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**Obama is aggressively pushing completion of a farm bill --- it’s his top priority**

**Dreiling, 11/15/13** (Larry, 11/15/2013, “Branches jockey for farm bill positions,” <http://www.hpj.com/archives/2013/nov13/nov18/1112FarmBillLDsr.cfm)>)

While the House-Senate farm bill discussions continue, the White House staked out its position in an address in New Orleans. Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow signaled Nov. 5 that face-to-face talks among the top four farm bill negotiators will resume this week, and she is upbeat enough to hope for a deal by Thanksgiving. “I hope so. It’s doable,” the Michigan Democrat said to the Capitol Hill publication Politico. “I feel confident the four of us can come together,” Stabenow said, speaking of herself, Sen. Thad Cochran, R-MS; Rep. Collin Peterson, D-MN; and House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas, R-OK. While the House remained on recess through Veterans Day, Peterson’s office confirmed that he was flying back to Washington early in the week, and Stabenow told Politico that all four would meet. “The savings of the farm bill will certainly be part of the solution to the budget,” said Stabenow, who is also part of those House-Senate negotiations. But she and Lucas have both said repeatedly that the text of any farm bill will be theirs to write. “The issue is who writes the farm bill,” Stabenow said. “We’ll write the farm bill.” For all her optimism, the chairwoman gave little ground herself on the contentious issue of savings on nutrition programs. The Senate farm bill proposes about $4 billion in 10-year savings, compared with the $39 billion in reductions assumed in the revised nutrition title approved by the House in September. It’s a huge gap, but Stabenow insisted that negotiators can’t ignore previously enacted food stamp cuts that went into effect Nov. 1. Those reductions will reduce spending by as much as $11 billion over the period used by the Congressional Budget Office to score the farm bill. Typically, these are not counted since the savings result from prior actions by Congress. But Stabenow said they cannot be ignored. “I am counting them,” she told Politco. “That’s real and if (the House’s) objective is to cut help for people, that started last Friday. I do count that. In fairness, that needs to be counted.” In the same vein, she showed no interest in a compromise narrowing the range of income and asset tests now used by states in judging eligibility for food stamps. “At this point, what I’m interested in doing is focusing on fraud and abuse—ways to tighten up the system to make it more accountable,” she said. “I’m not interested in taking food away from folks who have had an economic disaster, just as I’m not interested in cutting crop insurance for farmers who have had economic disasters.” Meanwhile, President Barack Obama delivered a speech at the Port of New Orleans Nov. 8, saying that passing a farm bill is the No. 1 way that Democrats and Republicans can increase jobs in the economy. Helping American businesses grow, creating more jobs—these are not Democratic or Republican priorities, Obama said. “They are priorities that everybody, regardless of party, should be able to get behind. And that’s why, in addition to working with Congress to grow our exports, I’ve put forward additional ideas where I believe Democrats and Republicans can join together to make progress right now,” Obama said. That’s when Obama **launched into his pitch on the farm bill**. “Congress needs to pass a farm bill that helps rural communities grow and protects vulnerable Americans,” Obama said. “For decades, Congress found a way to compromise and pass farm bills without fuss. For some reason, now Congress can’t even get that done. “Now, this is not something that just benefits farmers. Ports like this one depend on all the products coming down the Mississippi. So let’s do the right thing, pass a farm bill. We can start selling more products. That’s more business for this port. And that means more jobs right here.” Obama listed immigration reform and a responsible budget as his second and third priorities.

**An agreement is almost complete**

**Rogers, 12/4/13** (David, “Big trades advance farm bill talks” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/12/farm-bill-talks-progress-100670.html>)

