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#### A. Interpretation - Engagement is the attempt to influence the political behavior of a state by increasing contacts with that state – economic engagement means using exclusively economic contacts like trade, loans and grants

**Resnik, 1** – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, political science complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa

MILITARY CONTACTS

Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25)

Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.

This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28)

Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.

This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### And Toward is ‘in the direction of’

**Dictionary.com, 13** (‘toward, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/toward?r=66>)

to·ward [prep. tawrd, tohrd, tuh-wawrd, twawrd, twohrd; adj. tawrd, tohrd] Show IPA

preposition Also, to·wards.

1.

in the direction of: to walk toward the river.

2.

with a view to obtaining or having; for: They're saving money toward a new house.

3.

in the area or vicinity of; near: Our cabin is toward the top of the hill.

4.

turned to; facing: Her back was toward me.

5.

shortly before; close to: toward midnight.

#### B. Violation – the affirmative ends benefits and discourages trade by ending subsidies and its not toward Mexico.

#### C. Voting issue –

1. limits – they explode the topic – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical. It’s impossible to predict or prepare

2. negative ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans

#### Effects topical- they enact a policy that will increase trade later on cx checks reject the team for fairness and education
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#### Farm bill will pass and its key to solve food prices

The Daily Journal, 12/5/13 (“Farm bill talks continue with deadline approaching,” http://www.daily-journal.com/news/nation/farm-bill-talks-continue-with-deadline-approaching/article\_b9a88d6f-37cc-589d-b8ed-c8c5f9ce1bdb.html, bgm)

House and Senate negotiators plan to meet again this week in hopes of finishing another complicated piece of legislation before a critical, fast-approaching deadline. In this case it is the farm bill, an omnibus measure that sets federal agricultural policy and spending on food aid. The legislation is one of several items lawmakers hope to cross off their to-do list in the coming weeks, including a new budget agreement, a defense authorization bill and the confirmation of top Obama administration appointees. Failure to meet a Jan. 1 deadline won't rattle stock markets or spoil the nation's credit rating, but a new farm bill is more than two years overdue, and congressional leaders have so far been unwilling to consider passing another short-term extension. Failure to meet the deadline or pass a stopgap measure would mean that "breakfast in the United States is going to be significantly more expensive," Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack warned in a recent interview. The Agriculture Department is preparing to take steps that could prompt a series of changes affecting several commodities and grocery prices. Changes could begin shortly after New Year's Day with the price of milk, which could rise to more than $3 per gallon because federal dairy policy would revert to a 1949 law. Vilsack has warned that congressional inaction would eventually affect the price and supply of other staples, including rice, wheat and corn. But there seems to be little worry on Capitol Hill because lead negotiators believe they can meet the deadline and some of their aides suggest privately that a new farm bill could be passed as part of a broader budget agreement, which must be enacted by Jan. 15 to avoid another government shutdown. On Monday, Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., didn't rule out packaging a farm bill with other must-pass legislation. "I'm taking this one step at a time. That's how we've gotten as far as we've gotten," she said in an interview. "I believe this can be done by the end of this year if there's the political will to do it." Stabenow and the lead Republican on her committee, Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., plan to cut short their two-week Senate recess and return to Washington. They hope to complete a bill by next week, according to aides familiar with the talks.

**Plan drains PC-Economic engagement initiatives PERCEIVED as deprioritizing necessary focus on security issues and drug war while kowtowing to Mexico – perception is key and hardliner target spin control to play on fence sitters largest fears**

Shear, 13

(Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>)

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

#### PC is key --- overcomes partisanship

Josh Lederman 10/18/13, reporter for the Associated Press, and Jim Kuhnhenn, “No safe bets for Obama despite toned-down agenda,” US News and World Report, http://www.usnews.com/news/politics/articles/2013/10/18/no-safe-bets-for-obama-despite-toned-down-agenda

WASHINGTON (AP) — Regrouping after a feud with Congress stalled his agenda, President Barack Obama is laying down a three-item to-do list for Congress that seems meager when compared with the bold, progressive agenda he envisioned at the start of his second term.¶ But given the capital's partisanship, the complexities of the issues and the limited time left, even those items — immigration, farm legislation and a budget — amount to ambitious goals that will take political muscle, skill and ever-elusive compromise to execute.¶ "Those are three specific things that would make a huge difference in our economy right now," Obama said. "And we could get them done by the end of the year if our focus is on what's good for the American people."

#### New farm bill key to prevent a food price spike

Nelson 10/17/13 [Joe Nelson, writer for WEAU news, “Obama, ag industry waiting for new Farm bill,” http://www.weau.com/home/headlines/Obama-ag-industry-waiting-for-new-Farm-Bill-228259521.html]

With the government shutdown over, farmers are still waiting for a deal to be made.¶ President Obama listed the farm bill as one of his top priorities to address, which could protect farmers and low income families.¶ “We should pass a farm bill, one that American farmers and ranchers can depend on, one that protects vulnerable children and adults in times of need, one that gives rural communities opportunities to grow and the long-term certainty that they deserve. Again, the Senate's already passed a solid bipartisan bill. It's got support from democrats and republicans. It's sitting in the House waiting for passage. If House republicans have ideas that they think would improve the farm bill, let's see them. Let's negotiate. What are we waiting for? Let's get this done,” Obama said.¶ Farmers said if they struggle without a farm bill, it could cause food prices to spike, force some out of the industry and damage the economy.¶ “If the milk price falls below a certain level, the Farm bill does help support farmers during a time of an economic crisis when prices drop too low,” Chippewa County U.W. Extension Crops and Soils Educator, Jerry Clark¶ The current, five-year Farm bill was temporarily extended, but both farmers and Clark said with much to lose, a new one is needed.¶ “Any time we can get the new bill passed, it's definitely going to help because there's always new changes in agriculture, as far as commodities or practices that need to be implemented,” Clark said. “So those types of things should be passed to keep up with the current trends in agriculture.¶ Durand corn and soybean farmer and Value Implement dealer TJ Poeschel says not having a new farm bill and reverting to a bill from 1949 could cut down profits or even force some farmers to quit or retire.

