to include other inputs in demand by indepen - dent businesses, including—but not limited to—good such as art supplies, food preparation equipment, bookkeeping materials, and basic electronic equipment and software required for retail sales and business administration.¶ vi) Authorize the Sale of Telecommunications Hardware in Cuba : Current U.S. regulations, as amended by the Obama administration in 2009, allow for donations of some telecommunications equipment, thereby recognizing that these goods by themselves do not violate the embargo. The next step should be to allow for the sales of those same goods inside the Island. Along with those provisions, changes should also allow for the provision of general travel licenses for research, marketing and sale of those goods.¶ vii) Authorize the Reestablishment of Ferry Services to Cuba : Current U.S. regulations allow both “aircraft and vessels” to serve Cuba as an exception to the U.S. embargo against the Island. The use of chartered aircrafts to transport Cuban-Americans and other licensed U.S. travelers to and from Cuba has long been authorized by the U.S. Department of Treasury. The next step should be to reestablish safe and secure chartered ferry services to transport the same categories of passengers to and from Cuba. Ferry service offers an affordable alternative to airline travel to Cuba and would allow an increase in the amount of goods that Cuban-Americans and other licensed travelers may legally take to Cuba to support their families and micro entrepreneurs.¶ viii) Simplify the Provision of Controlled Commodities, such as Computers and Laptops Direct the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed guidance for individuals to determine whether or not controlled commodities, such as laptops and printers, qualify under the general export waiver.¶ ix) Allow Licensed U.S. Travelers Access to U.S.-Issued Debit, Credit, and Pre-Paid Cards and Other Financial Services While on Authorized Travel in Cuba: Currently, U.S. travelers to Cuba have no access to U.S. bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards or other basic financial services. With few exceptions, U.S. travelers are forced to carry cash with them to Cuba. Allowing U.S. travelers access to electronic payment systems would help ensure their safety and security while being on the Island. Moreover, authorizing new electronic payment systems would facilitate the Administration’s goal of promoting people-to-people contacts and facilitating private economic activity by safeguarding the transfer of money from U.S. residents to relatives and independent entrepreneurs on the island.¶ x) Review Cuba’s Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism: Cuba’s status on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism has been subject to debate for more than a decade. The President should order a comprehensive, apolitical review to determine whether this designation reflects the reality of Cuba today.¶ xi) Develop an expanded bilateral agenda with a range of specific topics of mutual interest : Agenda should include topics such as the resolution of property claims to help foster an environment of dialogue, problem- solving and trust building— thereby helping to set the stage for an eventual normalization of relations.

### Aff Ground

#### Cuba QPQs are predictable in the literature

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 15-16

Rather than maintaining the status quo, the US should simultaneously pursue two forms of engagement with Cuba. First, it should actively seek out Castro’s willingness to engage in a conditional relationship and to chart a course towards more satisfactory relations. It should attempt to strike a dialogue with Castro in which reasonable benefits are offered to him in return for reasonable changes. Rather than accentuating the desire for a regime change or immediate democratic elections, US policy-makers should make lesser goals the focus of their policy, as the more ambitious the demands, the less likely Castro is to enter into a process of engagement. For instance, the release of political prisoners and the legitimisation of political parties might be offered in exchange for the selected lifting of elements of the embargo. Regardless of Castro’s reaction to such an approach, benefits would accrue to the United States. If Castro accepted this dialogue, US policy would be seen as pushing forward real political liberalisation on the island; if Castro rejected these attempts, America would still ease tensions with its European allies by demonstrating it was willing to take a more flexible line towards Cuba.

#### Venezuela QPQs are predictable

Christy 3/15, [Patrick Christy is a senior policy analyst at the Foreign Policy Initiative, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/15/after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela](file:///C:\Users\Nirav%20Ilango\Dropbox\camp%202013!\Patrick%20Christy%20is%20a%20senior%20policy%20analyst%20at%20the%20Foreign%20Policy%20Initiative,%20http:\www.usnews.com\opinion\blogs\world-report\2013\03\15\after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela)

