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#### Interpretation – economic engagement requires expanding bilateral economic relations

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations - is a subject of growing interest in international relations. Most research on economic statecraft emphasizes coercive policies such as economic sanctions. This emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa, 1994; Pollins, 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how often strategies of economic engagement are deployed: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno, 2003). Beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies of economic engagement have been limited to the policies of great powers (Mastanduno, 1992; Davis, 1999; Skalnes, 2000; Papayoanou & Kastner, 1999/2000; Copeland, 1999/2000; Abdelal & Kirshner, 1999/2000). However, engagement policies adopted by South Korea and one other state examined in this study, Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics and that it may be more widespread than previously recognized.

#### This means the plan has to be government-to-government – not civil or private economic engagement

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

Violation: they only remove the tomato price floor against Mexico

#### **A) limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible**

#### **B) negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations and trade disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’**
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#### **US economic engagement with Mexico is a vehicle for neoliberal exploitation for the entire region – the plan becomes a tool for military intervention and US security interests while strengthening its economic grip over Latin America**

Jacobs, 04 – Assistant Prof of Polisci at West Virginia University (Jamie Elizabeth, "Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America," Latin American Politics & Society 46.4 (2004) 149-152, MUSE)//VP

The advance of neoliberalism suffers no shortage of critics, both from its supporters who seek a greater balance in the interests of North and South, and from its opponents who see it as lacking any real choice for developing states. The spread of neoliberalism is viewed by its strongest critics as part of the continuing expression of Western power through the mechanisms of globalization, often directly linked to the hegemonic power of the United States. Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos have assembled a collection of articles that pushes this debate in a somewhat new direction. This compilation addresses the question from a different perspective, focusing not on the neoliberal process as globalization but on neoliberalism as the new guise of panamericanism, which emphasizes a distinctly political overtone in the discussion. The edited volume argues that neoliberalism reanimates a system of relations in the hemisphere that reinforces the most negative aspects of the last century's U.S.-dominated panamericanism. The assembled authors offer a critical view that places neoliberalism squarely in the realm of U.S. hegemonic exploitation of interamerican relations. This volume, furthermore, articulates a detailed vision of the potential failures of this approach in terms of culture, politics, security, and economics for both North and South. Oliva and Prevost present a view from Latin America that differs from that of other works that emphasize globalization as a general or global process. This volume focuses on the implementation of free market capitalism in the Americas as a continuation of the U.S. history of hegemonic control of the hemisphere. While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as old wine in new bottles. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and intervention in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny in the past, the prospect of hemispheric economic integration will be marked by a dominant view privileging U.S. security, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to undermine the stable governance that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for instability could also generate a new period of U.S. interventionism in Latin America. Treto also analyzes how the "liberal peace" could be undermined by the "right of humanitarian intervention" in the Americas if the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia served as a model for U.S. involvement in the hemisphere. Hector Luis Saint-Pierre raises the issue of "democratic neoauthoritarianism," responsible for "restricting citizenship to the exercise of voting, limiting its voice to electoral polls of public opinion, restraining human rights to consumer's rights, [and] shutting down spaces to the citizens' participation" (116). While these critiques are leveled from a structuralist viewpoint, they often highlight concerns expressed from other theoretical perspectives and subfields (such as the literature on citizenship and participation in the context of economic integration). These chapters also emphasize the way inattention to economic, social, and political crisis could damage attempts at integration and the overall success of the neoliberal paradigm in the Americas. In general, the section on hemispheric issues offers a suspicious view of the U.S. role in promoting integration, arguing that in reality, integration offers a deepening of historical asymmetries of power, the potential to create new justifications for hegemonic intervention, and the further weakening of state sovereignty in the South. [End Page 150] If the first section of the book is joined with skepticism of integration as panamericanism and chooses to focus broadly on the negative effects of the implementation of these policies, part 2 links these regional issues with the politics of specific countries. This section offers articles that speak to country-specific issues in a regional context and to ways that bilateral relations with the United States shape the overall context of regional and hemispheric integration. The regional issues range from CARICOM's evolution to the different approaches to balancing human security and globalization in Central America, the special relationship of Mexico and the United States, and the disincentives for political parties to embrace the Mercosur process. Again, the authors offer continued pessimism about the process of integration unless Latin American states can exercise more control over its evolution. Key to this idea of alternative integration are Brazil and Mexico, the former more successful in asserting its independence than the latter, in the authors' view. Jaime Preciado Coronado singles out the geopolitics of U.S.-Mexican relations and their magnified effect in the region, where the United States has collaborated in Mexico's insertion into the world networks of interdependence and, in return, Mexico promotes the idea of the Washington Consensus intensely and its model of the promotion of free trade with the United States for the rest of Latin America, in order to achieve the consolidation of the continental bloc that maintains American hegemony through the use of the advantages of the international division of labor.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction

Darder, 10 – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.
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#### Immigration reform will pass now

Leopold 10/24 David, Immigration Attorney/Immigration Reform Advocate, past president & past general counsel, American Immigration Lawyers Association, Huffington Post, Immigration Reform Is Alive and Kicking on Capitol Hill, 10/24/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/immigration-reform-is-alive\_b\_4136478.html

As it turns out, reports of the death of immigration reform were greatly exaggerated. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.), Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) and other House Republicans and Democrats are reportedly working on various immigration plans, some of which, including a bill to be released next week by Issa, deal with the toughest issue of all -- what to do about the nation's 11.7 million undocumented immigrants. And Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) says that immigration reform could get to the floor of the House before the end of the year.¶ Is common sense breaking out on Capitol Hill? That might be too much to ask for. But at least the GOP leadership seems to be taking a hard look at political reality.¶ Here are four big reasons why an immigration overhaul is likely to happen by the end of the year:¶ 1. Immigration reform is a political win-win for Democrats and Republicans.¶ I can't say that either the Democrats or Republicans came out of last week's shutdown and debt limit brinksmanship looking good to the American people, but the whole debacle hurt the Republicans much more. A recent NBCNews/Wall Street Journal poll found that the public blames the GOP more than President Obama by 53 percent to 31 percent, a 21 point margin. And approval ratings for the Republican party are at an all-time low -- never before in the history of polling have the numbers shown such blatant disappointment.¶ Immigration reform gives the Republicans a unique opportunity to do something big, to reach across the aisle and work with House Democrats to pass real immigration reform either in a comprehensive package or as a series of bills that ultimately have a chance to fix what's wrong with our immigration system. It would be a colossal mistake for the House GOP not to seize the chance to lead on immigration reform. The American people want it, the country needs it, and it's a pathway to political redemption for the badly bruised Republican party.¶ 2. The immigration reform coalition is unified and ready to make the final push.¶ A broad coalition of business, labor, faith-based and ethnic groups are full of energy and ready to finish the job the Senate started in the spring. In the midst of the combined "shutdown and debt ceiling" crisis, thousands of Americans descended on Washington to join the "March for Dignity and Respect." Eight members of Congress, including civil rights icon John Lewis (D-Ga.), joined together in an historic act of civil disobedience and were arrested near the steps of the Capitol in a show of solidarity with the immigration reform movement. As Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.) wrote recently in his The Huffington Post column "Why I Went To Jail":¶ Some may call it a publicity stunt. Some may call it a political theater. For whatever reason some may think I stood out there with thousands of clergy and advocates calling for immigration reform, the fact is that it got attention. And immigration reform is a critical issue that desperately needs it. If eight Members of Congress getting thrown in jail is what it takes to get people talking about it, then I'll gladly sit in the slammer. We cannot let ourselves forget that our nation has been built by immigrants, and the story of America began with people from another nation traveling to our shores.¶ Congress needs to fix the twisted morass of rules and regulations that pass for America's immigration policy. No longer can we sit idle as our mess of a "system" ruthlessly breaks up American families, stifles economic growth, and compromises our nation's democratic principles. Now is the time.¶ 3. The DREAMERs have become doers.¶ A funny thing happened since the DREAM Act was first introduced in 2001. The DREAMERs grew up. And they grew up as Americans, watching football, going to homecoming dances, eating hotdogs on the 4th of July and dreaming about giving back to the country they've struggled against all odds to enrich. They are no longer the helpless children who were brought to the U.S. by their parents. Today they are, in effect, undocumented Americans.¶ Through masterful use of 21st century tools like Facebook and Twitter, coupled with old-fashioned organizing and courage, the DREAMERs have become a key voice in the struggle for immigration reform. They, more than any other group, deserve the lion's share of credit for pushing the administration to grant an administrative deportation reprieve to qualified undocumented youth last year.¶ For DREAMERs there is no giving up on their journey toward U.S. citizenship. They will no longer take no for an answer.¶ 4. Now is the time.¶ The passion is there, the energy is there, and, most of all, the American people are there. It's time for both parties to sit down together and create an immigration process that will protect our borders, keep our families safe and together, give our businesses the tools they need to compete in the global economy, and provide a road map to lawful immigration status for the 11 million aspiring citizens currently living in the shadows.¶ Now, not later. Now.