#### High food prices cause Russian instability ---- forces the Kremlin to force dietary changes which was at the core of past revolutions

Stratfor in ‘8

(“Russia: Problems in the Winners' Circle”, 6-13, http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/russia\_problems\_winners\_circle, Google Cache)

As an energy and grain exporter, Russia is one of the clear winners in the current global energy and food markets. However, the recent changes within Russia will present the Kremlin with some tough choices about how to prioritize its political and economic goals. Analysis Related Special Topic Pages \* The Russian Resurgence \* The Mounting Global Food Crisis \* Oil Prices’ Unprecedented Rise As Stratfor follows the tumult in the energy and food markets and its effects on the global balance of power, a line has been drawn between the countries that are “winners” and which are “losers” in the short and long terms. Those countries that rely on food and oil imports are in a lose-lose situation and those that export seem to not only be comfortable, but reaping all the political and financial power that accompanies such a position. There is also a gray area full of those countries that export one strategic resource and import the other. Russia seems to fit squarely in the category of clear winners, since it holds and exports some of the world’s largest energy supplies and is also a minor grain exporter. Russia also has been swimming in the financial windfall that comes with being such a large energy exporter. Moreover, Russia has been discussing how it can expand its agricultural sector in order to meet the increased global demand for foodstuffs. But there is a downside to being a winner. Russia has been changing internally, and that transformation is creating new burdens to bear and testing the Kremlin’s ability to carry the weight. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia went through different economic models that were like a series of social, political and economic earthquakes. Under the stress of those changes and the global recession of the late 1990s, Russia’s economy nearly collapsed in the 1998 ruble crisis. During that time, the average monthly income in Russia was between $20 and $70, and the Russian people’s standard of living depended on the availability of bare necessities. In the past decade, though, as the Russian economy has recovered and the country has begun seeing the state use its petrodollars, the standard of living inside Russia has risen dramatically. Chart - Russian wages However, as the Russian people have grown richer, their basic consumption patterns — including food consumption — have changed. Their food consumption has shifted from the cheaper grains and potatoes to more expensive foods, like meat and dairy. Russia’s consumption of meat has nearly doubled since 2000 and has risen 5 percent since the start of 2008. Chart - Russian meat consumption The issue is that meat prices are in the mix of commodities whose prices are skyrocketing. Meat and dairy have grown more expensive for a slew of reasons, including high transportation costs and higher prices for the grain needed to feed the livestock. Depending on the region, prices for meat and dairy in Russia have risen between 7 percent and 22 percent since the beginning of the year. In a poll, most Russians placed food prices and security as their current top concern. The Kremlin has acknowledged these concerns and, in the past six months, placed three price freezes on certain strategic food items, like meat and dairy. One of the main reasons for the swift response from the government is that the Kremlin did not want to face criticism during an election cycle. But the Kremlin is now looking at the long term and is considering an indefinite price freeze for “socially important” foodstuffs. The Russian government is not worried about people starving, as many other countries are; after all, Russia is a net exporter of grains. Moreover, it is technically possible to change a population’s food consumption pattern back to what it was seven years ago pretty quickly. What could be problematic are the social and political implications of a massive dietary change in a country where food consumption patterns are a major form of social status and differentiation. Dietary patterns mark today’s Russians as rich and powerful domestically, as opposed to their position seven years ago when their country was weak and in economic disarray. Politically, Russia’s leaders pride themselves on high domestic approval ratings and control over a consolidated society. This could rapidly change if people are forced back to eating habits from their dire past — after all, who likes to switch from steak to gruel? Keep in mind that a series of food crises hit Russia in the early 1900s and created one of the pillars of the 1905 and 1917 Russian revolutions. This does not mean that a revolution is on the way, but that social unrest and food scarcity have caused such things in the past. The Russian government today is wealthy enough to absorb some of the high costs of food. The Russian gross domestic product has risen nearly tenfold since 2000 due to the inflow of petrodollars. Moreover, Russia has several rainy day funds amounting to approximately $160 billion that are sitting idle. But the Kremlin wants to keep that cash aside for real crises and to help its ambitious plans to reshape Russia’s national economy and recreate its global presence. Chart - Russian GDP Chart - Russian Meat Imports Russia’s current food consumption problems could create another problem: If Russians continue eating more expensive items, like meat, Russia will either have to continue relying on imports of such goods or grow its own husbandry sector. Russia’s meat industry is minor; the country currently imports more than 76 percent of its meat, mostly from the European Union. Increased meat consumption in Russia has been supported by increasing imports. This does not mean that Russia cannot expand its own husbandry industry. The country has enough land and water resources available to boost both that and agriculture. However, it would be a massive long-term and expensive undertaking to develop the industry and infrastructure needed, and it is unclear whether Russia has the necessary domestic work force or if it would need to import that as well. Regardless, the Russian government under Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and President Dmitri Medvedev has made it its goal to prevent dependence on other countries for strategic items, such as energy or food, and see its dependence on the European Union for meat as a possible vulnerability. Moscow has used the export of its strategic goods — particularly energy — as a tool or weapon against Europe and others in the past, and there are quite a few countries that would be interested in returning the favor. As long as food prices remain high, the Kremlin will have to make some hard choices between social instability, diverting money intended to rebuild a strong Russia or depending on its neighbors in Europe, though Moscow wants to be the dominant partner in that relationship.

#### The impact is nuclear war

David in ‘99

(Steven, Prof. Pol. Sci. @ Johns Hopkins, Foreign Affairs, “Saving America from the coming civil wars”, Vol. 28, Iss. 1, Proquest)

AT NO TIME since the civil war of 1918-Zo has Russia been closer to bloody conflict than it is today. The fledgling government confronts a vast array of problems without the power to take effective action. For 70 years, the Soviet Union operated a strong state apparatus, anchored by the KGB and the Communist Party. Now its disintegration has created a power vacuum that has yet to be filled. Unable to rely on popular ideology or coercion to establish control, the government must prove itself to the people and establish its authority on the basis of its performance. But the Yeltsin administration has abjectly failed to do so, and it cannot meet the most basic needs of the Russian people. Russians know they can no longer look to the state for personal security, law enforcement, education, sanitation, health care, or even electrical power. In the place of government authority, criminal groups-the Russian Mafia-increasingly hold sway. Expectations raised by the collapse of communism have been bitterly disappointed, and Moscow's inability to govern coherently raises the specter of civil unrest. If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 5o percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation-personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia-even though in decline-does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,ooo nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much materiel. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.
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#### TEXT: The United States federal government should renegotiate NAFTA to include the elimination of all direct and indirect U.S. farm subsidies for corn and bean exported to Mexico, while maintaining domestic subsidies for individual recipients of subsidies whom earn less than $250,000 annual income per year.

#### The United States federal government should eliminate crop insurance premium subsidies for individuals with an adjusted gross income of more than $250,000 per year.

#### Contention 1 - Solvency

#### The counterplan bolsters small farmer and solves all overproduction and trade advantages

Andrea Perera 05, staff, “Rural America Preservation Act Helps Farmers Here and Abroad,” Oxfam America, 2—15—05, http://www.oxfamamerica.org/whatwedo/campaigns/agriculture/news\_publications/rapa/feature\_story.2005-02-16.5713333381, accessed 9-11-08.