Farm bill negotiators **broke major new ground** toward a long-sought deal, even as a leading agriculture lobby urged rival commodity groups Wednesday to “close ranks” behind a final package this winter.¶ Staff were closeted still working out the details and much will depend on final scoring from the Congressional Budget Office. But both sides made important concessions in the course of an hourlong closed-door meeting Wednesday of the four top principals from the House and Senate Agriculture committees.¶ The House moved off its position that all commodity subsidies be a function of a farmer’s planted acres. The Senate agreed to greater food stamp savings — albeit still far short of the $40 billion in 10 years cuts approved by the House in September.¶ “We’re making great progress, across the board we’re trying to bring it all together,” Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) told reporters. “We are coming closer in every part of the bill.”¶ Her counterpart, House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) was cautious but decidedly more upbeat than he had been 24 hours before. “We made great progress. We have more progress to make,” Lucas said. “Let us keep working.”¶ Neither Lucas nor Stabenow discussed any details, but the format of Wednesday’s meeting gave Stabenow the opportunity to present what was described as a five-page response to proposals previously made by Lucas. The fact that both chairs came out smiling was a healthy sign, and after weeks of floundering there was genuine hope that the pieces of a deal could be coming together.¶ Indeed, the framework for the commodity title appeared to be largely in place if the compromise holds regarding base vs. planted acres. In the case of the nutrition title, the Senate moved off what had been a rigid position of rejecting any savings beyond the $4 billion in its bill.

**SNAP is the last item in negotiations and Obama’s capital is key to brokering the deal**

**Hagstrom, 11/3/13** --- founder and executive editor of The Hagstrom Report (11/3/2013, Jerry, “Compromise Is the Key to a New Farm Bill; It is time for House and Senate conferees to stop listening to the lobbyists and finish the bill,” <http://www.nationaljournal.com/outside-influences/compromise-is-the-key-to-a-new-farm-bill-20131103>))

It was a good question because the bill's overlong development period has given all the interests so many opportunities to state their positions that they seem more dug in than in past bill-writing efforts. But at the conference last week there were signals that the conferees think the time to act has come. The 41 conferees did use the last and possibly only public opportunity to make the case for their views. But almost all the members abided by the directive from the conference leader, House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas, R-Okla., to keep their remarks to three minutes. And even the most ideological of them on the right and left were polite and stressed that they were there to compromise and finish a bill. It's unclear how quickly the conferees will proceed to the big issues because the House has left town until Nov. 12, the day after Veterans Day. There has been talk of a meeting on the bill between President Obama and the four conference committee principals—Lucas, House Agriculture ranking member Collin Peterson, D-Minn., Senate Agriculture Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., and Senate Agriculture ranking member Thad Cochran, R-Miss. Peterson said he has mixed feelings about such a meeting because support from Obama might cause some House members to oppose the bill. But Peterson noted that the "one place" on which Obama could be "helpful" would be resolving the size of the cut to food stamps, formally known as the **S**upplemental **N**utrition **A**ssistance **P**rogram. Lucas has said that it is likely to be the last item settled and that Obama, House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., will have to make the call on that. The official White House position on food stamps is to make no cuts, while the Senate-passed farm bill would cut the program by $4 billion over 10 years and the House-passed bill would cut it by $39 billion over the same period.

#### Direct government aid is extremely contentious

David Pozen, January 7. JD Candidate, Yale Law. “Tax Expenditures as Foreign Aid,” Yale Law Journal, 116 Yale L.J. 869.

Few issues in global politics are as contentious as foreign aid - how much rich countries should give, in what ways, to whom. For years, it has been a commonplace that U.S. policies are stingy. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) routinely ranks the United States far behind its industrialized peers in official development assistance (ODA), measured as a percentage of gross national income (GNI). [1](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=90c7a16f276b8a02bccbaaa1ab658e94&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAW&_md5=6547aef2814d16feb85f2a9f7c2db23a" \l "n1#n1" \t "_self) An endless parade of critics has implored the government to do more; some suggest that the Bush Administration's support for the Monterrey Consensus, which sets a goal of increasing assistance to 0.7% of GNI, commits it to do more. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=90c7a16f276b8a02bccbaaa1ab658e94&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAW&_md5=6547aef2814d16feb85f2a9f7c2db23a" \l "n2#n2" \t "_self) Against these allegations of miserliness, executive officials and certain sympathetic scholars have begun to argue that the published statistics are misleading because they fail to account for individual and corporate philanthropy. What the OECD misses, this argument runs, is the exceptional extent of Americans' private generosity. [3](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=90c7a16f276b8a02bccbaaa1ab658e94&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAW&_md5=6547aef2814d16feb85f2a9f7c2db23a" \l "n3#n3" \t "_self) What both sides of the debate have missed, this Comment proposes, is not the role of the private sector in generating foreign aid but the role of tax expenditures in subsidizing it. Tax expenditures are deviations from the normal tax structure "designed to favor a particular industry, activity, or class of persons." [4](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=90c7a16f276b8a02bccbaaa1ab658e94&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAW&_md5=6547aef2814d16feb85f2a9f7c2db23a" \l "n4#n4" \t "_self) They take the form of deductions, exemptions, exclusions, deferrals, credits, or preferential rates. Economically, these "expenditures" may be seen as equivalent to direct government outlays: if U.S. taxpayers saved $ 70 billion last year from, say, the mortgage interest deduction, the government therefore gave a $ 70 billion (implicit) subsidy to homeownership. Stanley Surrey pioneered the theory of tax expenditures in the late 1960s, and the concept is now widely credited. Since 1974, Congress has required the annual publication of a tax expenditure budget. [5](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=90c7a16f276b8a02bccbaaa1ab658e94&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkAW&_md5=6547aef2814d16feb85f2a9f7c2db23a" \l "n5#n5" \t "_self) Although not immediately evident from the budget data, in recent years a growing amount of expenditure has gone toward foreign aid. The reason lies in America's tax treatment of nonprofit organizations. Whenever U.S. charities and foundations spend money overseas - as they have increasingly been doing - some portion of this spending can be attributed to the support they receive from numerous state and federal tax privileges. Unlike traditional ODA, these tax expenditure funds are privately organized and distributed, yet unlike voluntary transfers they are paid for by the public fisc. This is not private aid; it is privatized aid.