#### The plan’s perceived as soft on Mexico – drains capital and specifically derails immigration

Shear ’13 (Michael. Politics for the New York Times. “In Latin America, US Shifts Focus from Drug War to Economy” 5/5/13 NYT)//VP

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. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that when it comes to the United States and Central America, “so much of the focus ends up being on security.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

#### Capital is key – allows Obama to thread the needle – there’s momemtum now

McMorris-Santoro 10/15 Evan, BuzzFeed Staff, Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next, 10/15/13, http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for

As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win.¶ The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.¶ “It’s at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can’t govern responsibly and is reckless that they’re going to say, ‘All right, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?’” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America’s Voice. “That’s where immigration could fill the bill.”¶ The White House and Democrats are “ready” to jump back into the immigration fray when the fiscal crises ends, Sharry said. And advocates are already drawing up their plans to put immigration back on the agenda — plans they’ll likely initiate the morning after a fiscal deal is struck.¶ “We’re talking about it. We want to be next up and we’re going to position ourselves that way,” Sharry said. “There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, ‘We’re not going to wait.’”¶ The White House isn’t ready to talk about the world after the debt limit fight yet, but officials have signaled strongly they want to put immigration back on the agenda.¶ Asked about future strategic plans after the shutdown Monday, a senior White House official said, “That’s a conversation for when the government opens and we haven’t defaulted.” But on Tuesday, Press Secretary Jay Carney specifically mentioned immigration when asked “how the White House proceeds” after the current fracas is history.¶ “Just like we wish for the country, for deficit reduction, for our economy, that the House would follow the Senate’s lead and pass comprehensive immigration reform with a big bipartisan vote,” he said. “That might be good for the Republican Party. Analysts say so; Republicans say so. We hope they do it.”¶ The president set immigration as his next priority in an interview with Univision Tuesday.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama said. He also set up another fight with the House GOP on the issue.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”¶ Don’t expect the White House effort to include barnstorming across the country on behalf of immigration reform in the days after the fiscal crisis ends, reform proponents predict. Advocates said the White House has tried hard to help immigration reform along, and in the current climate that means trying to thread the needle with Republicans who support reform but have also reflexively opposed every one of Obama’s major policy proposals.¶ Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on more of the blame from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans.¶ “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”

**Immigration key to biotech**

**Dahms 3**, (executive director of the California State University System Biotechnology Program (CSUPERB); chair of the Workforce Committee, Biotechnology Industry Organization; and a member of the ASBMB Education and Professional Development Committee, (A. Stephen, “ Foreign Scientists Seen Essential to U.S. Biotechnology,” in Pan-Organizational Summit on the U.S. Science and Engineering Workforce: Meeting Summary, National Academy of Sciences, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/picrender.fcgi?book=nap10727&blobtype=pdf>)

The **scarcity of skill**ed technicians **is** seen by **the biotech**nology **industry** in the U.S. and Canada as one of it**s** **most serious challenges**. The success of this industry is dependent on the quality of its workforce, and the skills and talents of highly trained people are recognized as one of the most vital and dynamic sources of competitive advantage. The U.S. biotechnology industry workforce has been growing 14 to 17 percent annually over the last six years and is now over 190,000 and conservatively estimated to reach 500,000 by **2012**. Despite efforts by the industry to encourage U.S. institutions to increase the production of needed specialists, a continual shortfall in the needed expertise requires access to foreign workers. Foreign workers with unique skills that are scarce in the U.S. can get permission to stay in the U.S. for up to six years under the H1B classification, after which they can apply for permanent resident status. There are currently over 600,000 foreign workers in this category across all industries, and they are critical to the success and global competitiveness of this nation. Of these H-1B visa holders, 46 percent are from India and 10 percent are from China, followed in descending order by Canada, Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, U.K., Pakistan, and the Russian Federation. Our annual national surveys have demonstrated that between 6 and 10 percent of the biotechnology workforce have H-1B visas. The constant shortfall in specialized technical workers that has been experienced by the biotechnology industry over the past six years has been partially alleviated by access to talented individuals from other nations. However, the industry’s need is sufficient to justify a 25 percent increase in H-1Bs in 2004. Biotechnology industry H-1B visa holders are mainly in highly sought after areas such as analytical chemistry, instrumentation specialization, organic synthesis, product safety and surveillance, clinical research/biostatistics, bio/pharm quality, medicinal chemistry, product scale-up, bioinformatics and applied genomics, computer science, cheminformatics, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics. Forty percent of H-1B foreign workers are at the Ph.D. level, 35 percent M.S., 20 percent B.S., and 5 percent M.D. In comparison, the U.S. biotechnology industry technical workforce is estimated to be 19 percent Ph.D., 17 percent M.S., 50 percent B.S., and 14 percent combined voc-ed/ community college trained. These and other survey data by industry human resource groups clearly show that the **H-1B** worker skill**s match** the **most pressing** employment **needs** of the biotechnology industry. The data demonstrate that maintaining a reasonably-sized H-1B cap is critical to the industry. Although the national annual H-1B visa cap was raised from 115,000 to 195,000 in the 106th Congress via S. 2045, the cap has already been exceeded. The increased cap remains in effect until 2003 and efforts are under way to ensure that it remains high. The Third Annual National Survey of H-1Bs in the biotechnology industry found that 80 percent are from U.S. universities, and 85 percent of those eventually get green cards. Companies now spend, on average, $10,200 in processing fees and legal expenses to obtain each green card, an estimated cost to the industry of more than $150 million over the past 5 years. In the wake of the 9/11 World Trade Center attacks, debate has been focused on more restrictions on foreign students, a development that would have a **severe impact** upon the competitiveness of the U.S. biotechnology industry. Clearly, the H-1B route provides a temporary solution to shortages in the national and domestic biotechnology labor pools, shortages mirroring the inadequate production of appropriately trained U.S. nationals by U.S. institutions of higher learning. The reality is that universities have inadequate resources for expanding the training pipeline, particularly in the specialized areas of the research phase of company product development. Efforts should be directed toward influencing greater congressional and federal agency attention to these important topics.

**Extinction**

**Trewavas, 2000** – Institute of Cell and Molecular Biology at the University of Edinburgh  
(Anthony, “GM Is the Best Option We Have,” 6/5/2000, [www.agbioworld.org/biotech-info/articles/biotech-art/best\_option.html](http://www.agbioworld.org/biotech-info/articles/biotech-art/best_option.html))

In 535A.D. a volcano near the present **Krakatoa** exploded with the force of 200 million Hiroshima A bombs. The dense cloud of dust so reduced the intensity of the sun that for at least two years thereafter, summer turned to winter and crops here and elsewhere in the Northern hemisphere failed completely. The population survived by hunting a rapidly vanishing population of edible animals. The after-effects continued for a decade and human history was changed irreversibly. But the planet recovered. Such examples of benign nature's wisdom, in full flood as it were, dwarf and make miniscule the tiny modifications we make upon our environment. There are apparently 100 such volcanoes round the world that could at any time unleash forces as great. And even smaller volcanic explosions change our climate and can easily threaten the security of our food supply. Our hold on this planet is tenuous. In the present day an equivalent 535A.D. explosion would **destroy** much of our **civilisation**. Only those with agricultural technology sufficiently advanced would have a chance at survival. Colliding **asteroids** are another problem that requires us to be forward-looking accepting that technological advance may be **the only buffer between** us and **annihilation**. When people say to me they do not need GM, I am astonished at their prescience, their ability to read a benign future in a crystal ball that I cannot. Now is the time to experiment; not when a holocaust is upon us and it is too late. GM is a technology whose time has come and just in the nick of time. With each billion that mankind has added to the planet have come technological advances to increase food supply. In the 18th century, the start of agricultural mechanisation; in the 19th century knowledge of crop mineral requirements, the eventual Haber Bosch process for nitrogen reduction. In the 20th century plant genetics and breeding, and later the green revolution. Each time population growth has been sustained without enormous loss of life through starvation even though crisis often beckoned. For the 21st century, genetic manipulation is our **primary hope** to maintain developing and complex technological civilisations. When the **climate is changing** in unpredictable ways, diversity in agricultural technology is a strength and a necessity not a luxury. Diversity helps secure our food supply. We have heard much of the **precautionary principle** in recent years; my version of it is "be prepared".

## 1NC

#### The United States federal government should condition the United States Department of Commerce removing the tomato price floor against Mexico on ending human rights abuses by Mexican forces. The United States federal government should enact a periodic certification process to determine that abuses are effectively investigated and prosecuted.

#### Aid without human rights conditions send the message that US condones torture and violence – turns the aff and reinforces organized crime

**WOLA 10** – Washington Office on Latin America (“Congress: Withhold Funds for Mexico Tied to Human Rights Performance,” 9/14/2010, <http://www.wola.org/publications/congress_withhold_funds_for_mexico_tied_to_human_rights_performance>) //RGP

However, research conducted by our respective organizations, Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission, and even the State Department’s own reports, demonstrates conclusively that Mexico has failed to meet the four human rights requirements set out by law. As a result, Congress should not release these select Merida funds. Releasing these funds would send the message that the United States condones the grave human rights violations committed in Mexico, including torture, rape, killings, and enforced disappearances.¶ We recognize that Mexico is facing a severe public security crisis, and that the United States can play a constructive role in strengthening Mexico’s ability to confront organized crime in an effective manner. However, human rights violations committed by Mexican security forces are not only deplorable in their own right, but also significantly undermine the effectiveness of Mexico’s public security efforts. Building trust between the Mexican people and the government is essential to gathering information to dismantle organized crime. When security forces commit grave human rights violations and they are not held accountable for their actions, they lose that trust, alienating key allies and leaving civilians in a state of terror and defenselessness. It is thus in the interest of both of our countries to help Mexico curb systematic human rights violations, ensure that violations are effectively investigated and those responsible held accountable, and assess candidly the progress Mexico is making towards improving accountability and transparency. ¶ Evidence demonstrates that Mexico is not fulfilling effectively any of the requirements established by Congress, particularly those dealing with prosecuting military abuses and torture:

## Protectionism

#### No unique brink – their Riley evidence says the conflict has dated back until NAFTA

#### Alt cause to aerospace – no demand

Blakey 12 [Marion, Aerospace Industries Association president, “Saving The Defense Industrial Base,” Breaking Defense, 12/27/12, <http://breakingdefense.com/2012/12/27/saving-the-defense-industrial-base/>]//VP

If 9/11 brought to an abrupt end Francis Fukuyama’s “End of History” thesis that the spread of liberal democracies and free market capitalism might lead to an era of peace, recent events have provided the United States an even more ominous warning that we must be prepared to address current and emerging long-term threats to our military superiority.¶ Certainly, countering Iran’s ambition to become a nuclear power and its ongoing efforts to destabilize the Middle East is a real concern. And we must also take seriously the idea that our strategic “Pacific Pivot” may need to be implemented quicker than our military planners initially envisioned. This fall’s saber rattling between China and Japan over a set of contested tiny islands in the South China Sea and East China Sea serve as a sobering reminder that America could well find itself involved in a war between two great Asian powers in the near future.¶ Unfortunately, these challenges are occurring at a time when the U.S. defense budget is being significantly squeezed by tremendous fiscal pressures. And we know from past eras of defense budget retrenchment that investments in new equipment and research and development of the new systems and capabilities needed to maintain America’s vital technological edge are often first on the chopping block.¶ There is a corollary concern for national defense involving the scientists, engineers and technicians whose innovation we count on to ensure our nation remains second to none. AIA has documented how mandatory sequestration budget cuts will put at risk 2.14 million jobs across the economy. We have a real concern that once pink slips come to valuable defense workers, we may lose their talents and skills for good.