Oxfam America and a diverse alliance of farming, poverty, environmental and taxpayer advocacy groups applauded the introduction of the Rural America Preservation Act Tuesday, a bill that would put a cap on agriculture subsidies. Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) is sponsoring the legislation that would lower the payment caps on agricultural subsidies by about 30 per cent, from the current $360,000 to $250,000 for individual recipients, and close loopholes allowing multiple payments. Senators Byron Dorgan (ND), Tim Johnson (D-SD), and Chuck Hagel (R-NE) have signed on to co-sponsor the Rural America Preservation Act. "Farm payments that were originally designed to benefit small and medium-sized farmers have contributed to their demise," said Grassley at a press conference announcing the Rural America Preservation Act. "Unlimited farm payments have placed upward pressures on land prices and have contributed to overproduction and lower commodity prices, driving many farmers off the farm." The senators join a growing movement to limit subsidy payments that now fund overproduction and dumping of surplus overseas. Earlier this month, the president included subsidy cuts in his budget proposal to help save money and balance the federal budget. And non-governmental organizations Citizens Against Government Waste, Bread for the World, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Izaak Walton League of America, Taxpayers for Common Sense, National Taxpayers Union, Sustainable Agriculture Coalition, and Environmental Defense showed their support for the subsidy cap when they joined the senators and Oxfam America at Rural America Preservation Act press conference. Oxfam joined the fight to help alleviate poverty for family farmers here and abroad. "Agriculture has the potential to grow economies and lift so many out of poverty, but the current agricultural subsidy system is broken," said Barbara Fiorito, Chair of the Board of Directors of Oxfam America. "Oxfam supports the Rural America Preservation Act as a step toward long-overdue reform of the agricultural subsidy program." Though federal farm payments were introduced during the Great Depression as a safety net for family farmers, these days, they are doing more to hurt than help. "The current lack of real payment limitations within the farm program has been a significant agent of the economic decline of rural America for many years," said Mark W. Leonard, a farmer who came from Holstein, for the introduction of the bill. In 2003, the government spent more than $16 billion on agriculture subsidies, according to the Farm Subsidy Database of the Environmental Working Group. But a large majority of farms—67 per cent—are ineligible for government support because they do not grow a select group of subsidized commodities. Of the 33 per cent of farms that do get subsidies, the top 10 per cent receive 52 per cent of all government payments, according to Oxfam's Finding the Moral Fiber report. Not only are subsidies harmful to family farmers in the US, they are devastating to farmers in poor countries abroad. The US was found in violation of World Trade Organization rules for dumping surplus cotton overseas, undermining the livelihoods of poor farmers in the developing world. In crop year 2002, the US government provided $3.4 billion in total subsidies to the cotton sector. That's nearly twice the total US foreign aid given to sub-Saharan Africa. It is also more than the GDP of Benin, Burkina Faso, or Chad, the main cotton-producing countries in the region, according to the Moral Fiber report. "It is time to stop forcing the taxpaying public to pay for farm consolidation and the loss of economic opportunities in farming," said Ferd Hoefner, from the Sustainable Agriculture Coalition. "The current lack of effective payment limits hurts family farmers and the rural communities they help support, harms the environment, and compounds our compliance problems with world trade rules."

#### Capping crop insurances is key to solving small farms and stopping price dumping,

Wisconsin State Farmer 9-13-2014 [Crop insurance reforms were proposed

by state leaders during farm bill debate, <http://www.wisfarmer.com/news/crop-insurance-reforms-were-proposed---by-state-leaders-during-farm-bill-debate-----jcpg-335359-224420431.html>] Awirth

DIVERSE SUPPORT Kind and Petri said the act would have saved taxpayers $11 billion over 10 years and would still have provided a safety net for smaller and medium-sized farms. "Unlike other subsidies, Congress does not know who receives crop insurance subsidies. Taxpayers deserve to know where their tax dollars are going," Kind said. The measure - which ultimately didn't survive as an amendment during debate on the farm bill in the House - would have limited the total value of crop insurance subsidies to $40,000 per person each year. Kind said that under current programs there is no cap. It would have also eliminated crop insurance premium subsidies for individuals with an adjusted gross income (AGI) of more than $250,000 and would have required the private insurance companies to bear more of those "administrative and operating" expenses. Kind said that the measure would have promoted operating efficiencies in the crop insurance companies. The measure would also have lowered the "target rate of return" that USDA builds into premiums through the Standard Reinsurance Agreement, which is done in order to guarantee long-term profitability for crop insurance companies. Kind said that he introduced the measure after a Government Accounting Office (GAO) report showed that the top four percent of recipients benefit from one-third of all taxpayer premium subsidies. "The top 10 percent receive 54 percent of the taxpayer premium subsidies. This shows how top-heavy the current system is." He also voiced concern that as crop insurance subsidies become more important in replacing old farm safety net programs they could run afoul of international trade rules with the World Trade Organization (WTO.) The jury is still out on whether or not federally subsidized crop insurance programs in lieu of other farm subsidies are going to get the green light under WTO agreements. They may be considered a distorting influence on crop production. PROGRAM TRANSPARENCY If it had passed, the AFFIRM measure would have been a step toward promoting transparency in government subsidies by requiring the reporting of all parties that receive federally subsidized crop insurance, Kind said. That transparency in itself would have also been a step toward cutting down on waste, fraud and abuse, he added. In May, Petri said he was delighted to be part of the bi-partisan effort to "provide a much-needed tightening up of the crop insurance program." Petri noted that the federal government subsidizes roughly 62 percent of farmers' crop insurance premiums at a cost of $9 billion a year. America's small farmers received only 27 percent of the subsidies, he said. The bill, he said, was intended to keep in place a safety net for farmers who need assistance, while ensuring the program is not exploited at a cost to taxpayers. It would have also prevented farmers from "farming for government insurance." The men said that from 2001-12, crop insurance companies enjoyed $10.3 billion in underwriting gains. According to the GAO report, over 4,200 farmers individually received more than $100,000 in premium subsidies in 2011; 26 received more than $1 million in subsidies. In contrast, the bottom 80 percent of policyholders received only 27 percent of subsidies in 2011, with an average subsidy of around $5,000. Kind said that figure again highlights how top-heavy the program is.

#### Contention 2 – Net Benefit

#### Agriculture would be destroyed in a ‘free market’—should subsidize small farms to promote ag sustainability

John Ikerd, Professor Emeritus, Agriculture, University of Missouri, “Redirecting Government Policies to Ensure Agricultural Sustainability,” 2003, http://web.missouri.edu/~ikerdj/papers/ASASFarmPolicy.htm, accessed 9—11—08.

American agriculture is in crisis. Without current farm subsidies, which are among the largest in the world, the financial situation today would be no better than during the farm financial crisis of the 1980s. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 does little more than formalize the annual “emergency bail out” process of the failed Freedom to Farm Act. The “lion’s share” of subsidies and benefits will continue to go to wealthy landowners and corporate agribusiness, not to family farmers. Current U.S. farm and agricultural trade policies are based on the faulty assumption that American farmers can compete in a global free market. In fact, U.S. farmers have lost their global competitive advantage. Land and labor costs are far lower in other major agricultural areas of the world and are likely to remain so. Agribusiness corporations are shifting their capital and production technology to those areas. Current farm policies, coupled with global free trade policies, could mean the end of American agriculture, thus threatening America’s food security. Thankfully, a different philosophy of farming is emerging in response to the growing economic, ecological, and social problems arising from the industrial agricultural paradigm. Thousands of farmers, calling themselves organic, holistic, practical, or just family farmers, are creating “the new American farm.” These livestock producers may promote their products as grass-fed, free-range, hormone and antibiotic free, or humanely raised. But these farmers are all pursuing approaches to agriculture that are more ecologically sound, economically viable, socially responsible, and thus, more sustainable. Free markets provide no incentives for farmers to take care of the land, to maintain a rural culture of stewardship, or to provide food security for all, in times of crisis or tranquility. Thus, farm programs should be redirected to encourage these “public benefits,” to reward farmers for their contribution to long run food security. Trade policies should be redirected to ensure the rights of all nations to protect their resources and their people from exploitation. American farm and trade policies must be fundamentally changed.