What's perverse is how the Obama administration's move to "reset" relations with Maduro is doing more to legitimize him as the rightful heir to Venezuela's presidency than to resuscitate relations between the two governments. The move showed itself to be even more naive after Maduro accused the United States of plotting to poison Chavez shortly after the strongman's death.Washington must realize that a strategy of engagement alone will not ensure a renewed and improved partnership with Caracas. Failure to realize this will not only undermine whatever influence America has in the months ahead, but also send a troubling signal to Venezuela's increasingly united political opposition. The Obama administration should instead pursue a more principled policy towards a post-Chavez Venezuela. In particular, it should:Pressure Caracas to implement key election reforms.Venezuela's opposition faces formidable obstacles. Interim President Maduro will use the government's near-monopoly control of public airwaves, its established networks of political patronage and last-minute public spending programs to bolster his populist agenda.Washington should stress publicly and privately that any attempts to suppress or intimidate the opposition runs contrary to Venezuela's constitution and the principles defined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was adopted by Venezuela in 2001. To this point, José Cárdenas, a former USAID acting assistant administrator for Latin America, [writes](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/03/06/the_struggle_for_venezuela_s_future),The Venezuelan opposition continues to insist that the constitution (which is of Chavez's own writing) be followed and have drawn up a list of simple electoral reforms that would level the playing field and better allow the Venezuelan people to chart their own future free of *chavista* and foreign interference.Demand free, fair and verifiable elections. Although Venezuela announced that a special election to replace Chavez will be held next month, it is important to remember that elections alone do not make a democracy. Indeed, Chavez long embraced the rhetoric of democracy as he, in reality, consolidated executive power, undermined Venezuela's previously democratic political system and altered the outcomes of election through corruption, fraud and intimidation.The Obama administration should make clear that free and fair elections,[properly monitored](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/the-chavez-plan-to-steal-venezuelas-presidential-election-what-obama-should-do) by respected international election observers, are essential to Venezuela's future standing in the hemisphere and the world. Likewise, Secretary of State John Kerry should work with regional partners—including (but not limited to) Brazil, Canada, Colombia and Mexico—to firmly encourage Maduro's interim government. A unified regional voice would send a powerful signal to Chavez's cronies in Caracas and longtime enablers in China, Iran and Russia.Condition future diplomatic and economic relations**.** Corruption and criminality were widespread under the Chavez regime, as high-level government and military officials benefited from close ties to corrupt businesses and international drug traffickers. Yet to date, the Obama administration has done little to hold Venezuela's leaders accountable. Washington should make clear that full diplomatic relations with the United States will be contingent upon Venezuela ending ties to international terrorist groups and rogue regimes like Iran. If Venezuela takes meaningful steps to end these ties and ensure future elections, the United States should work with Caracas and the private sector to reform Venezuela's energy industry and identify key development projects and reforms to improve the country's economic future.The United States can play an important role in shaping Venezuela's post-Chavez future. But to do so, the Obama administration will need to stand with the people of Venezuela by publicly defending democratic principles and the impartial rule of law in Latin America.

# 1NR

## Trade

### Econ Decline

#### Downswings don’t cause war – 93 empirical examples

Miller 2K

(Morris Miller, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

## Elections Conditions CP

### AT: P/ CP

#### “Resolved” necessitates certainty.

American Heritage Dictionary, 11-xx-2011, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, an American dictionary of the English language published by Boston publisher Houghton Mifflin, “resolve,” <http://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=resolved&submit.x=-826&submit.y=-210>

re·solved, re·solv·ing, re·solves v.tr. 1. a. To make a firm decision about: resolved that I would do better next time. See Synonyms at decide.

#### “Should” mandates certainty.

The Collins English Dictionary, 12-31-2011, the Collins English Dictionary, a printed and online dictionary of English, “English Dictionary – definition of “should”,” <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/should?showCookiePolicy=true>

should Definitions verb the past tense of shall: used as an auxiliary verb to indicate that an action is considered by the speaker to be obligatory ( you should go) or to form the subjunctive mood with I or we ( I should like to see you; if I should be late, go without me) See also shall Should has, as its most common meaning in modern English, the sense ought as in I should go to the graduation, but I don't see how I can. However, the older sense of the subjunctive of shall is often used with I or we to indicate a more polite form than would: I should like to go, but I can't. In much speech and writing, should has been replaced by would in contexts of this kind, but it remains in formal English when a conditional subjunctive is used: should he choose to remain, he would be granted asylum Word Origin Old English sceold; see shall shall Definitions verb Word forms: past tense should takes an infinitive without to or an implied infinitive esp with I or we as subject used as an auxiliary to make the future tense ⇒ we shall see you tomorrow Compare will1 (sense 1) with you, he, she, it, they, or a noun as subject used as an auxiliary to indicate determination on the part of the speaker, as in issuing a threat ⇒ you shall pay for this! used as an auxiliary to indicate compulsion, now esp in official documents ⇒ the Tenant shall return the keys to the Landlord used as an auxiliary to indicate certainty or inevitability ⇒ our day shall come

#### “Should” requires immediacy.

**Summers, 94** — Justice on the Oklahoma Supreme Court (“Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 199hgghj4 OK 123, 11-8, <http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13>)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. [Continues – To Footnote] [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### “Substantial” means unconditional and immediate.

Words and Phrases, 1964 (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Increase” must be immediate relative to the status quo.

Rogers 5 Judge, STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, 6/24, lexis

[\*\*48]  Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16)While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly,  [\*\*49]  in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

#### “Toward” implies certainty.

Anne Marie Lofaso, 2-24-2010, West Virginia University, College of Law, “Talking is Worthwhile: The Role of Employee Voice in Protecting, Enhancing, and Encouraging Individual Rights to Job Security in a Collective System,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1558563>

The obligations placed on employers are significant in two ways. First and significantly, the Collective Redundancies Directive places on employers a duty to consult "with a view to reaching an agreement." n172 Given the Directive's language choice, this consultation right seems to be at least coextensive with the federal right to bargain under the National Labor Relations Act and perhaps even greater than the right granted under the NLRA. Federal courts interpreting NLRA Section 8(d)'s definition of the bargaining duty n173 have made clear that the duty to bargain does not include the duty to come to agreement. n174 Perhaps this is why Professor [\*86] Summers, in describing the duty to bargain under Section 8(d) always referred to it as obligating the parties to bargain in good faith with "a view toward reaching agreement." The use of the preposition "toward" suggests a duty to come close to agreement but not a duty to close the deal.