**New farm bill key to prevent a doubling in food prices**

**Thuman, 12/5/13** (Scott, “Farm Bill hangs in the balance as crucial deadline looms”

Read more: http://www.wjla.com/articles/2013/12/farm-bill-hangs-in-the-balance-as-crucial-deadline-looms-97746.html#ixzz2mhOX4n2X

WASHINGTON (WJLA) - While much of the nation has been focusing on President Barack Obama's health care bill, there's another major battle taking place on Capitol Hill over pending legislation.¶ It's the Farm Bill, and it affects every single American. What more, it's in danger of expiring at year's end, and that could be **catastrophic** for the nation.¶ Very few pending bills before Congress could have such an **immediate and negative impact** on people across america, and debate over the Farm Bill has been fierce in both houses of Congress.¶ In an exclusive interview, Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack says that the mishandling of the Farm Bill could lead to **major market disruptions**; in his words, breakfast would be "much more expensive."¶ "(I) would have to go out into the marketplace and start purchasing commodities - milk, butter, cheese and grains **at highly inflated prices**," Vilsack said. "If I'm paying **twice the market price**, you can do the math."¶ The New Year's deadline that could send the price of milk skyward looms over congressional negotiators as they try to reach agreement on a five-year bill. They've been tripped up by differences over the nation's food stamp program and how to restructure farm subsidies.¶ Finding a compromise on cuts to the nation's $80 billion-a-year food stamp program has been the toughest obstacle over the last two years. The House passed a bill this summer that would cut $4 billion from food stamps - now known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP - annually and allow states to create new work requirements for some recipients.¶ The Democratic Senate, backed by President Barack Obama, passed a farm bill with $400 million annual cut, or a tenth of the House cut. There also major disputes over how farmers crops should be calculated for subsidies.

**Extinction**

**Brown 9** (Lester R, Founder of the Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=civilization-food-shortages>)

**The biggest threat to global stability** is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation¶ One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis.¶ For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization.¶ I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such **a collapse is possible.** The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever.As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, **entire nations will break down** at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk.States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy.Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six).Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.
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#### Text: The United States federal government should provide a 39-cent tax credit for every dollar that American businesses invest in ****nonprofit non-governmental organizations engaged in micro-financing.****

#### The CP solves and is more efficient than government assistance --- businesses will say yes and it avoids our disads.

Justin Muzinich and Eric Werker, 10/20/2007. JD from Yale, Works for a Hedge Fund in Connecticut; and Assistant Professor at Harvard Business School. “A Global Tax Credit,” The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/20/opinion/20werker.html?\_r=0.