#### No internal link to trade – their evidence says Mexico will retaliate but does not make the warrant of a trade war

#### Trade does not solve war

**Martin et al 08,** Mayer and Thoenig, 08 (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)//VP

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.

#### No miscalc – The US is not on hair-trigger alert.

Ford ‘8 (Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Technology and Global Security at the Hudson Institute in Washington. D.C. He previously served as U.S. Special Representative for Nuclear Nonproliferation, and as a Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Stat; Dilemmas of Nuclear Force ‘De-Alerting’” Presented to the International Peace Institute Policy Forum  New York  October 7; [www.hudson.org/files/documents/**De-Alerting**%20FINAL2%20(2).pdf](http://www.hudson.org/files/documents/De-Alerting%20FINAL2%20(2).pdf), )//VP

This argument seems somewhat less compelling, however, when one realizes that it is based upon a confusion: U.S. and Russian nuclear postures apparently do not actually assume that launch orders will be given upon warning of attack. In fact, though the United States has always refused absolutely to rule out a launch-on- warning posture, apparently believing that ambiguity on this score complicates Russian planning scenarios and enhances thus deterrence10 – and although U.S. alert forces could launch on such short notice if the President actually gave the order – U.S. strategic planners appear never to have adopted such a position. Indeed, the United States has spent many billions of dollars to build and maintain an extremely capable ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) force as the backbone of its deterrent posture, precisely because of the presumed invulnerability to preemptive attack of deployed U.S. submarines on “deterrent patrol.”11 Having such a survivable force available for retaliatory strikes necessarily means that when confronted with what appears to be an incoming Russian attack, U.S. leaders would not necessarily face irresistible “use it or lose it” pressures to launch immediately. Since the end of the Cold War, moreover, the U.S. force posture has evolved further away from maintaining a rapid reaction capability and high alert levels, and today few of the operationally deployed U.S. nuclear forces are maintained on a ready alert status capable of immediate launch even if this were American policy. The United States carefully maintains the ability to respond promptly to any attack in order to complicate any adversary’s planning and thereby enhance deterrence, but it does not assume LOW. (Nor, however, does it ever discuss precisely what its actual alert status is. No nuclear weapons state does.12) As the U.S. Ambassador to the CD quipped at one point, in response to a request that the United States abandon its “hair- trigger” alert policy, “Frankly, in order to take action to comply with this request, we would first have to put our weapons on ‘hair-trigger alert,’ so we could then de-alert them. The fact is that U.S. nuclear forces are not and have never been on ‘hair-trigger alert.’”13

#### Animals will adapt to ocean acid --- their studies are flawed.

**Schlengel et al 2012** - Peter Schlegel, Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, Jon N. Havenhand, Department of Biological & Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Tjärnö Marine Biological Laboratory, Strömstad, Sweden, Michael R. Gillings, Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, Jane E. Williamson, Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, “Individual Variability in Reproductive Success Determines Winners and Losers under Ocean Acidification: A Case Study with Sea Urchins,” <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0053118>)//a-berg

Environmental factors directly affect populations by selecting resilient individuals. Selection at the gametic level, or during early life, has strong and immediate effects at the population level, carrying over into subsequent life stages. Heritability of this resilience leads to cascading adaptive effects in subsequent generations. For example, in free-spawning marine organisms, sperm selection during fertilization plays a key role by determining the nature and diversity of genotypes in the subsequent generation [1], [2] and thus their resilience to environmental change. Rising atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are a key driver of environmental change, and will likely lead to rapid ocean acidification [3], [4]. With gametes possessing no, or only limited, buffering capacities against CO2-mediated pH changes in seawater, the dynamics of fertilization and subsequent development are likely to be affected in all free-spawning marine organisms, with potentially severe implications [5], [6]. Yet we know little about the relative fitness of individuals within species under the predicted acidification of the ocean. The sensitivity of reproductive processes to ocean acidification has thus far been assessed from mean responses of mixtures of gametes and/or larvae obtained from multiple individuals [7]–[10] (but see [11]). However, the key determinant of reproductive success in a future ocean is not the average response, but the proportion of successful offspring contributed by each individual under the changed environmental conditions. Individual-level responses to ocean acidification have been examined to some extent in larval development processes [12], [13], but not closely in fertilization processes. In this context, the importance of naturally high variability that is observed in fertilization success of individual pairwise crosses [14], [15] becomes apparent: not all matings are equal. Consequently, acidification-mediated impacts on reproductive success and subsequent development might result in flow-on consequences for genetic diversity and population demographics [12].

## Tomatoes

#### **No internal link –**

#### **1) their Moore ev does not make the warrant that Mexicos price floor kills all green tech innovation**

#### **2) just because tomato harvesting green tech goes down does not mean there will be a nuclear war – no brink**

#### **Not reverse casual – their evidence does not say that removing the price floor would solve greentech**

#### **Food wars are a myth**

Salehyann, 7 – Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas (Idean, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922>) //SP

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

#### **No shortages – food is abundant**

Poole, 6 – Institute for Food and Development Policy (Holly Kavana, “12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, <http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths>) //SP

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products.

# 2NC

## Protectionism

#### Even if they solve workforce, security clearance issues prevent solvency

Blakey 12 [Marion, Aerospace Industries Association president, “Saving The Defense Industrial Base,” Breaking Defense, 12/27/12, <http://breakingdefense.com/2012/12/27/saving-the-defense-industrial-base/>]//VP

A number of factors are leading students away from considering defense-oriented careers. A report released this October by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) laid it on the line. While “a workforce with robust STEM capabilities is critical to sustaining U.S. preeminence,” wrote the authors, “Today, the STEM activities of the DOD are a small and diminishing part of the nation’s overall science and engineering enterprise.” The report focused not only on the lack of DOD STEM programs, but on the difficulty of hiring foreign nationals for defense work because they cannot obtain security clearances. Yet they constitute more than 50 percent of America’s new graduates in STEM disciplines.

**CTBT verification solves miscalc and accidental war.**

Nature News 2 (“Microphones tell asteroids from A-bombs,” July 17, http://www.nature.com/news/1998/020715/full/news020715-4.html)//VP

Ground-based groups of microphones, called infrasonic arrays, can distinguish atomic blasts from exploding asteroids up to a few hundred kilometres away, say Brown, Tagliaferri and colleagues1. The arrays pick up the very-low-frequency sounds that penetrate hundreds of kilometres of the Earth's atmosphere. Multiple arrays pinpoint the position and size of a blast almost as accurately as the satellites used by US Space Command, the researchers show. Right now, there are 12 such arrays. Sixty will be built within the next 5 years as part of the CTBT International Monitoring Network. The rules of the treaty dictate that their data must be available to all. A global array should spot meteor explosions from most areas of the world, says Brown. The infrasonic network will also be important for research. Meteorites smaller than 10 metres across are hard to detect with telescopes, so scientists have little idea of how often they breach our atmosphere. An idea of how frequently small asteroids occur is important for estimating the likelihood of larger ones, such as the one that devastated thousands of square kilometres of Siberian forest in Tunguska in 1908. The microphone array, says Matthew Genge of the Natural History Museum in London, UK, "will help us tell just how many Tunguskas we can expect".

## Politics

#### extinction

Ochs, 2[Richard, BS in Natural Resource Management from Rutgers University, with honors, BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE IMMEDIATELY ABOLISHED, http://www .freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)//VP

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of **nuc**lear weapon**s**, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are **easier to control. B**iological **w**eapons, on the other hand, can **get out of control** very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then **grow** or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even **greater calamity** on the human race **than** could persistent **radiation**. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

**Turns the economy**

**Krudy ‘13** [Edward. Politics for Reuters. “Analysis: Immigration Reform could Boost US Economic Growth” Reuters, 1/29/13 ln]