#### And, small farms are key to survival—crop diversity

James Boyce, Pol. Econ. Research Institute at UMass, 2004, A Future for Small Farms, p. 25-26

There is a future for small farms. Or more precisely, there can be and should be a future for them. Given the dependence of ‘modern’ low-diversity agriculture on ‘traditional’ high-diversity agriculture, the long-term food security of humankind will depend on small farms and their continued provision of the environmental service of in situ conservation of crop genetic diversity. Policies to support small farms can be advocated, therefore, not merely as a matter of sympathy, or nostalgia, or equity. Such policies are also a matter of human survival. The diversity that underpins the sustainability of world agriculture did not fall from the sky. It was bequeathed to us by the 400 generations of farmers who have carried on the process of artificial selection since plants were first domesticated. Until recently, we took this diversity for granted. The ancient reservoirs of crop genetic diversity, plant geneticist Jack Harlan (1975, p. 619) wrote three decades ago, ‘seemed to most people as inexhaustible as oil in Arabia.’ Yet, Harlan warned, ‘the speed which enormous crop diversity can be essentially wiped out is astonishing.' The central thesis of this essay is that efforts to conserve in situ diversity must go hand- in-hand with efforts to support the small farmers around the world who sustain this diversity. Economists and environmentalists alike by and large have neglected this issue. In thrall to a myopic notion of efficiency, many economists fail to appreciate that diversity is the sine qua non of resilience and sustainability. In thrall to a romantic notion of ‘wilderness,’ many environmentalists fail to appreciate that agricultural biodiversity is just as valuable – indeed, arguably more valuable from the standpoint of human well- being – as the diversity found in tropical rainforests or the spotted owls found in the ancient forests of the northwestern United States.

## Off

#### The 1AC ignores the *interconnectedness* and *inherent worth* of every individual; this denies us of our *morality* and *value to life*.

**Henning 09** (Brian; Associate Professor of Philosophy at Gonzaga University; “Trusting in the 'Efficacy of Beauty: A Kalocentric Approach to Moral Philosophy”; Ethics & the Environment- Volume 14, Number 1)//RSW

**Final truths** (whether in religion, morality, or science) **are unattainable** not only due to the finitude and fallibility of human inquirers, but because we live in what the theologian John F. Haught calls an "unfinished universe" (2004). The notion that one could achieve anything like a final or absolute formulation in any field of study presupposes that one's object is static. Thankfully, we do not live in such a universe. Over the last century scientists have consistently discovered that the universe is not a plenum of lifeless, valueless facts mechanistically determined by absolute laws. Rather, we live in a processive cosmos that is a dynamic field of events organized in complex webs of interdependence, rather than a collection of objects interacting via physical laws. The intuition that the universe is fundamentally a clockwork machine successfully guided science in the wake of Newton's inspirational formulation of the laws of mechanics, but this metaphor proved increasingly inadequate as Newton's work was supplanted in the early 20th century by both general relativity and quantum mechanics. Even at its peak, the [End Page 107] mechanical metaphor created difficulties for thinking about human beings, who were never effectively illuminated by the assumption that they were complex machines. At the level of elementary particles, quantum mechanics disclosed a world of wave-like particles spread out in space and inextricably entangled with other particles in the local environment. The notion of autonomous "individual" particles disappeared. Although all metaphors are misleading to some degree, the metaphor of the world as an evolving organism has become more helpful than the old mechanical model of the world as a clock. This, in a sense, is the founding insight of Whitehead's "philosophy of organism," which took as its starting point the view that individuals—particles, plants, and people—are not discrete facts walled off from each other but parts of complex and intersecting wholes. Conceived of as an organic process, every individual is inextricably intertwined and interconnected with every other. The fundamental reality is no longer individual entities but rather the ongoing processes by which they interact and create novel structures. **Once we recognize that every individual—from a subatomic event to a majestic sequoia—brings together the diverse elements in its world in just this way, just here, and just now, we see that nothing is entirely devoid of value and beauty**. This process whereby many diverse individuals are brought together into the unity of one new individual, which will eventually add its energy to future individuals, characterizes the most basic feature of reality and is what Whitehead calls the "category of creativity." On this view, reality is best characterized not as an unending march of vacuous facts, but as an incessant "creative advance" striving toward ever-richer forms of beauty and value. Noting its emphasis on interdependence and interrelation, many scholars have rightly noted that Whitehead's metaphysics is uniquely suited to provide a basis for making sense of our relationship to the natural world.10 Decades before modern ecologists taught us about ecosystems, Whitehead was describing individuals as interrelated societies of societies. No individual, Whitehead insisted, can be understood apart from its relationship to others.11 Indeed, whereas ecologists only explain how it is that macroscopic individuals are related in interdependent systems, Whitehead's organic metaphysics of process provides a rich account of how individuals at every level of complexity—from subatomic events to ecosystems, and from oak trees to galaxies—arise and are perpetuated.12 [End Page 108] What is more, Whitehead's philosophy of organism places a premium on an individual's dependence on and relationship to the larger wholes of which it is a part without making the mistake of subsuming the individual into that larger whole.13 With the philosophy of organism we need not choose between either the one or the many, "the many become one and are increased by one" (Whitehead [1929] 1978, 21). By providing a robust alternative to the various forms of reductive physicalism and destructive dualism that currently dominate many branches of science and philosophy, the philosophy of organism is an ideal position from which to address the complex social and ecological challenges confronting us. First, if who and what I am is intimately and inextricably linked to everyone and everything else in the universe, then I begin to recognize that my own flourishing and the flourishing of others are not independent. Not only do I intimately and unavoidably depend on others in order to sustain myself, with varying degrees of relevance, **how I relate to my environment is constitutive of who and what I am.** As we are quickly learning, we ignore our interdependence with our wider environment at our own peril. Moreover, in helping us to recognizing our connection to and dependence on our larger environment, an organic model forces us to abandon the various dualisms that have for too long allowed us to maintain the illusion that we are set off from the rest of nature. Adopting an organic metaphysics of process forces us finally to step down from the self-constructed pedestal from which we have for millennia surveyed nature and finally to embrace the lesson so compellingly demonstrated by Darwin: humans are not a singular exception to, but rather a grand exemplification of, the processes at work in the universe.14 In this way we ought finally to reject not only the materialisms of contemporary science, but also the dualisms that often undergird our religious, social, political, and moral understandings of ourselves and our relationship to the natural world. As John Dewey concisely put it, **"man is within nature, not a little god outside"** (1929, 351). Until we shed our self-deluding arrogance and recognize that who and what we are as a species is fundamentally bound up in and dependent on the wider scope of events unfolding in the universe, the ecological crisis will only deepen. Taken seriously, our understanding of reality as composed of vibrant, organically interconnected achievements of beauty and value, has a dramatic effect on how we conceive [End Page 109] of ourselves, of nature, and of our moral obligations—morality can no longer be limited merely to inter-human relations. In rejecting modernity's notion of lifeless matter, we come to recognize that **every form of actuality has value in and for itself, for others, and for the whole.** In aiming at and achieving an end for itself, **every individual—no matter how ephemeral or seemingly insignificant—has intrinsic value for itself and in achieving this self-value it thereby becomes a value for others and for the whole of reality.** Every individual, from the most fleeting event in deep space to centuries old redwoods, has value for itself, for others, and for the whole of reality and it is from this character of reality that our moral obligations derive (Whitehead 1938, 111). Given that every individual in our universe, no matter how small or seemingly insignificant, has some degree of value, **the scope of our direct moral concern**15 **can exclude nothing.** Thus, in rather sharp contrast to the invidious forms of anthropocentrism that characterize much of western moral thought, our scope of direct moral concern cannot be limited to humans, to sentient beings, or even to all living beings. Morality is not anthropocentric, but neither is it sentientcentric or biocentric. **In affirming the value of every individual, we must begin to recognize that every relation is potentially a moral relation.** As Whitehead vividly puts it, "The destruction of a man, or of an insect, or of a tree, or of the Parthenon, may be moral or immoral.… Whether we destroy or whether we preserve, our action is moral if we have thereby safeguarded the importance [or value] of experience so far as it depends on that concrete instance in the world's history" (1938, 14–15). Morality is not merely about how we ought to act toward and among other human beings, other sentient beings, or even other living beings. **Morality is fundamentally about how we comport ourselves in the world, how we relate to and interact with every form of existence.**