BARACK OBAMA has proposed that the United States double the amount it spends on foreign aid to $50 billion each year. But before promising to spend more taxpayer money, Mr. Obama and the other presidential candidates should look to reform our system of foreign aid by modeling it on the successful programs the United States has used to reduce domestic poverty. While foreign aid works in some situations, it has two huge problems. First, there is never enough money to go around. Last year, the United States provided $23 billion of development aid to foreign countries. This was more than any other donor, but it still resulted in very little for the billion people who live on less than $1 per day. The second problem is that the money that does get distributed doesn't always reach the people who need it. As the economist Jeffrey Sachs has noted, of every dollar given to sub-Saharan Africa, only about 40 cents is actually directed toward economic development. The rest goes to debt service, consultants and humanitarian emergencies. And after those expenses are subtracted, the remaining money is further reduced by mismanagement and corruption. A solution to both problems would be to give tax credits to American companies that invest in qualified developing countries. A similar program that focuses on domestic poverty has been a resounding success. In 2000, Congress created a program giving businesses that invest in poor communities within the United States a tax credit equal to 39 percent of the cost of the investment. The theory was that poverty and joblessness in poor communities could be ended only by developing local businesses, not by an aid check. Seven years later, so many businesses want to invest in poor areas that only a quarter of the companies that applied for tax credits in 2006 received them. Using the domestic program as a template, Congress should provide a 39-cent tax credit for every dollar of American investment in developing countries. If Company X were to build a $100 million factory in Madagascar, its tax bill would be reduced by $39 million. The lost tax revenue would be offset by reducing direct foreign aid by the same amount. The power of substituting tax credits for lump sums of cash is that while the cash would bring at most $39 million to Madagascar, the tax credit results in a $100 million investment. For the same cost to the federal government, Madagascar receives far more resources. And by leveraging its foreign aid dollars, the United States is better off too, for reasons from the creation of new markets to alleviating conditions that may aid terrorist recruitment. Using tax credits instead of traditional foreign aid also means that the money will be spent more prudently. Because for-profit companies are focused on the bottom line, they will be more protective than government agencies of the money they invest in developing countries. Moving from inefficient direct aid to investment tax credits could lead to a fivefold increase in the capital that is deployed in developing countries. Of the $23 billion the United States spends on foreign aid, less than half reaches the ground. Providing $23 billion in tax credits, on the other hand, would lead to $59 billion of investment, if the domestic formula is applied abroad. Of course, the private sector is not always efficient, and not all of the money allocated to foreign aid should be converted to tax credits. But by involving the private sector, the United States could significantly increase the amount of money it spends in poor countries, without using any more taxpayer dollars. This tax credit program could reinforce goals other than economic growth. Credits could be awarded to countries that embrace ''green'' development or good governance. Eligibility could be restricted to new investment that creates jobs and transfers know-how to the poorest countries that do not compete directly with American workers. If Mr. Obama and the other presidential candidates in both parties think as creatively about helping the developing world as Congress did about alleviating domestic poverty, then foreign aid can be transformed from a faltering effort into one that brings the fruits of globalization to poor countries.

# 3

#### The plan’s neoliberal policies is the root cause of economic crisis and guarantees inevitable systems collapse

**Palley 10 –** PhD in economics from Yale (Thomas, MA in IR from Yale, and a BA from Oxford, “AMERICA’S EXHAUSTED PARADIGM: MACROECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS AND GREAT RECESSION”, New School Economic Review, Volume 4(1), 2010: 15-43, ZBurdette)

This paper traces the **roots** of the current financial crisis to a **faulty U.S. macroeconomic paradigm**. One flaw in this paradigm was the neoliberal growth model adopted after 1980 that relied on debt and asset price inflation to drive demand in place of wage growth. A second flaw was the model of U.S. engagement with the global economy that created a **triple economic hemorrhage of spending on imports, manufacturing job losses, and off-shoring of investment.** Financial deregulation and financial excess are important parts of the story, but they are not the ultimate cause of the crisis. These developments contributed significantly to the housing bubble but they were a **necessary** part of the neoliberal model, their function being to fuel demand growth by making ever larger amounts of credit easily available. As **the neoliberal model slowly cannibalized itself** by undermining income distribution and accumulating debt, the economy needed larger speculative bubbles to grow. **The flawed model of global engagement accelerated the cannibalization process**, thereby creating need for a huge bubble that only housing could provide. However, when that bubble burst it pulled down the entire economy because of the bubble’s massive dependence on debt. The old postWorld War II growth model based on rising middle-class incomes has been dismantled, while the new neoliberal growth model has imploded. The United States needs a new economic paradigm and a new growth model, but as yet this challenge has received little attention from policymakers or economists.