**The sluggish U.S. economy could get a lift** if President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of senators succeed in what could be the biggest overhaul of the nation's immigration system since the 1980s. Relaxed immigration rules could **encourage entrepreneurship**, increase demand for housing, raise tax revenues and help reduce the budget deficit, economists said. By helping more immigrants enter the country legally and allowing many illegal immigrants to remain, the United States could help offset a slowing birth rate and put itself in a stronger demographic position than aging Europe, Japan and China. "**Numerous industries in the U**nited **S**tates **can't find the workers they need, right now even in a bad economy**, to fill their orders and expand their production as the market demands," said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration specialist at the libertarian Cato Institute. The emerging **consensus among economists** is that **immigration** provides a net benefit. It **increases** **demand** and productivity, helps drive innovation and lowers prices, although there is little agreement on the size of the impact on economic growth. President Barack Obama plans to launch his second-term push for a U.S. immigration overhaul during a visit to Nevada on Tuesday and will make it a high priority to win congressional approval of a reform package this year, the White House said. The chances of major reforms gained momentum on Monday when a bipartisan group of senators agreed on a framework that could eventually give 11 million illegal immigrants a chance to become American citizens. Their proposals would also include means to keep and attract workers with backgrounds in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This would be aimed both at foreign students attending American universities where they are earning advanced degrees and high-tech workers abroad. An estimated 40 percent of scientists in the United States are immigrants and studies show immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses, said Nowrasteh. Boosting legal migration and legalizing existing workers could add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years, estimates Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a specialist in immigration policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. That's an annual increase of 0.8 percentage points to the economic growth rate, **currently stuck at about 2 percent**. REPUBLICANS' HISPANIC PUSH Other economists say the potential benefit to growth is much lower. Richard Freeman, an economist at Harvard, believes most of the benefits to the economy from illegal immigrants already in the United States has already been recorded and legalizing their status would produce only incremental benefits. While opposition to reform lingers on both sides of the political spectrum and any controversial legislation can easily meet a quick end in a divided Washington, the chances of substantial change seem to be rising. Top Republicans such as Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana are not mincing words about the party's need to appeal to the Hispanic community and foreign-born voters who were turned off by Republican candidate Mitt Romney's tough talk in last year's presidential campaign. A previous Obama plan, unveiled in May 2011, included the creation of a guest-worker program to meet agricultural labor needs and something similar is expected to be in his new proposal. The senators also indicated they would support a limited program that would allow companies in certain sectors to import guest workers if Americans were not available to fill some positions. An additional boost to growth could come from rising wages for newly legalized workers and higher productivity from the arrival of more highly skilled workers from abroad. Increased tax revenues would help federal and state authorities plug budget deficits although the benefit to government revenues will be at least partially offset by the payment of benefits to those who gain legal status. In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that proposed immigration reform in that year would have generated $48 billion in revenue from 2008 to 2017, while costing $23 billion in health and welfare payments. There is also unlikely to be much of a saving on enforcement from the senators' plan because they envisage tougher border security to prevent further illegal immigration and a crackdown on those overstaying visas. One way to bump up revenue, according to a report co-authored by University of California, Davis economist Giovanni Peri, would be to institute a cap-and-trade visa system. Peri estimated it could generate up to $1.2 billion annually. Under such a system, the government would auction a certain number of visas employers could trade in a secondary market. "A more efficient, more transparent and more flexible immigration system would help firms expand, contribute to more job creation in the United States, and slow the movement of operations abroad," according to a draft report, soon to be published as part of a study by the Hamilton Project, a think tank. There was no immediate sign that either the Obama or the senators' plan would include such a system. The long-term argument for immigration is a demographic one. Many developed nations are seeing their populations age, adding to the burden of pension and healthcare costs on wage-earners. Immigration in the United States would need to double to keep the working-age population stable at its current 67 percent of total population, according to George Magnus, a senior independent economic adviser at UBS in London, While Magnus says a change of that magnitude may prove too politically sensitive, the focus should be on attracting highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants in the way Canada and Australia do by operating a points system for immigrants rather than focusing mainly on family connections. "The trick is to shift the balance of migration towards those with education (and) skills," he added. HARD ROAD Academics at major universities such as Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology often lament that **many of their top foreign graduates end up returning to their home countries because visas are hard to get.** "We have so much talent that is sitting here in the universities," said William Kerr, a professor at Harvard Business School. "I find it very difficult to swallow that we then make it so hard for them to stay." The last big amnesty for illegal immigrants was in 1986 when President Ronald Reagan legalized about 3 million already in the country. Numerous studies have shown that subsequently their wages rose significantly. Research on how immigration affects overall wages is inconclusive. George Borjas at Harvard says immigration has created a small net decrease in overall wages for those born in the United States, concentrated among the low-skilled, while Giovani Peri at UC Davis found that immigration boosts native wages over the long run. Hinojosa-Ojeda stresses that any reform needs to make it easier for guest workers to enter the country to avoid a new build-up of illegal workers. "If we don't create a mechanism that can basically bring in 300,000 to 400,000 new workers a year into a variety of labor markets and needs, we could be setting ourselves up for that again," said Hinojosa-Ojeda. Nowrasteh at Cato also believes an expanded guest worker program would stem illegal immigration and allow industries to overcome labor shortages. He found that harsher regulations in recent years in Arizona were adversely affecting agricultural production, increasing financial burdens on business and even negatively impacting the state's struggling real estate market. Some large companies have fallen foul of tougher enforcement regulations. Restaurant chain Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc fired roughly 500 staff in 2010 and 2011 after undocumented workers were found on its payrolls. Putting the chill on other employers, it is now subject of an ongoing federal criminal investigation into its hiring. "**The current system doesn't seem to work for anyone**," Chipotle spokesman Chris Arnold said.

**Immigration shreds cooperation**

**Inter-American Dialogue 12 -** the Inter-American Dialogue is the leading US center for policy analysis, exchange, and communication on issues in Western Hemisphere affairs(“Remaking the Relationship The United States and Latin America”, April 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)//VP

Washington’s failure to repair the United States’ broken immigration system is breeding resentment across the region, nowhere more so than in the principal points of origin and transit: Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. Latin Americans find the idea of building a wall on the US-Mexico border particularly offensive. Despite bitter political battles over immigration in the United States, there is general agreement about what sensible reform would include . It combines effective border and employer enforcement, the adoption of a general worker program consistent with labor market needs in the United States, and a path toward residence and citizenship for the estimated 12 million unauthorized residents living in the country . This package is similar to the reform effort (unfortunately defeated in Congress) proposed under President George W . Bush . The complicated and divisive politics of the United States, compounded by the weakness of the US economy, have so far blocked this comprehensive approach . But more limited measures such as the Dream Act, allowing children brought to the United States without appropriate documentation an opportunity to qualify for citizenship, would not only be welcomed in US Latino communities and in Latin America, but it would demonstrate that the issue is being taken seriously and with a measure of compassion in Washington . Sensible US immigration policies promise to benefit the US economy . Migrants make up a significant percentage of younger workers. Their presence would improve the labor demographic and increase the US capacity for economic growth even while their contributions help sustain the US social security system. Immigration reform would also recognize the growing “Latinoamericanization” of the United States . Roughly one sixth of the population is currently of Latino descent . The cultural, demographic and family ties of those 50 million people will continue to deepen. The United States’ inability to respond to the policy challenge of immigration will have increasingly negative consequences, standing in the way of a more productive relationship with Latin America.

**We control the internal link to aerospace – temporary workers key to industry competitiveness and innovation**

**AIAA 10** [American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, "Recruiting, retaining, and developing a world-class aerospace workforce: An AIAA Information Paper, presented at the AIAA's 13th Annual AIAA Congressional Visits Day in March 2010, pdf, <http://www.doleta.gov/brg/indprof/aerospace_report.pdf>]//VP

Without a strong aerospace workforce, the United States will lose the resulting economic and national security benefits. Incentives are needed for industry to invest in domestic aerospace workforce development, and for U.S. students to choose an engineering career. Barriers to employing talented foreign nationals must also be removed. Aerospace represents about $200 billion (or 1.5%) of the domestic economy and in 1997 provided a $56 billion positive trade balance. The aerospace workforce is the foundation of the industry’s success, yet unique workforce demographics present challenges. Figure 11 shows the age distribution of the aerospace business workforce compared to the total U.S. workforce. Up to half of the current aerospace workforce will be eligible for retirement within five years. Aerospace workforce composition does not match national demographic averages. Compared to the total US workforce, the aerospace industry and NASA have a disproportionately large percentage of workers aged 4055, and a disproportionately small percentage of workers younger than 40. Student loans, research dollars to support universities, and service scholarships can provide incentives for younger workers to consider aerospace and join the industry. If talented young engineers are not recruited, retained, and developed to replace the workforce generation that is near retirement, then the U.S. stands to lose the valuable economic and critical national security benefits of the domestic aerospace industry. As shown in Figure 22, large percentages of engineers are working outside the science and engineering professions. Engineering students burdened with college loans are seeking greener pastures. As shown in Figure 33, aerospace engineering salaries are low compared to other industries. If the U.S. is to retain its edge in this industry, salaries need to rise and incentives given for entering the industry. Further, since 1980, the number of nonacademic science and engineering jobs has grown at more than four times the rate of the U.S. labor force as a whole2. With a growing number of science and engineering jobs anticipated, the supply of visas set aside under law for “highly qualified foreign workers,” – 65,000 a year4 – is not enough. A decline in student, exchange, and temporary high-skilled worker visas issued since 2001 interrupted a long-term trend of growth. The number of student visas and of temporary high-skilled worker visas issued have both declined by more than 25% since FY 2001. These declines were due both to fewer applications and to an increase in the proportion of visa applications rejected2.To add to the supply pressures of science and engineering workers in our economy, there is increased recruitment of high-skilled labor, including scientists and engineers, by many national governments and private firms. For example, in 1999, 241,000 individuals entered Japan with temporary high-skill work visas, a 75 percent increase over 19925. Research and development [R&D] expenditures keep the aerospace industry strong and help maintain US leadership in this sector. As shown in Figure 46, the R&D tax credit is working to increase corporate spending on this important activity. In the early 1990s, after implementation of the R&D tax credit legislation, private expenditures on R&D rose2. Yet even with this incentive, U.S. industry research and development funding is lagging. In 2001, US industry spent more on tort litigation than on research and development4. Perhaps as a result, American companies are lagging in patents. In 2005, only four American companies ranked among the top 10 corporate recipients of patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office4. And to further add to this distressing R&D dollars situation, federal research funding is lagging as well. The amount invested annually by the US federal government in research in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering combined is less than what Americans spend on potato chips7,8. RECOMMENDATIONS To remain globally competitive, the U.S. must adopt policies to increase our talent base in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), must educate, engage, and retain STEM professionals using means consistent with generational changes in technologies and markets, and must provide incentives for investment in research and development that helps to attract applicable talent. The AIAA recommends policies in three areas to achieve these goals: incentives for college students to study engineering, and corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, and immigration for STEM professionals. In the area of incentives for college students to study engineering, forgivable loan programs should be implemented for students who study engineering and enter the domestic technical workforce. Service scholarships should be created to pay college for students who desire to and will serve in aerospace-related U.S. government agencies after graduation. In addition, investments must be made in aerospace research infrastructure and increasing R&D funding to universities, since good research opportunities attract talented students into graduate STEM studies. R&D dollars provide a fourfold return by supporting graduate students, generating knowledge, creating innovation opportunities for small businesses around universities, and building the next generation of talented engineers. In the area of corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, targeted tax credits or incentives should be instituted for domestic aerospace workforce development expenses. An IR&D-like program for aerospace workforce development should be established by allowing a small percentage of government contract funding to aerospace companies to go into a development fund to be used on effective programs to expand domestic workforce capabilities. In addition, the R&D tax credit should be made permanent, providing stability to corporate fiscal policies, and thereby fostering a critical technology and engineering research environment that attracts the best and brightest into the technology and engineering fields. Lastly, in the area of immigration, barriers should be removed so that the US may retain talented foreign nationals in STEM professions critical to the aerospace industry.