#### Our alternative is to reject the AFFs appeal to solve extinction in order to endorse the global suicide of humanity as a thought experiment. The only possible way to atone for centuries of human violence and environmental destruction is to engage in radical utopian anti-humanism. Global suicide as a thought experiment is the most ethical response to anthropocentricism

Kochi and Ordan 08 (Dec. 2008, Tarik Kochi, PhD, Lecturer in Law & International Security, University of Sussex, Noam Ordan, linguist and translator, conducts research in Translation Studies at Bar Ilan University, research focus on human cultural history, “An argument for the global suicide of humanity,” Borderlands,<http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol7no3_2008/kochiordan_argument.pdf>, azp)

The version of progress enunciated in Hawking's story of cosmic colonisation presents a view whereby the solution to the negative consequences of technological action is to create new forms of technology, new forms of action. New action and innovation solve the dilemmas and consequences of previous action. Indeed, the very act of moving away, or rather evacuating, an ecologically devastated Earth is an example at hand. Such an approach involves a moment of reflection--previous errors and consequences are examined and taken into account and efforts are made to make things better. The idea of a better future informs reflection, technological innovation and action. However, is the form of reflection offered by Hawking broad or critical enough? Does his mode of reflection pay enough attention to the irredeemable moments of destruction, harm, pain and suffering inflicted historically by human action upon the non-human world? There are, after all, a variety of negative consequences of human action, moments of destruction, moments of suffering, which may not be redeemable or ever made better. Conversely there are a number of conceptions of the good in which humans do not take centre stage at the expense of others. What we try to do in this paper is to draw out some of the consequences of reflecting more broadly upon the negative costs of human activity in the context of environmental catastrophe. This involves re-thinking a general idea of progress through the historical and conceptual lenses of speciesism, colonialism, survival and complicity. Our proposed conclusion is that the only appropriate moral response to a history of human destructive action is to give up our claims to biological supremacy and to sacrifice our form of life so as to give an eternal gift to others. From the outset it is important to make clear that the argument for the global suicide of humanity is presented as a thought experiment. The purpose of such a proposal in response to Hawking is to help show how a certain conception of modernity, of which his approach is representative, is problematic. Taking seriously the idea of global suicide is one way of throwing into question an ideology or dominant discourse of modernist-humanist action. [3] By imagining an alternative to the existing state of affairs, absurd as it may seem to some readers by its nihilistic and radical 'solution', we wish to open up a ground for a critical discussion of modernity and its negative impacts on both human and non-human animals, as well as on the environment. [4] In this respect, by giving voice to the idea of a human-free world, we attempt to draw attention to some of the asymmetries of environmental reality and to give cause to question why attempts to build bridges from the human to the non-human have, so far, been unavailing. Subjects of ethical discourse One dominant presumption that underlies many modern scientific and political attitudes towards technology and creative human action is that of 'speciesism', which can itself be called a 'human-centric' view or attitude. The term 'speciesism', coined by psychologist Richard D. Ryder and later elaborated into a comprehensive ethics by Peter Singer (1975), refers to the attitude by which humans value their species above both non-human animals and plant life. Quite typically humans conceive non-human animals and plant life as something which might simply be used for their benefit. Indeed, this conception can be traced back to, among others, Augustine (1998, p.33). While many modern, 'enlightened' humans generally abhor racism, believe in the equality of all humans, condemn slavery and find cannibalism and human sacrifice repugnant, many still think and act in ways that are profoundly 'speciesist'. Most individuals may not even be conscious that they hold such an attitude, or many would simply assume that their attitude falls within the 'natural order of things'. Such an attitude thus resides deeply within modern human ethical customs and rationales and plays a profound role in the way in which humans interact with their environment. The possibility of the destruction of our habitable environment on earth through global warming and Hawking's suggestion that we respond by colonising other planets forces us to ask a serious question about how we value human life in relation to our environment. The use of the term 'colonisation' is significant here as it draws to mind the recent history of the colonisation of much of the globe by white, European peoples. Such actions were often justified by valuing European civilisation higher than civilisations of non-white peoples, especially that of indigenous peoples. For scholars such as Edward Said (1978), however, the practice of colonialism is intimately bound up with racism. That is, colonisation is often justified, legitimated and driven by a view in which the right to possess territory and govern human life is grounded upon an assumption of racial superiority. If we were to colonise other planets, what form of 'racism' would underlie our actions? What higher value would we place upon human life, upon the human race, at the expense of other forms of life which would justify our taking over a new habitat and altering it to suit our prosperity and desired living conditions? Generally, the animal rights movement responds to the ongoing colonisation of animal