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

**Makwana 6** (Rajesh, As a non-governmental organisation with consultative status at the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC), STWR works to influence policy through research and publications outlining how to rapidly secure basic human needs through greater international cooperation and economic sharing., 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization

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

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

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

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to Maria Páez Victor:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Economic Growth

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

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

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

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

Free Trade

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

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

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

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

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

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

Liberalization

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

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

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

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

#### Reject the aff as a means to create space for alternatives to neoliberal engagement.

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

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

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

# 4

#### Chinese influence in Mexico increasing now.

Eric Farnsworth, 9/24/2013. Vice President of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society. “China and Mexico: An Emerging Trans-Pacific Partnership?” China US Focus, http://www.chinausfocus.com/foreign-policy/china-and-mexico-an-emerging-trans-pacific-partnership/.

China’s exploding interest in Latin America is a defining element of the past decade in the Americas.  From a base approaching zero, China is now the top trade partner for Brazil, Chile, and Peru and ranks near the top for several others.  Mostly, this is a reflection of the sale of primary goods from the region to China, and the return purchase of products manufactured in China.  Investment is also flowing, primarily from China to Latin America, although Latin American multilatinas are increasingly aware of investment opportunities in China.

One nation has conspicuously been absent from the party: Mexico.  Latin America’s second largest economy after Brazil, Mexico has long been tied closely to the United States economically, in 2012 sending almost 80 percent of its exports north and importing almost 50 percent from the United States.  Even as South Americans have sold aggressively into the China market since the first visit of then-leader Hu Jintao in 2003, Mexico’s trade patterns remained largely the same as before.  The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) gives Mexico preferential access into the world’s largest market, and the changing nature of production and global supply chains has meant that North America has now become an integrated production space.  The National Bureau of Economic Research has found, in fact, that 40 percent of Mexico’s global exports are inputs from the United States.  At the same time, Mexican producers have long complained that China’s market has been difficult to crack, particularly in areas where Mexico is a competitive producer.

Similarly, China’s quest for economic takeoff over the past decade has required massive inputs of raw materials from around the world, including energy, ores, minerals, and agricultural products, among others.  With the exception of energy, most of which has been used domestically or exported to the United States, Mexico simply doesn’t produce the types of materials that China has sought from elsewhere in Latin America.  Many of the items that Mexico does produce for export are manufactured goods—exactly the sort of products in which China has specialized.  And both have been increasingly competitive in seeking to serve the U.S. market.  The two countries have long seen themselves as competitors, rather than natural economic partners.  Politics has also intervened: the visit by the Dalai Lama to Mexico in 2011 and the H1N1 health scare put the relationship in the deepfreeze.

As a result, neither nation has made much effort to improve the bilateral relationship.  Until now.

One of the top foreign policy initiatives of the Pena Nieto Administration in Mexico since the inauguration in December 2012 has been to diversify Mexico’s political and economic relationships.  That is not necessarily to say that Mexico is looking to distance itself from the United States, but rather that it is looking to broaden its other relationships as a means to build Mexico’s global profile—a priority for the new team in Mexico City.  One important way to do this is to redefine the bilateral relationship with China.  At the same time, leadership change in China earlier this year has offered a fortuitous opportunity to re-engineer relationship led by two newly elevated, next generation leaders.

The evidence of warming relations is mounting, even as relations between China and South America are cooling given continued political uncertainty in countries such as Venezuela and a slowing Chinese economy that is softening regional commodities sales.  Shortly after his inauguration, Mexican President Enrique Pena Nieto traveled to China in April, where he sought greater balance to the trade relationship weighted heavily in China’s favor.  Newly installed President Xi Jinping reciprocated by traveling to Mexico City in June.  A third meeting between the two leaders was just held in St. Petersburg during the G20 earlier in September.

Out of these meetings—and numerous others conducted at the cabinet and sub-cabinet levels—have developed a series of commitments to upgrade the relationship through increased Chinese purchases of Mexican goods including tequila and pork, educational exchanges, and energy and minerals investments, among others.  The last of these is particularly important given Pena Nieto’s efforts to reform the energy sector in Mexico by allowing direct foreign investment for the first time since the 1938 nationalization.  Should this effort be successful, Mexico’s energy sector will be hungry for capital, technology, and know-how, including foreign markets, and China will be better positioned to participate in the sector.  At the same time, increasing Chinese investments in Mexico generally will serve as a platform for production that can target the U.S. market as a near shoring play.  There is evidence of investment flowing back to Mexico given increasing labor costs and challenging business conditions in China; China’s own government may also be noticing the trend and seeking to take full advantage.