**WE turn green-tech**

Norris 10--Teryn, "Racing for Clean Tech Jobs: Why America Needs an Energy Education Strategy", Daily Kos, March 18th, <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2010/3/18/847363/-Racing-for-Clean-Tech-Jobs:-Why-America-Needs-an-Energy-Education-Strategy>//VP

In the aftermath of the Great Recession, the United States faces serious questions about the future of its economy and jobs market. Where will the good jobs of the future come from, how do we prepare the American workforce, and what is our strategy to maintain economic leadership in an increasingly competitive world? A growing consensus suggests that clean tech will be one of our generation's largest growth sectors. The global clean-tech market is expected to surpass $1 trillion in value within the next few years, and a perfect storm of factors - from the inevitability of a carbon-constrained world, to skyrocketing global energy demand, to long-term oil price hikes - will drive global demand for clean-energy technologies. That is why the national debate about global clean-tech competitiveness is so important, sparked by the rapid entry of China and other nations. My colleagues and I recently contributed to the discussion with "Rising Tigers, Sleeping Giant," a large report providing the first comprehensive analysis of competitive positions among the U.S. and key Asian challengers. In order to compete, we found, "U.S. energy policy must include large, direct and coordinated investments in clean-technology R&D, manufacturing, deployment, and infrastructure." But even if the United States adopts a real industrial policy for clean energy, there is little evidence that our workforce is skilled enough to compete. Unfortunately, according to the Department of Energy, "The U.S. ranks behind other major nations in making the transitions required to educate students for emerging energy trades, research efforts and other professions to support the future energy technology mix." A competitive energy workforce requires much more than technicians and building retrofitters. Scientists, engineers, high-tech entrepreneurs, and advanced manufacturers will play a critical role, just as they have in strategic sectors like infotech, aerospace, and biotech. The federal government has started to address the need for green technician and efficiency retrofit training, such as with the Green Jobs Act, but it has not implemented an education strategy to keep the U.S. at the leading edge of energy science, technology, and entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, the majority of our colleges and universities lack degree programs focused on energy, and the U.S. power engineering education system is on the decline. Over the next five years, 45 percent of electric utility engineers will be eligible for retirement, along with 40 percent of key power engineering faculty at U.S. universities, according to a report by IEEE. "Engineering workforce shortages are already occurring," the report concludes. "We need more electrical engineers to solve industry challenges, and to build the 21st century electric power grid... Meeting these needs requires long-term investment now." Meanwhile, other countries are producing a substantially larger portion of scientists, engineers, and researchers that will benefit their clean-tech industries. Science and engineering make up only about one-third of U.S. bachelor's degrees, compared to 63 percent in Japan, 53 percent in China and 51 percent in Singapore, and the number of Chinese researchers is now on par with the United States (though some have pointed out that the quality of these graduates and researchers is not always comparable). "Over time," stated a recent report by the National Science Board, "the United States has fallen from one of the top countries in terms of its ratio of natural science and engineering degrees to the college-age population to near the bottom of the 23 countries for which data are available." The energy workforce deficit and STEM education gap will substantially limit the nation's ability to lead the clean-tech industry and accelerate clean energy development. As Nobel Laureate Paul Krugman put it, "If you had to explain America's economic success with one word, that word would be 'education.'" In order to succeed in the clean-tech industry, the U.S. must develop an energy education strategy to develop tens of thousands of advanced energy scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs, as well as technicians.

#### Obama has switched strategies on immigration and is willing to negotiate with House republicans---Limited time of the docket means Obamas leverage his political capital to secure a comprehensive set of reforms.

Los Angeles Times 10/25/13

HEADLINE: Obama softens tone on border reform; He indicates that he would consider a package of smaller GOP bills that include a path to citizenship.

After months of insisting the House should take up the comprehensive immigration bill that passed the Senate in June, President Obama changed tactics Thursday and said he might consider GOP proposals to overhaul separate parts of the immigration system. The White House is hoping that public anger at the 16-day government shutdown has so badly damaged the GOP that House Republican leaders will consider immigration reform as a way to improve their popularity with moderate voters. Obama's aides also are intent on showing the president is willing to compromise, partly to counter GOP charges that he was inflexible during the bitter shutdown standoff. In remarks at the White House, Obama hinted that he was no longer tied to the Senate bill, the elaborate product of months of intense bipartisan negotiations, to achieve what he has called a major priority for his second term. Obama instead signaled that he might consider a package of smaller bills, if necessary, as long as they provide a path to citizenship for the estimated 11 million people in the country without legal status. "If House Republicans have new and different additional ideas on how we should move forward, then we want to hear them. I'll be listening," Obama told several dozen pro-reform activists from labor, business and religious groups. White House spokesman Jay Carney echoed the shift, telling reporters there are "a variety of ways that you can reach the ultimate goal" of a bill that Obama could sign into law. "The House's approach will be up to the House," Carney said. "There is a comprehensive bill the House Democrats have put together that is similar to the Senate bill and reflects the president's principles. But the means by which we arrive at our destination is in some ways of course up to the lawmakers who control the houses of Congress." The White House effort to resuscitate a bill that seemed all but dead in the House before the shutdown still faces steep and perhaps insurmountable odds. But the jockeying Thursday raised at least some hope that compromise remains possible. "I hope President Obama meant what he said today about listening to new and different ideas presented by House Republicans," House Judiciary Committee Chairman Robert W. Goodlatte (R-Va.) said in a statement. "The president should work with Congress, including House Republicans, to achieve immigration reform, and not against us." In recent weeks, GOP leaders have worked behind the scenes to craft legislative proposals that might pass muster with rank-and-file Republicans and -- if joined with a legalization program -- could appeal to the White House. Majority Leader Eric Cantor and other House Republicans have met in small groups to write bills that would change parts of the immigration system. GOP proposals include adding high-tech visas, revamping farm and low-skilled immigrant labor programs, and ramping up border security. "I expect us to move forward this year in trying to address reform and what is broken about our system," Cantor said on the House floor Wednesday. Whether the House will go as far as the Senate, and include a 13-year pathway to citizenship for qualified immigrants, is far from clear. Republicans seemed unwilling to accept the entire Senate bill, which includes $46 billion over 10 years for extra border security and other programs, as well as numerous legal reforms. On Thursday, House Speaker John A. Boehner's office said the House would not consider "massive, Obamacare-style legislation that no one understands," referring to the Senate bill. "Instead, the House is committed to a common-sense, step-by-step approach that gives Americans confidence that reform is done the right way." In his comments Thursday, Obama offered some unsolicited advice to House Republicans, who took the brunt of the blame for the bruising budget and debt battles of recent weeks. "Good policy is good politics in this instance," Obama said. "If folks are really that consumed with the politics of fixing our broken immigration system, they should take a closer look at the polls, because the American people support this." Outside analysts and advocates say Obama needs to gain support from House Republicans who might be tempted to support immigration reform but are wary of supporting a bill he has embraced. Simply urging the House to pass the Senate bill may antagonize them. "He has zero credibility," said Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.), who has worked for months on a House bill that would increase border security and make it possible for some immigrants without legal status to pay a penalty and eventually apply for legal status. "If he wants to be helpful on immigration reform, he has to do what he has been doing for the past five years, which is nothing." Rep. Luis V. Gutierrez (D-Ill.), who asked the president in a meeting at the White House earlier this year to step back from negotiations in Congress for fear his involvement would spook Republicans, thought Obama struck the right tone Thursday. "He didn't say, 'It's my way or the highway,' " said Gutierrez, who is involved in discussions with House Republicans on immigration proposals. Gutierrez wants Obama to step up his involvement in crafting a deal, including bringing together both sides for a face-to-face meeting. "Camp David is a nice place in the fall," Gutierrez said. The bigger problem may be time. The House is only in session for five more weeks before the Christmas break. With other business stacked up due to the government shutdown, that leaves scant floor time to debate and pass a complex package of proposals. Motorola Solutions Inc. Chairman Greg Brown, who heads the Business Roundtable Select Committee on Comprehensive Immigration Reform, saw room for compromise. "We agree with Speaker Boehner and the president that the time is now to fix our broken immigration system," he said in a statement. "Our economy needs a boost, and immigration reform will help." Frank Sharry, the head of America's Voice, an immigration reform advocacy group, said he thought the president's comments "signaled openness."