habitats by humans by asking whether the modern Western subject should indeed be the central focus of its ethical discourse. In saying 'x harms y', animal rights philosophers wish to incorporate in 'y' non-human animals. That is, they enlarge the group of subjects to which ethical relations apply. In this sense such thinking does not greatly depart from any school of modern ethics, but simply extends ethical duties and obligations to non-human animals. In eco-ethics, on the other hand, the role of the subject and its relation to ethics is treated a little differently. The less radical environmentalists talk about future human generations so, according to this approach, 'y' includes a projection into the future to encompass the welfare of hitherto non-existent beings. Such an approach is prevalent in the Green Party in Germany, whose slogan is "Now. For tomorrow". For others, such as the 'deep ecology' movement, the subject is expanded so that it may include the environment as a whole. In this instance, according to Naess, 'life' is not to be understood in "a biologically narrow sense". Rather he argues that the term 'life' should be used in a comprehensive non-technical way such that it refers also to things biologists may classify as non-living. This would include rivers, landscapes, cultures, and ecosystems, all understood as "the living earth" (Naess, 1989, p.29). From this perspective the statement 'x harms y' renders 'y' somewhat vague. What occurs is not so much a conflict over the degree of ethical commitment, between "shallow" and "deep ecology" or between "light" and "dark greens" per se, but rather a broader re-drawing of the content of the subject of Western philosophical discourse and its re-definition as 'life'. Such a position involves differing metaphysical commitments to the notions of being, intelligence and moral activity. This blurring and re-defining of the subject of moral discourse can be found in other ecocentric writings (e.g. Lovelock, 1979; Eckersley, 1992) and in other philosophical approaches. [5] In part our approach bears some similarity with these 'holistic' approaches in that we share dissatisfaction with the modern, Western view of the 'subject' as purely human-centric. Further, we share some of their criticism of bourgeois green lifestyles. However, our approach is to stay partly within the position of the modern, Western human-centric view of the subject and to question what happens to it in the field of moral action when environmental catastrophe demands the radical extension of ethical obligations to non-human beings. That is, if we stick with the modern humanist subject of moral action, and follow seriously the extension of ethical obligations to non-human beings, then we would suggest that what we find is that the utopian demand of modern humanism turns over into a utopian anti-humanism, with suicide as its outcome. One way of attempting to re-think the modern subject is thus to throw the issue of suicide right in at the beginning and acknowledge its position in modern ethical thought. This would be to recognise that the question of suicide resides at the center of moral thought, already. What survives when humans no longer exist? There continues to be a debate over the extent to which humans have caused environmental problems such as global warming (as opposed to natural, cyclical theories of the earth's temperature change) and over whether phenomena such as global warming can be halted or reversed. Our position is that regardless of where one stands within these debates it is clear that humans have inflicted degrees of harm upon non-human animals and the natural environment. And from this point we suggest that it is the operation of speciesism as colonialism which must be addressed. One approach is of course to adopt the approach taken by Singer and many within the animal rights movement and remove our species, homo sapiens, from the centre of all moral discourse. Such an approach would thereby take into account not only human life, but also the lives of other species, to the extent that the living environment as a whole can come to be considered the proper subject of morality. We would suggest, however, that this philosophical approach can be taken a number of steps further. If the standpoint that we have a moral responsibility towards the environment in which all sentient creatures live is to be taken seriously, then we perhaps have reason to question whether there remains any strong ethical grounds to justify the further existence of humanity. For example, if one considers the modern scientific practice of experimenting on animals, both the notions of progress and speciesism are implicitly drawn upon within the moral reasoning of scientists in their justification of committing violence against nonhuman animals. The typical line of thinking here is that because animals are valued less than humans they can be sacrificed for the purpose of expanding scientific knowledge focussed upon improving human life. Certainly some within the scientific community, such as physiologist Colin Blakemore, contest aspects of this claim and argue that experimentation on animals is beneficial to both human and nonhuman animals (e.g. Grasson, 2000, p.30). Such claims are 'disingenuous', however, in that they hide the relative distinctions of value that underlie a moral justification for sacrifice within the practice of experimentation (cf. LaFollette & Shanks, 1997, p.255). If there is a benefit to non-human animals this is only incidental, what remains central is a practice of sacrificing the lives of other species for the benefit of humans. Rather than reject this common reasoning of modern science we argue that it should be reconsidered upon the basis of species equality. That is, modern science needs to ask the question of: 'Who' is the best candidate for 'sacrifice' for the good of the environment and all species concerned? The moral response to the violence, suffering and damage humans have inflicted upon this earth and its inhabitants might then be to argue for the sacrifice of the human species. The moral act would be the global suicide of humanity.