#### Economic engagement is key to check Chinese influence --- the U.S. is making promises now, but has not followed words with policy --- Mexico is key.

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

Though the U.S. and Chinese presidents heralded a “new model” of cooperation at their weekend summit, a growing competition looks more likely. The whirlwind of activity before President Barack Obama met with President Xi Jinping in the California desert revealed that Beijing and Washington’s sights are set on a similar prize — and face differing challenges to attain it. Their focus is Latin America and the prize is increased trade and investment opportunities in a region where economic reforms have pulled millions out of poverty and into the middle class. Latin America is rich in the commodities and energy that both China and the United States need, largely stable politically and eager to do deals. Consider the travel itinerary: Obama visited Mexico and Costa Rica last month. Vice President Joe Biden recently went to Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago and Brazil. Chile’s president paid Obama a visit last week, Peru’s leader arrived Tuesday and Brazil’s is due in October. Meanwhile, just after Biden left Trinidad, Xi arrived, part of a tour that also took him to Costa Rica and Mexico to promote trade and cooperation. Both U.S. and Chinese officials, however, are finding a more self-confident Latin America, able to leverage its new strength to forge better agreements and find multiple trading partners. That will likely force Washington to work harder to maintain its leading trade position against China — which has money to burn in the region. “There is a more energetic [U.S.] tone, a more optimistic mood about economic agenda in second term than [the] first time,” Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington policy group, told me. “There’s something happening in the region and the U.S. wants to be part of it. Whether there’s a well-thought-out vision or policy remains a question. But there is more of an affirmation of the region and a willingness to engage.” The United States, Latin America’s largest trading partner throughout much of its history, still retains this position. Washington has now signed free trade agreements with more than a third of the hemisphere’s nations and annually exchanges more than $800 billion in goods and services with Latin America — more than three times the region’s commerce with China. In Obama’s first term, however, the administration was widely viewed as neglecting Latin America. And China has moved in fast. China built its annual trade with the region from virtually nothing in 2000 to about $260 billion in 2012. In 2009, it overtook the United States as the largest trading partner of Brazil, the region’s powerhouse — largely through massive purchases of iron ore and soy. Other data is telling: In 1995, for example, the United States accounted for 37 percent of Brazil’s foreign direct investment. That dropped to 10 percent in 2011, [according to](http://www.americasquarterly.org/charticles/Latin-Americas-Changing-Global-Connections/) the Council of the Americas, which seeks to foster hemispheric ties. Washington’s renewed ardor is at least partly because of the fear that China will repeat in Latin America the economic success it has [built in Africa](http://www.economist.com/news/middle-east-and-africa/21574012-chinese-trade-africa-keeps-growing-fears-neocolonialism-are-overdone-more). China has been able to present itself as a benevolent partner there, which has played well against the West’s history of [meddling in domestic affairs](http://www.coldwar.org/articles/50s/guatemala.asp). “It’s about influence and leverage,” said Eric Farnsworth, vice president of the Council of the Americas, “…The region matured and expects to be treated in real partnership rather than [in the] patronizing way it happened in the past.” The challenges facing Beijing and Washington lie in how each approaches the region. Washington confronts lingering resentment about its [historic regional interference](http://www.thenation.com/article/latin-americas-shock-resistance), stretching back to the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, and its continuing desire to mix business with policy — which muddies its approach to trade and investment. Washington’s domestic problems, its pivot to Asia and a host of global crises, also serve as distractions that could keep its actions in Latin America from matching its words — as has happened before. China, meanwhile, is largely viewed in the region as unencumbered by ideology. It approaches opportunities almost exclusively on commercial terms there. Biden, in a May 29 speech in Rio de Janeiro, gushed about the progress made by Latin America and[trumpeted](http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/05/20130529148122.html#axzz2VLN5zuzZ) the region’s growing international stature. “In the U.S.,” Biden said, “the discussion is no longer what it was when I was first elected as a young man: What could we do for the Americas? That’s long since gone. The issue now is: What can we do together? We want to engage more. We think there’s great opportunity. We’re optimistic.” As with many new starts, a recognition of past mistakes is in order. “For many in Brazil,” Biden said, “the United States doesn’t start with a clean slate. There’s some good reason for that skepticism. That skepticism still exists and it’s understandable. But the world has changed. We’re moving past old alignments, leaving behind old suspicions and building new relationships.” China has particular interest in Mexico, the region’s second-largest market. Beijing has been competing with Mexico to supply the U.S. market with manufactured goods. But China is now looking to work with Mexico City — investing in infrastructure, mining and energy because of the expected reforms that would open the oil industry to foreign investment.