#### Obama’s push locks-up a House vote, but the window is narrow

**Scher, 10/18** – Reporter for The Week (Bill, The Week, 2013, How to make John Boehner cave on immigration, theweek.com/article/index/251361/how-to-make-john-boehner-cave-on-immigration)//VP

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) generally adheres to the unwritten Republican rule that bars him from allowing votes on bills opposed by a majority of Republicans, even if they would win a majority of the full House. But he's caved four times this year, allowing big bills to pass with mainly Democratic support. They include repealing the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans; providing Hurricane Sandy relief; expanding the Violence Against Women act to better cover immigrants, Native Americans, and LGBT survivors of abuse; and this week's bill raising the debt limit and reopening the federal government. Many presume the Republican House is a black hole sucking President Obama's second-term agenda into oblivion. But the list of Boehner's past retreats offers a glimmer of hope, especially to advocates of immigration reform. Though it has languished in the House, an immigration overhaul passed with bipartisan support in the Senate, and was given a fresh push by Obama in the aftermath of the debt limit deal. The big mystery that immigration advocates need to figure out: What makes Boehner cave? Is there a common thread? Is there a sequence of buttons you can push that forces Boehner to relent? Two of this year's caves happened when Boehner was backed up against hard deadlines: The Jan. 1 fiscal cliff and the Oct. 17 debt limit. Failure to concede meant immediate disaster. Reject the bipartisan compromise on rolling back the Bush tax cuts, get blamed for jacking up taxes on every taxpayer. Reject the Senate's three-month suspension of the debt limit, get blamed for sparking a global depression. Boehner held out until the absolute last minute both times, but he was not willing to risk blowing the deadline. A third involved the response to an emergency: Hurricane Sandy. Conservative groups were determined to block disaster relief because — as with other federal disaster responses — the $51 billion legislative aid package did not include offsetting spending cuts. Lacking Republican votes, Boehner briefly withdrew the bill from consideration, unleashing fury from New York and New Jersey Republicans, including Gov. Chris Christie. While there wasn't a hard deadline to meet, disaster relief was a time-sensitive matter, and the pressure from Christie and his allies was unrelenting. Two weeks after pulling the bill, Boehner put it on the floor, allowing it to pass over the objections of 179 Republicans. The fourth cave occurred in order to further reform and expand a government program: The Violence Against Women Act. The prior version of the law had been expired for over a year, as conservatives in the House resisted the Senate bill in the run-up to the 2012 election. But after Mitt Romney suffered an 18-point gender gap in his loss to Obama, and after the new Senate passed its version again with a strong bipartisan vote, Boehner was unwilling to resist any longer. Two weeks later, the House passed the Senate bill with 138 Republicans opposed. Unfortunately for immigration advocates, there is no prospect of widespread pain if reform isn't passed. There is no immediate emergency, nor threat of economic collapse. But there is a deadline of sorts: The 2014 midterm elections. If we've learned anything about Boehner this month, it's that he's a party man to the bone. He dragged out the shutdown and debt limit drama for weeks, without gaining a single concession, simply so his most unruly and revolutionary-minded members would believe he fought the good fight and stay in the Republican family. What he won is party unity, at least for the time being. What Boehner lost for his Republicans is national respectability. Republican Party approval hit a record low in both the most recent NBC/Wall Street Journal poll and Gallup poll. Here's where immigration advocates have a window of opportunity to appeal to Boehner's party pragmatism. Their pitch: The best way to put this disaster behind them is for Republicans to score a big political victory. You need this. A year after the Republican brand was so bloodied that the Republican National Committee had to commission a formal "autopsy," party approval is the worst it has ever been. You've wasted a year. Now is the time to do something that some voters will actually like. There's reason to hope he could be swayed. In each of the four cases in which he allowed Democrats to carry the day, he put the short-term political needs of the Republican Party over the ideological demands of right-wing activists. Boehner will have to do another round of kabuki. He can't simply swallow the Senate bill in a day. There will have to be a House version that falls short of activists' expectations, followed by tense House-Senate negotiations. Probably like in the most formulaic of movies, and like the fiscal cliff and debt limit deals, there will have to be an "all-is-lost moment" right before we get to the glorious ending. Boehner will need to given the room to do all this again. But he won't do it without a push. A real good push.

#### Ag lobby will backlash – empirics prove they find controversy in everything

**Drum, 09** – inventor of Friday catblogging, Kevin was a blogosphere pioneer when, after a stint in marketing, he went online as Calpundit in 2003. Prior to joining MoJo, he blogged at the Washington Monthly's Political Animal (Kevin, November 2009, “Betting the Farm”, Mother Jones, <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2009/11/betting-farm>)//VP

They are indeed. Because while most industries would be happy to win a total and unconditional victory, agriculture isn't like most industries. They still had complaints, chief among them the fact that the bill would modestly raise the price of energy and chemicals in the future, and farmers buy energy and chemicals. Everyone else does too, of course, and that's the whole point: Higher prices will provide an incentive to use less energy and fewer chemicals, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and slowing global warming. But everyone else doesn't have the power of the ag lobby behind them. "Farm Bureau" may sound rural and heartlandish, but in reality it's a multibillion-dollar trade association **cum insurance company** with branches in all 50 states and close ties to agribusiness giants like Archer Daniels Midland and Novartis, not to mention a few dozen farm-state senators. With clout like that, shared sacrifice clearly isn't an acceptable option, even in the service of fixing a problem that poses an enormous threat to farmers. (Global warming is projected to hit heartland states the hardest—and even small shifts in temperature can have disastrous consequences for crop yields.) And so, the lobby demanded compensation for those higher energy and chemical prices, even though they would mean only a tiny hit to farm incomes—1 percent at most for the next nine years, according to the USDA. The compensation they got came via something called offsets. Under Waxman-Markey's cap-and-trade provisions, you'd have to buy permits for the CO2 you emit, but you can reduce the number of permits you have to buy if you do things to reduce greenhouse gases. Some offsets are legitimate; some are smoke and mirrors. The way to support the former and weed out the latter is to have the EPA keep a close eye on things. But the ag lobby insisted that the farm-friendly USDA be put in charge of the offset program instead. Change the way you till the soil so that—maybe, possibly—less carbon is released, and voilà! You get a check. The USDA estimates that an average wheat farmer could make an extra $1,775 a year this way. But that still wasn't enough for the ag lobby. Next on their hit list was protection for ethanol. For years corn farmers have argued that ethanol has a lower carbon footprint than gasoline. It turns out that this isn't true if you take into account the land-use changes that accompany ethanol production: The corn grown for ethanol displaces feed corn, which displaces soybean crops, which causes Brazilian farmers 6,000 miles away to make up the difference by growing more soybeans on their pastureland. This in turn displaces their cattle to new pastures created by clearcutting the rainforest, thus wiping out all of ethanol's carbon benefits. The net effect, the EPA's scientists have concluded, is that ethanol's real carbon footprint is about the same as gasoline's—or even worse.

#### Plan causes trade disputes in congress – political opposition – Obama gets the blame too

**Korves, 12** Truth About Trade and Technology in 2004 as the Economic and Trade Policy Analyst. Researching and analyzing economic issues important to agricultural producers, Ross provides an intimate understanding regarding the interface of economic policy analysis and the political process. Mr. Korves served the American Farm Bureau Federation as an Economist from 1980 – 2004. He served as Chief Economist from April 2001 through September 2003 and held the title of Senior Economist from September 2003 through August 2004. (Ross, “U.S. Tomato Dispute with Mexico”, Truth about Trade and Technology, October 4, <http://www.truthabouttrade.org/2012/10/04/u-s-tomato-dispute-with-mexico/>)//VP

That politics would enter a trade dispute in a Presidential election year is not a surprise. Both political parties slice the electorate into political interest subgroups and appeal to their specific needs. That tomato growers, input suppliers and farm workers, would be one of those subgroups seems logical. Representatives from both parties signing a letter of support is a normal response to a local political constituency. A Senator running for reelection is expected to chime in. The role of the President should be different. He is called upon to represent the broader interests of all consumers and exporters of other goods and services. The goal of the Florida tomato growers is to protect their business interests. Achieving that requires taxing the competition and that requires calculations to show that Mexican tomatoes are not priced high enough. A U.S. President should not be part of that to the disadvantage of all U.S. consumers and other exporters.

#### The means all parts

**Merriam-Websters, 8** [Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary]

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### “Federal Government” is all three branches

**Truman Library, No Date** (Harry S. Truman: Library and Museum- One of thirteen presidential libraries, “Three Branches of Government”, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/teacher_lessons/3branches/1.htm>) MaxL

Our federal government has three parts. They are the Executive, (President and about 5,000,000 workers) Legislative (Senate and House of Representatives) and Judicial (Supreme Court and lower Courts).

#### **Spiking the link is a voting issue – steals neg ground – politics DAs are good because it increases civic engagement**

#### **A**) Congressional review act

David M. McIntosh, Chair, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory, Affairs of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee and Former Executive Director of the Council on Competitiveness in the Bush I Administration, “Congress Must Stop Regulation Without Representation,” THE PUBLIC MANAGER: THE NEW BUREAUCRAT, June 22, 1998, LN.

By requiring the agencies to report all new rules to Congress and giving Congress the opportunity to review and strike down bad rules, the CRA gives Congress a powerful trump card against agencies that go too far. It could put Congress back in the driver's seat. At the same time, the CRA puts Congress in the hot seat.

#### B) Appropriations

Lovell 2K (Assistant Professor of Government, College of William and Mary, George, 17 Const. Commentary 79)

It is true that members of Congress do not cast "yes" or "no" votes on particular rules created by agencies, but they do quite often need to go on record with "yes" or "no" votes that make agency activities possible. Legislators must cast votes to establish executive branch agencies and to give those agencies the authority to make regulatory decisions. The democratic controls created by such votes weaken over time. (Most of the voters who voted for the legislators who passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act are now dead). But members of Congress need to take at least one vote per year (on the relevant appropriations bill) in order for any regulatory program to continue, and circumstances sometimes force members to cast additional votes on particular programs. Since no regulatory program can operate without being created and continually authorized by Congress, there is nothing about delegation that prevents an unhappy electorate from holding members of Congress accountable for regulatory power exercised by the agencies.