#### Extinction is inevitable; embracing the equality of all life forms is key to transcend consciousness.

Seed 88 (John; Australian environmentalist and director of the Rainforest Information Centre; THINKING LIKE A MOUNTAIN - TOWARDS A COUNCIL OF ALL BEINGS; http://www.rainforestinfo.org.au/deep-eco/Anthropo.htm)

, although the fear and anxiety which were part of our motivation start to dissipate and are replaced by a certain disinterestedness. We act because life is the only game in town, but actions from a disinterested, less attached consciousness may be more effective. Activists often don't have much time for meditation. The disinterested space we find here may be similar to meditation. Some teachers of meditation are embracing deep ecology (5) and vice versa(6). Of all the species that have existed, it is estimated that less than one in a hundred exist today. The rest are extinct. As environment changes, any species that is u"But the time is not a strong prison either. A little scraping of the walls of dishonest contractor's concrete Through a shower of chips and sand makes freedom. Shake the dust from your hair. This mountain sea-coast is real For it reaches out far into the past and future; It is part of the great and timeless excellence of things." (1) "Anthropocentrism" or "homocentrism" means human chauvinism. Similar to sexism, but substitute "human race" for"man" and"all other species" for "woman". Human chauvinism, the idea that humans are the crown of creation, the source of all value, the measure of all things, is deeply embedded in our culture and consciousness. "And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth , and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all that moveth on the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hands they are delivered".(2) When humans investigate and see through their layers of anthropocentric self-cherishing, a most profound change in consciousness begins to take place. Alienation subsides. The human is no longer an outsider, apart. Your humanness is then recognised as being merely the most recent stage of your existence, and as you stop identifying exclusively with this chapter, you start to get in touch with yourself as mammal, as vertebrate, as a species only recently emerged from the rainforest. As the fog of amnesia disperses, there is a transformation in your relationship to other species, and in your commitment to them. What is described here should not be seen as merely intellectual. The intellect is one entry point to the process outlined, and the easiest one to communicate. For some people however, this change of perspective follows from actions on behalf of Mother Earth. "I am protecting the rainforest" develops to "I am part of the rainforest protecting myself. I am that part of the rainforest recently emerged into thinking." What a relief then! The thousands of years of imagined separation are over and we begin to recall our true nature. That is, the change is a spiritual one, thinking like a mountain (3), sometimes referred to as "deep ecology". As your memory improves, as the implications of evolution and ecology are internalised and replace the outmoded anthropocentric structures in your mind, there is an identification with all life, Then follows the realisation that the distinction between "life" and "lifeless" is a human construct**.** Every atom in this body existed before organic life emerged 4000 million years ago. Remember our childhood as minerals, as lava, as rocks? Rocks contain the potentiality to weave themselves into such stuff as this. We are the rocks dancing. Why do we look down on them with such a condescending air. It is they that are immortal part of us. (4) If we embark upon such an inner voyage, we may find, upon returning to present day consensus reality, that our actions on behalf of the environment are purified and strengthened by the experience. We have found here a level of our being that moth, rust, nuclear holocaust or destruction of the rainforest genepool do not corrupt. The commitment to save the world is not decreased by the new perspective nable to adapt, to change, to evolve, is extinguished. All evolution takes place in this fashion In this way an oxygen starved fish, ancestor of yours and mine, commenced to colonise the land. Threat of extinction is the potter's hand that molds all the forms of life.The human species is one of millions threatened by imminent extinction through nuclear war and other environmental changes. And while it is true that the "human nature" revealed by 12,000 years of written history does not offer much hope that we can change our warlike, greedy, ignorant ways, the vastly longer fossil history assures us that we CAN change. We ARE the fish, and the myriad other death-defying feats of flexibility which a study of evolution reveals to us. A certain confidence ( in spite of our recent "humanity") is warranted. From this point of view, the threat of extinction appears as the invitation to change, to evolve. After a brief respite from the potter's hand, here we are back on the wheel again. The change that is required of us is not some new resistance to radiation, but a change in consciousness. Deep ecology is the search for a viable consciousness. Surely consciousness emerged and evolved according to the same laws as everything else. Molded by environ mental pressures, **the mind of our ancestors must time and again have been forced to transcend itself.** To survive our current environmental pressures, we must consciously remember our evolutionary and ecological inheritance. We must learn to think like a mountain. If we are to be open to evolving a new consciousness, we must fully face up to our impending extinction (the ultimate environmental pressure). This means acknowledging that part of us which shies away from the truth, hides in intoxication or busyness from the despair of the human, whose 4000 million year race is run, whoseorganic life is a mere hair's breadth from finished.(7) A biocentric perspective, the realisation that rocks WILL dance, and that roots go deeper that 4000 million years, may give us the courage to face despair and break through to a more viable consciousness, one that is sustainable and in harmony with life again. "Protecting something as wide as this planet is still an abstraction for many. Yet I see the day in our own lifetime that reverence for the natural systems - the oceans, the rainforests, the soil , the grasslands, and all other living things - will be so strong that no narrow ideology based upon politics or economics will overcome it". (8) Jerry Brown, Governor of California. The term "deep ecology" was coined by the Norwegian professor of Philosophy and eco-activist Arne Naess, and has been taken up by academics and environmentalists in Europe, the US and Australia. "The essence of deep ecology is to ask deeper questions... We ask which society, which education, which form of religion is beneficial for all life on the planet as a whole." (9)

#### Ethics first- how we choose to act shapes how we interact with the world.

#### Their advantages are sandcastles built into a fundamentally flawed system of anthropocentrism, accurate knowledge starts with a revaluation of the world.

Weston 09 Anthony Weston, Professor of Philosophy at Elon University, 2009

[*The Incompleat Eco-Philosopher* p. 9-11]

If the world is a collection of more or less ﬁxed facts to which we  must respond, then the task of ethics is to systematize and unify our  responses. This is the expected view, once again so taken for granted  as to scarcely even appear as a “view” at all. Epistemology is prior to  ethics. Responding to the world follows upon knowing it—and what  could be more sensible or responsible than that? If the world is not  “given,” though—if the world is what it seems to be in part because  we have made it that way, as I have been suggesting, and if therefore  the process of inviting its further possibilities into the light is funda-  mental to ethics itself—then our very knowledge of the world, of the  possibilities of other animals and the land and even ourselves in relation  to them, follows upon “invitation,” and ethics must come ﬁ rst. Ethics  is prior to epistemology—or, as Cheney and I do not say in the paper  but probably should have said, what really emerges is another kind of  epistemology—“etiquette,” in our speciﬁ c sense, as epistemology.  But then of course we are also speaking of something sharply  different from “ethics” as usually understood. We are asked not for a  set of well-defended general moral commitments in advance, but rather  for something more visceral and instinctual, a mode of comportment more than a mode of commitment, more ﬂeshy and more vulnerable.  Etiquette so understood requires us to take risks, to offer trust before  we know whether or how the offer will be received, and to move with  awareness, civility, and grace in a world we understand to be capable  of response. Thus Cheney and I conclude that ethical action itself must be “ﬁrst and foremost an attempt to open up possibilities, to enrich the world” rather than primarily an attempt to respond to the world  as already known.  Cheney, true to his nature, also takes the argument on a more  strenuous path, exploring indigenous views of ceremony and ritual.  Once again the question of epistemology turns out to be central.  Euro-Americans, Cheney says, want to know what beliefs are encoded  in the utterances of indigenous peoples. We treat their utterances as  propositional representations of Indigenous worlds. But what if these utterances function, instead, primarily to produce these worlds? Cheney  cites the indigenous scholar Sam Gill on the fundamentally performative function of language. When Gill asks Navajo elders what prayers mean, he reports, they tell him “not what messages prayers carry, but  what prayers do.” More generally, Gill asserts that “the importance of  religion as it is practiced by the great body of religious persons for  whom religion is a way of life [is] a way of creating, discovering, and  communicating worlds of meaning largely through ordinary and common actions and behavior.”11  What then, Cheney and I ask, if this performative dimension of language is fundamental not just in indigenous or obviously religious   settings, but generally? How we speak, how we move, how we carry  on, all the time, also literally brings all sorts of worlds into being—and  thus, again, the ethical challenge put mindful speech, care, and respect  ﬁrst. Indeed we would now go even further. Here it is not so much  that epistemology comes ﬁrst but that, in truth, it simply fades away.  The argument is not the usual suggestion that the West has misunderstood the world, got it wrong, and that we now need to “go back” to  the Indians to get it right. Cheney is arguing that understanding the  world is not really the point in the ﬁ rst place. We are not playing a  truth game at all. What matters is how we relate to things, not what  things are in themselves. Front, center, and always, the world responds.  The great task is not knowledge but relationship.