#### Chinese influence in Latin American is key to maintain their economic growth.

Arnson et al. ‘9(Cynthia Anderson, Mark Mohr, Riordan Roett, writers for Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Enter the Dragon? China’s Presence in Latin America”, <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/EnterDragonFinal.pdf>) (JN)

China’s role in Latin America is, above all, based on trade, despite U.S. concerns about China’s military inﬂuence in Latin America. The major exception to this rule is Cuba, for which China represents a political relationship as well as one based on economic interests. Although Venezuelan authorities may also prefer that its relationship with China have political as well as economic dimensions, it is not clear that China has the same expectations of its relationship with Venezuela. To China, Latin America represents a signiﬁcant source of the necessary natural resources that will help China maintain its economic growth. Due primarily to trade with China, Latin America’s trade volume grew from $2.8 billion in 1988 to $49 billion in 2005. Also, and as publicly announced, China intends to surpass $180 billion in trade with Latin America by 2010, not only due to the country’s need for natural resources, but also as a result of China’s intention to diversify and expand its markets in the region. Thus, Latin America represents a substantial market for Chinese goods.

#### Chinese economic decline causes great power war.

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

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

# 1NC Gender

#### War is the root of gender violence—it’s more productive to focus on preventing war

**Goldstein 2001** – IR professor at American University (Joshoue, War and Gender, p. 412, Google Books)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about 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 work 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 is 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 fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 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 runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### Feminist explanations of international violence are too broad to be theoretically useful–realism is the only alternative

Lind 2005 (Michael, Executive Editor of the National Interest, “Of Arms and the Woman,” Jan 20, http://feminism.eserver.org/of-arms-and-the-woman.txt)

Though realist theory can survive, and perhaps even accommodate, many of the arguments of feminism with respect to collective conflict and state sovereignty, realism must reject the third aspect of the feminist criticism: the redefinition of security to mean social justice. From the Marxist left, feminists have picked up the argument that interstate violence is just one genre of "structural violence," which includes the economic oppression of lower classes by upper classes (Marxism) and the subordination of women to men by custom and by violence (feminism). But this notion merely disguises a change of subject as a change of approach. To say that mass rape by soldiers in wartime and wife-beating in societies at peace (excuse me, at "peace") are parts of the same phenomenon is to abandon any pretense of engaging in serious thinking about international relations. The result may be feminist theory, but it is not a theory of world politics. It is a theory of human society in general. When, as in "ecofeminism," the mistreatment of women by men in all societies, in peace and at war, is fused, as a subject of analysis, with the mistreatment of the ecosystem by humanity, one has a theory of everything, and a theory of everything is usually not very much.

#### Empirical evidence disproves their conflict claims

**Nakaya, UNIFEM, 2003 (Sumie, Global Governance, Oct-Dec, ebsco)**

Yet the premise of women's participation as an introduction to gender equality and sustainable peace agreements has not been tested; it is not backed by empirical evidence. In fact, the short- to medium-term results of many peace processes point to the contrary: women continue to be discriminated against and marginalized in postwar society. In Kosovo, despite the introduction of 30 percent electoral quotas for women, only 8.2 percent of those elected to the Municipal Assemblies in the October 2000 elections were women.[sup9] In Burundi, despite the historic convention of the All-Party Women's Conference in July 2000 in which two women from each of nineteen political parties participating in peace negotiations, formulated women's recommendations, and managed to incorporate twenty-three of them into the final peace agreement, conference-goers could not agree on which one delegate would represent them at the accord signing. To date, the role of women in the implementation of the accord has been minimal.[sup10] In Guatemala, Cambodia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, women's representation in parliament has decreased from prewar levels. With international financial institutions advocating the downsizing of the civil service, women are often the last and the least favored in obtaining public sector employment.¶ Even upon quick inspection, these shortcomings may not be accountable to women and their role at the peace table. Patriarchic traditions, gender-discriminatory state structures, the lack of incentives on the part of fighting parties to commit to peace processes, or the unavailability of national and international resources to implement agreements may be beyond the scope of what women can bring to the peace process. What is, then, the exact nature and impact of "contributions" that women bring to the peace process? Is it the creation of a reconciliatory environment for negotiated settlements, or has it influenced the political processes in which peace agreements are implemented? And if evidence does support that women's participation in peace processes promotes social transformation, which entails gender equality and sustainable peace, what would be the mechanism of such change?