#### \*C) Accountability

David E. Lewis, Professor, Politics and Public Affairs, Princeton University, PRESIDENTS AND THE POLITICS OF AGENCY DESIGN, 2003, p. 4.

Agency design determines bureaucratic responsiveness to democratic impulses and pressure, particularly those channeled through elected officials like the president. It can determine the success or failure of modern presidents in meeting constitutional and electoral mandates. One of the central concerns of presidency scholars beginning with Richard Neustadt (1960) has been increasing public expectations of presidents (Lowi 1985; Skowronek 1993). The president is held accountable for the success or failure of the entire government. When the economy is in recession, when an agency blunders, or when some social problem goes unaddressed, it is the president whose reelection and historical legacy are on the line.

# 1NR

## CP

**We have an obligation to reduce Latin American poverty – complacency represents acceptance – a political approach is key**

**O’Donnell 96** - Helen Kellogg Professor of Government and International Studies, Academic Director of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame (Guillermo, “Poverty and Inequality in Latin America: Some Political Reflections, 1996, <http://www.rrojasdatabank.info/225odonnell.pdf>)

Extensive poverty and deep social inequality are characteristics of Latin America that go back to the colonial period. We have not overcome these conditions; we have aggravated them. One may point out that some problems in some countries did not turn out so badly, especially among those that have registered high rates of economic growth in recent years; but even these countries’ present poverty and inequality data look bad indeed when compared with data from the 1960s and early 1970s. Or, as the dominant mood in the 1980s dictated, one may argue that the current increases in poverty and inequality are the unavoidable consequence of correcting past errors. Or one may simply ignore these trends, availing oneself of some of the many mechanisms that human beings invent for justifying their callousness toward others. One way or the other, these stances naturalize poverty and inequality: although different from arguments of centuries past, they still cast poverty and inequality as inevitable consequences of the natural ordering of things. From this point of view, while one may regret some of the visible manifestations of such ordering, it would be senseless, if not worse, to try to change it. Poverty-generated needs are so many and so vital that one is morally and professionally impelled to alleviate them. But these efforts, and the highly specialized knowledge required, should not detract from attempting to grasp the overall picture and forging alliances that are premised on broad agreements about a non-naturalized vision of what poverty and inequality are and what might done about them. Of course, remedial action should be praised: in terms of actual human beings it does make a lot of difference. Also praiseworthy is moral indignation leading to energetic condemnations of the situation and proposals for a much better world—but too often we are not told how to get from here to there, and in the meantime these invocations often include a disparaging tone toward ‘mere’ remedial actions. 2) Somewhere in the middle there are various policy prescriptions, typical of reports of various commissions and international organizations, with which in most cases I agree. These include improving tax collection and making the tax system less regressive; investing more resources in social policies and finding more creative means of cooperation between the state and NGOs, churches, and business; correctly targeting some social policies; promoting popular participation; and other good ideas that I need not detail here. Although some progress in some policy areas has been registered in some countries, an obvious question is why so little of so much good advice has been actually implemented. The third hard fact is that the poor are politically weak. Their permanent struggle for survival is not conducive, excepting very specific (and usually short-lived) situations and some remarkable individuals, to their organization and mobilization. Furthermore, this weakness opens ample opportunity for manifold tactics of cooptation, selective repression, and political isolation. Democracy makes a difference, in that the poor may use their votes to support parties that are seriously committed to improving their lot. But, if elected, these parties face severe economic constraints. In addition, they must take into account that determined propoor policies will mobilize concerns not only among the privileged but also among important segments of the middle class who, after their own sufferings through economic crises and adjustments, feel that it is they who deserve preferential treatment. These concerns, to which I will return, may coagulate in a veto coalition that threatens not only the policy goals of those governments but also whatever economic stability or growth has been achieved.

#### US human rights leadership is key to international peace, security, domestic interests, and the pursuit of global democracy

Griffey, 11 Brian, human rights consultant who has worked for the United Nations, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International USA and as an investigative journalist, 3/18, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/150667-us-leadership-on-human-rights-essential-to-strengthen-democracy-abroad>, “U.S. leadership on human rights essential to strengthen democracy abroad,”)//VP

In the midst of what many are calling the Arab world’s 1989, the United States has a chance to revisit that effort, and reaffirm President Carter’s declaration: “Human rights is the soul of our foreign policy, because human rights is the soul of our sense of nationhood.” Since helping to establish the United Nations, U.S. participation in international human rights treaties and mechanisms has been fraught with debate over the merits of involvement and perceived threats to U.S. policymaking prerogative, topics still contentious on Capitol Hill. Nonetheless, U.S. leadership on human rights offers clear opportunities to advance not only international peace and security – a fundamental purpose of the U.N. – but also conjoined US political and economic interests at home and abroad. The U.S. is presently demonstrating exactly how crucial such involvement is as an elected member of the Human Rights Council, participating in vital negotiations on how best to mitigate widespread abuses responding to ongoing unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, including by strategic US allies in global security and trade. As Secretary Clinton expressed en route to Geneva to participate in recent talks on human rights violations in Libya, joining the Council has “proven to be a good decision, because we’ve been able to influence a number of actions that we otherwise would have been on the outside looking in.” In its first submission to the body, the U.S. likewise recognized that participation in the Council’s peer-review system allows the U.S. not only to lead by example and “encourage others to strengthen their commitments to human rights,” but also to address domestic human rights shortcomings. By leading international discourse on human rights, the U.S. will be in a better position both to advance observation of human rights abroad, and to take on new treaty commitments that demonstrate adherence of our own system to the vaulting principles we identify with our democracy. While the U.S. is party to more than 12,000 treaties, it has dodged most human rights treaties drafted since World War II through the U.N., and has ratified only a dozen. Upon transmission of four core human rights treaties to the Senate in 1978, President Carter observed: “Our failure to become a party increasingly reflects upon our attainments, and prejudices United States participation in the development of the international law of human rights.” The Senate ratified two of those treaties 15 years later. The others continue to languish in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, still awaiting ratification after 32 years. It likewise took the Senate almost 40 years to approve a treaty punishing genocide, after signing it in 1948 following the Holocaust. Other human rights treaties U.S. presidents have signed – but the Senate has yet to agree to – include U.N. conventions protecting the rights of women, children, and persons with disabilities. The U.S. is the only nation in the world that hasn’t ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child, with the exception of war-torn Somalia, which lacks a functioning government and control over much of its territory. As we watch the contours and nature of power being reshaped in the Middle East and North Africa, the U.S. must have a singular message on human rights – both at home and abroad: Human rights go hand-in-hand with a healthy democracy, and demand a concerted and collective effort to be upheld, especially in times of crisis.

#### Conditioning Mexico solves the link to politics

**WOLA, 8/02/13** – Q & A of WOLA’s Senior Associate for Mexico and Central America [Maureen Meyer](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/87239da188) (Washington Office on Latin America, “One Year after Enrique Peña Nieto’s Election”

<http://www.wola.org/commentary/one_year_after_enrique_pena_nieto_s_election>)//GP

As cooperation moves forward, support for police reform efforts in Mexico, particularly focused on increased accountability measures, as well as continued support for justice reform, will be important. As several members of the [U.S. Congress](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/646426890d) recently expressed in a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry, the defense of human rights should also be a central part of the U.S.-Mexico bilateral agenda, particularly given the grave human rights situation in Mexico and the human rights conditions placed on U.S. security assistance to the country. What has the Peña Nieto administration done to address human rights violations in Mexico? While Peña Nieto has stated his commitment to ensuring that “rights established on paper become reality,” the human rights situation in Mexico remains dire. **Complaints of human rights violations by the Mexican military continue at alarming levels**. In the first five months of 2013, the National Human Rights Commission (Comisión Nacional de Derechos Humanos, CNDH) received 585 complaints about abuses by the military. This included 15 unlawful killings and 15 forced disappearances. For the most part, past cases of abuse also remain in impunity. Not a single one of the 7,441 complaints of human rights violations filed against the military between 2006 and 2012 has led to a conviction in civilian court. As of January 2013, the Mexican military reports that since 2006, [only 38 soldiers](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/f9a7874995) have been sentenced by military courts for human right abuses. The Mexican Congress has yet to reinitiate discussions to reform Mexico’s Military Code of Justice so that human rights violations committed by soldiers are investigated and prosecuted in civilian courts. Brazen attacks on migrants and against migrant shelters continue unabated, despite continued national and international pressure. In May 2013, a band of armed individuals boarded a train carrying as many as 500 migrants and demanded payment; more than [16 migrants were injured](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/61a2de78ef/p=340766) as a result. Several staff members at a shelter in Tenosique, Tabasco state were forced in early June 2013 to abandon the shelter after [frequent death threats](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/1e293db5fd), presumably from organized crime. These threats occurred after the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights had ordered precautionary protection measures for the migrant shelter, which, according to Mexican human rights organizations, were not fully implemented. Meanwhile, public officials continue to abuse migrants. [More than 30 migrants were arrested at a shelter in Mexico state in June 2013](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/73599860dd) when members of the Federal Police and agents of the National Migration Institute (Instituto Nacional de Migración, INM) illegally entered a migrant shelter to arrest migrants. In the context of drug-related violence and the military’s involvement in public security, Mexico has seen an alarming number of disappearances. A government database recently made public in February 2013 revealed the names of more than [26,000 people who disappeared](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/791b47b9c1) between 2006 and 2012. The administration has claimed that this number is far too high, and the head of SEGOB, Miguel Angel Osorio Chong, told reporters recently that state and federal officials were purging the list of false positives. After multiple protests from family members of the disappeared, the Mexican Attorney General’s office announced in May 2013 the creation of a specialized unit to investigate disappearances, which will be staffed by 12 agents. The decree to create this office was only recently published, and so far the unit has no office or budget. Meanwhile, disappearances, including forced disappearances, continue; the CNDH received [twenty complaints](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/8365e7233c/Id_ViolaUni=478) of forced disappearances in the first five months of 2013. In January 2013, President Peña Nieto signed a law that recognized the right of victims of crimes and human rights violations to receive assistance, reparations, and access to justice. It would also create several government institutions designed to deliver assistance and information to victims. The law had been previously vetoed by President Calderón, and President Peña Nieto’s reversal of this decision was a **welcome change**. Needed modifications to the law were passed by Mexico’s congress in April and the law officially went into effect on May 4, 2013. Meanwhile, human rights defenders and journalists in Mexico continue to face threats, harassment, and, far too often, violence. One year after the Law to Protect Human Rights Defenders and Journalists went into force, implementation of the protection mechanism established in the law has fallen short. The National Center for Social Communication ([Centro Nacional de Comunicación Social](http://cts.vresp.com/c/?WashingtonOfficeonLa/cfa0701b83/8d629b4c00/32bb4b4243), Cencos) reports that in the first 100 days of the Peña Nieto government there were 56 attacks against journalists, including one murder, and 37 attacks against human rights defenders.