**Case**

**Struct**

**War turns structural violence**

**Goldstein 1**  (Joshua, Professor of International Relations at American University, War and Gender, 2001, p 412)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thining bout causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can world for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War in not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueld and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It run downward, too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice bring to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yes, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

**Structural violence claims are nebulous**

**Boulding ’77** (Kenneth Boulding, Prof Univ. of Michigan and UC Boulder, Journal of Peace Research 1977; 14; 75 p. Boulding p. 83-4)

Finally, we come to the great Galtung metaphors of ’structural violence’ and ’positive peace’. They are metaphors rather than models, and for that very reason are suspect. Metaphors always imply models and metaphors have much more persuasive power than models do, for models tend to be the preserve of the specialist. But when a metaphor implies a bad model it can be very dangerous, for it is both persuasive and wrong. The metaphor of structural violence I would argue **falls** right into this category. The metaphor is that poverty, deprivation, ill health, low expectations of life, a condition in which more than half the human race lives, is ’like’ a thug beating up the victim and taking his money away from him in the street, -or it is ’like’ a conqueror stealing the land of the people and reducing them to slavery. The implication is that poverty and its associated ills are the fault of the thug or the conqueror and the solution is to do away with thugs and conquerors. While there is some truth in the metaphor, in the modem world at least there is not very much. Violence, whether of the streets and the home, or of the guerilla, of the police, or of the armed forces, is a very different phenomenon from poverty. The processes which create and sustain poverty are not at all like the processes which create and sustain violence, although like everything else in the world, everything is somewhat related to everything else. There is a very real problem of the structures which lead to violence, but unfortunately Galtung’s metaphor of structural violence as he has used it has diverted attention from this problem. Violence in the behavioral sense, that is, somebody actually doing damage to somebody else and trying to make them worse off, is a ’threshold’ phenomenon, rather like the boiling over of a pot. The temperature under a pot can rise for a long time without its boiling over, but at some threshold boiling over will take place. The study of the structures which underlie violence are a very important and much neglected part of peace research and indeed of social science in general. Threshold phenomena like violence are difficult to study because they represent ’breaks’ in the system rather than uniformities. Violence, whether between persons or organizations, occurs when the ’strain’ on a system is too great for its ‘~s~trength’. The metaphor here is that violence is like what happens when we break a piece of chalk. Strength and strain, however, especially in social systems, are so interwoven historically that it is very difficult to separate them. The diminution of violence involves two possible strategies, or a mixture of the two; one is the increase in the strength of the system, ~the other is the diminution of the strain. The strength of systems involves habit, culture, taboos, and sanctions, all these things, which enable a system to stand Increasing strain without breaking down into violence. The strains on the system are largely dynamic in character, such as arms races, mutually stimulated hostility, changes in relative economic position or political power, which are often hard to identify. Conflict of interest are only part of the strain on a system, and not always the most important part. It is very hard for people to know their interests, and misperceptions of interests take place mainly through the dynamic processes, not through the structural ones. It is only perceptions of interest which affect people’s behavior, not the ’real’ interests, whatever these may be, and the gap between perception and reality can be very large and resistant to change. However, what Galitung calls structural violence (which has been defined by one unkind commentator as anything that Galltung doesn’~t like) was originally defined as any unnecessarily low expectation of life, an that assumption that anybody who dies before the allotted span has been killed, however unintentionally and unknowingly, by somebody else. The concept has been expanded to include all the problems off poverty, destitution, deprivation, and misery. These are enormously real and are a very high priority for research and action, but they belong to systems which are only peripherally related to the structures which, produce violence. This is not to say that the cultures of violence and the cultures of poverty are not sometimes related, though not all poverty cultures are culture of violence, and certainly not all cultures of violence are poverty cultures. But the dynamics of poverty and the success or failure to rise out off ’it are of a complexity far beyond anything which the metaphor of structural violence can offer. While the metaphor of structural violence performed a ’service in calling attention to a problem, it may have done a disservice in preventing us from finding the answer.

**Relations**

**US- Mexico Relationship won’t change**

**Rozental 2013**   
Andrés Rozental, former deputy foreign minister of Mexico, works primarily on global governance issues, U.S.-Mexico relations and international migration. He served for many years in Mexico’s diplomatic corps. February 1, 2013 “Have Prospects for U.S.-Mexican Relations Improved?” Brookings Institute http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/02/01-us-mexico-rozental

**The Mexico-U.S. relationship won't substantially change; there are too many ongoing issues to expect any major shift in what has become a very close** and cooperative bilateral **partnership in economic, security and social aspects**. **There will be a change of emphasis from the Mexican side** as far as the security relationship goes, with Peña Nieto's declared intention to focus much more on the economy and public safety. **He has already moved away from** the constant statements made by **his predecessor** extolling the number of criminals apprehended and 'successes' in the fight against organized crime. **The change of message comes as a relief to many Mexicans tired of hearing about violence and crime** on a daily basis.

**The Economies are already integrated enough- drug trafficking is more important**

**Walser 2013**   
Ray Walser, Senior Policy Analyst specializing in Latin America at The Heritage Foundation “Obama in Mexico: Change the Reality, Not the Conversation” 5/1/13 <http://blog.heritage.org/2013/05/01/obama-in-mexico-change-the-reality-not-the-conversation/>

Of course there is much value in an opportunities-oriented approach to U.S.–Mexico relations. **The two countries have unique ties based on patterns of trade, investment, integrated manufacturing, and the movement of peoples**. Both nations should continue to deepen this relationship by focusing on everything from trade, global competitiveness, and modernizing and securing our shared 2,000-mile border in ways that advance economic freedom and improve educational quality and energy development**.¶ Yet addressing hard, seemingly intractable issues related to the illicit traffic in drugs, people, guns, and money moving with relative ease across the U.S.–Mexico border remains a major challenge for both leaders.¶ The Obama Administration has done little to reduce drug demand in the U.S.** Consumption of marijuana is on the rise among teens. There is legal confusion in Washington following passage of legalization measures in Colorado and Washington. **Resource reductions for drug interdiction and treatment are built into the fiscal crisis**. Prior objectives for drug prevention and treatment established by the Obama Administration have not been met, according to the Government Accountability Office. Meanwhile, cash and guns flow south largely unchecked into Mexico.¶ **Cooperation with Mexico may be scaled back or waning as U.S. officials are excluded from intelligence fusion centers the U.S. helped to set up**. A new emphasis on citizen security may take the law enforcement heat of trafficking kingpins, who will likely attempt to move drugs across Mexico with less violence and greater efficiency as Mexican law enforcement focuses on the most violent criminal elements.

#### Peacetime created by aff allows the exploitation of the environment

McNEELY 02 (Jeffrey, Chief Scientist at IUCN, Conserving the Peace, 2002 www.iisd.org/pdf/2002/envsec\_conserving\_overview.pdf)

So while war is bad for biodiversity, peace can be even worse: in the 1960s, when Indonesia and Malaysia were fighting over border claims on the island of Borneo, they did relatively little damage to its vast wilderness, but in the 1990s they peacefully competed to cut down and sell its forests; in Indonesia, the 1997–1998 forest fires that caused US$4.4 billion in damage were set primarily by businesses and military to clear forests in order to plant various cash crops. Ironically, the prices of these commodities that were to be grown have fallen considerably in recent years, making them even less profitable. Vietnam’s forests are under greater pressure now that peace has arrived than they ever were during the country’s wars; Nicaragua’s forests are now under renewed development pressures; and Laos is paying at least part of its war debts to China and Vietnam with timber concessions; I was told in Laos that the Chinese and Vietnamese timber merchants and logging companies are able to operate with impunity in Laos, irrespective of logging regulations, protected area boundaries, or any other considerations. This is perhaps not surprising given the dependence of the Pathet Lao on the support of Vietnam and China during the IndoChina wars. The motivations may be more noble in times of peace, but the impacts of inappropriate development on biodiversity following the end of hostilities often are even worse than the impacts of war. Market forces may be more destructive than military forces