**The aff increases the economic inequality of the status quo – the conditions on human rights solves poverty in Latin America – only conditioning solves**

**Pogge 8 –** Professor of Philosophy and International Affairs at Yale University (Thomas, , “World Poverty and Human Rights” second edition, pg26-28, 2008)

Some hold (and I have been accused of holding) that we are harming the global poor insofar as we choose to treat them worse than we might – that only the best feasible treatment qualifies as non-harmful. My view as outlined in the preceding paragraph defines a notion of harm that is much more restrictive in six distinct respects. First, we are¶ harming the global poor only if our conduct sets back their most basic ¶ interests the standard of social justice I employ is sensitive only to¶ human rights deficits. Second, I am focusing exclusively on human¶ rights deficits that are causally traceable to social institutions. Third 1¶ am assigning moral responsibility for such a human rights deficit only¶ to those who actively cooperate in designing or imposing the relevant¶ social institutions - and only to them am I then ascribing compensatory¶ obligations to do their share toward reforming these social institutions¶ or toward protecting its victims. Fourth, I allow that our active¶ cooperation is harming the global poor only if it is foreseeable that this¶ order gives rise to substantial human rights deficits. 29 Fifth, I require¶ that these human rights deficits be reasonably avoidable in the sense¶ that a feasible alternative design of the relevant institutional order¶ would not produce comparable human rights deficits or other ills of¶ comparable magnitude. Sixth, this avoidability must be knowable: we¶ must be able to be confident that the alternative institutional design¶ would do much better in giving participants secure access to the objects¶ of their human rights.¶ I believe that we are involved in harming - and, more specifically,¶ in massively violating the human rights of - the global poor in this¶ quite restrictive sense. This does not mean that we must become hermits¶ or emigrants. We can compensate for our contribution to collective¶ harm also by contributing to efforts toward institutional reform or¶ toward protecting the victims of present institutional injustice. Focusing¶ on negative duties alone, I limit such compensatory duties to the¶ amount of harm one is responsible for by cooperating in the imposition¶ of an unjust institutional order. Setting aside any open-ended¶ positive duty to help the badly off, my appeal to a negative duty generates¶ then compensatory obligations that are tightly limited in range¶ (to persons subject to an institutional order one cooperates in imposing),¶ in subject matter (to the avoidance of human rights deficits), and¶ in demandingness (to compensation for one's share of that part of the¶ human rights deficit that foreseeably is reasonably avoidable through¶ a feasible alternative institutional design).¶ V Responsibilities and reforms¶ There is a simple two-part explanation for why our new global economic¶ order is so harsh on the poor. The design of this order is fashioned¶ and adjusted in international negotiations in which our governments enjoy a **crushing advantage in bargaining power and expertise**. And our representatives in international negotiations **do not¶ consider the interests of the global poor** as part of their mandate. They¶ seek to shape each such agreement in the best interests of the people¶ and corporations of their own country. To get a vivid sense of the zeal¶ with which our politicians and negotiators pursue this task, you need¶ only recall to what incredible length the US government has gone to¶ shift of its share of the UN general budget onto other countries.¶ This hard-fought victory now saves the US some $60 million annually,¶ 20 cents per US citizen each year - or 87 cents when one adds the¶ similarly reduced US share of the cost of UN peacekeeping operations. This is one example, chosen only because it is so well known.¶ There are plenty of cases illustrating similar zeal by the representatives of other affluent states. Our new global economic order is so **harsh** on¶ the global poor, then, because it is formed in negotiations where our representatives ruthlessly exploit their vastly superior bargaining power and expertise, as well as any weakness, ignorance, or corruptibility¶ they may find in their counterpart negotiators, to tune each¶ agreement for our greatest benefit. In such negotiations, the affluent¶ states will make reciprocal concessions to one another, but **rarely to¶ the weak**. The cumulative result of many such negotiations and agreements¶ is a grossly unfair global economic order under which the lion's¶ share of the benefits of global economic growth flows to the most¶ affluent states.¶ In many cases, our negotiators must know that, the better they¶ succeed, the more people will die of poverty. Our foreign and trade¶ ministers and our presidents and prime ministers know this, and so do¶ many journalists and academics, as well as the experts at the UN and¶ especially the World Bank, which bills itself as the official champion of¶ the global poor even while its management and decision-making are¶ controlled by the affluent states. After the terrorist attacks of September¶ 11, 2001, the President of the World Bank publicized his estimate¶ "that tens of thousands more children will die worldwide and some¶ 10 million more people are likely to be living below the poverty line of¶ $1 a day ... because the attacks will delay the rich countries' recovery¶ into 2002." Where do we find similar estimates about our tariffs, antidumping¶ duties, agricultural subsidies, and enforcement of intellectual¶ property rights in seeds and drugs? Or at least a reasoned denial that¶ we are causing grievous harms or that these harms are unjustifiable? After some 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus had been slaughtered¶ in Rwanda in early 1994, the world took notice. The massacres¶ were widely discussed in the media, with many expressing dismay at the decisions by Western governments to avoid both the word "genocide"¶ and a peacekeeping operation. 32 Many believe that we should¶ have stopped the massacres, even if this would have meant risking the¶ lives of our soldiers and spending a few hundred million dollars or¶ more. We all felt a bit responsible, but bearably so. The deaths, after¶ all, were brought about by clearly identifiable villains, and we were¶ clearly not among them and also did not benefit from the killings in¶ any way. Deaths caused by global economic arrangements designed¶ and imposed by our governments are a different matter: These governments¶ are elected by us, responsive to our interests and preferences,¶ acting in our name and in ways that benefit us. **This buck stops with us**.

#### a) Economic engagement specifically must be unconditional – means the perm and CP aren’t topical

**Haass and O’Sullivan, 2k** - \*Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*a Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution (Richard and Meghan, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies” Survival,, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf

The provision of economic incentives to the private sector of a target country can be an effective mode of ‘unconditional’ engagement, particularly when the economy is not state dominated. In these more open economic climates, those nourished by the exchanges made possible under economic engagement will often be agents for change and natural allies in some Western causes. To the extent that economic engagement builds the private sector and other non-state actors, it is likely to widen the base of support for engagement with America specifically and the promotion of international norms more generally. Certainly, US engagement with China has nurtured sympathetic pockets, if not to American ideals per se, then at least to trade and open economic markets and the maintenance of good relations to secure them. The only constraint on the scope and development of ‘unconditional’ engagement is the range of available collaborators in civil society or the private sector. Fortunately, globalisation and the explosion of economic entities that has accompanied it – while making economic isolation more difficult to achieve – presents a multitude of possible partners for unconditional engagement with non-state actors.

#### b) It severs should

**Summers 94** (Justice – Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994 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 in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.14 The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;15 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 ¶ [CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE]¶ 13 "Should" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with ought but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, 802 P.2d 813 (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). 14 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, 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### c) It severs substantial

**Words and Phrases 25**

Judicial and statutory definitions of words and phrases, Volume 7, p. 6738, **1925**

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. Bass v. Pease, 79 Ill. App. 308, 318.

#### Nieto will say yes – will is displayed

**Glickhouse and Zissis 13 -** Glickhouse: is editor-in-chief of AS/COA Online, the website of the Americas Society and Council of the Americas, She holds an MA in Journalism and Latin American Studies from New York University and a BA in History from George Washington University (Rachel and Carin, American Society/Council of the Americas, “Explainer: President Barack Obama's Trip to Mexico and Costa Rica,” 4/26/2013, <http://www.as-coa.org/articles/explainer-president-barack-obamas-trip-mexico-and-costa-rica>) //RGP

The U.S. State Department [budget request](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/207305.pdf) for fiscal year 2014 released this month allocates [$205 million](http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/04/20130410145570.html#axzz2RW4hXOFX) for Mexico, marking a $124 million decrease from 2012. But a portion of security funding to Mexico is being withheld over human rights concerns. A group of[23 U.S. legislators](http://panamericanpost.blogspot.com/2013/04/will-obama-address-human-rights.html) hopes Obama will bring up that subject while in Mexico. In a [letter](http://www.lawg.org/storage/FinalMexicoHR42513.pdf) to the U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry, the lawmakers note that the State Department is withholding $18 million of security aid “until the United States identifies areas of future collaboration with the Peña Nieto government on key human rights issues,” pointing out that Peña Nieto’s predecessor saw a quintupling in human rights complaints against Mexican soldiers and police. The congressman added: “We are encouraged by Peña Nieto’s strong statements affirming his commitment to human rights and we believe they provide the United States with an important opening to raise our concerns with the Mexican government.”