#### Our disad turns the case—the public and governments won’t accept feminism in times of war

**Bunch,** Executive Director of the Center for Women's Global Leadership at Douglass College, Rutgers, **2003 (Charlotte, Canadian Woman Studies 22 n.2, Fall/Winter 2002-2003, firstsearch)**

    Efforts to advance peace and the concept of human security were set back by the events of September 11th and the ensuing resurgence of the masculine dominated discourse on defense. Media response to this crisis proved a rude reminder that when it comes to issues of terrorism, war, and national security, feminism is **not on the map**. There was rich discussion about these events among women on the internet, but public commentary in the Western media was dominated by male "authority" figures. Even the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, one of the first to frame a response to 9/11 from the perspective of international law by suggesting justice for this act of terrorism be pursued internationally as crimes against humanity, rather than as a call to war, was quickly side-lined by the U.S. and the United Nations.

#### Their feminist system isn't any less aggressive and institutions mean they couldn't solve even if it was

Brooks, 8/9 – a Schwartz Senior Fellow at the New America Foundation and a law professor at the Georgetown University Law Center. From April 2009 to July 2011, she served as Counselor to Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Michèle Flournoy at the U.S. Department of Defense (Rosa, "Women Are from Mars Too Why more female leaders won't mean less war," Foreign Policy, 8-9-13, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/08/08/women_are_from_mars_too>, SMS)

In his Foreign Policy column this week, he cites recent evidence of a gender gap in support for U.S. drone strikes and notes that a "female-male divergence of opinions is an enduring characteristic of polls on the use of military force." Specifically, studies of global polling data suggest that women are consistently less likely than men to favor the use of military force, leading Zenko, with whom I usually agree, to speculate that perhaps "force would be used less" if there were more women in senior national leadership positions. I'm skeptical on this one. There are plenty of tough, not-exactly-pacifistic gals out there -- have I mentioned my mother? -- and there is a distinct dearth of evidence supporting the idea that "the world would be more peaceful if more women held political office." That's a sentiment apparently held by 65 percent of the 43 women leaders polled by Foreign Policy in 2012, but at the moment it represents wishful thinking more than anything else. This rosy view reflects a misunderstanding of the existing evidence on gender differences and an even deeper misunderstanding of the complex web of cultural and institutional factors that drive decisions about the use of military force. We hear all the time that men are different from women, and in certain crushingly obvious ways, it's true. There are biological differences between the sexes. The life trajectories of men and women tend to differ in measurable ways. There are male-dominated professions and female-dominated professions. And, as Zenko points out, there are some persistent gender gaps in opinions on numerous issues, from the use of military force to health care policy. We all know the stereotypes: Men are more "aggressive" than women; women are more "nurturing" than men. Those looking for evidence that these are enduring, hard-wired differences can find plenty of grist for the mill: Men commit the overwhelming majority of violent crimes, for instance, while women make up the overwhelming majority of early childhood teachers and daycare workers. See? Men are violent; women are kind. Ah, but not so fast. It's a big mistake to go from patterns of individual behavior to assumptions about inherent gender differences -- and a bigger mistake to assume that gender differences translate predictably into different policy outcomes on the scale of an entire nation. Recent research on gender suggests that men and women are far less different in their psychological makeup than most people think. In 2005, psychologist Janet Shibley Hyde analyzed dozens of prior meta-analyses of studies looking at gender differences in aggression, leadership, moral reasoning, communication, cognition, and a range of other psychological traits. By and large, she found, the effect of gender differences on most psychological variables was small: In fact, "78% of gender differences are small or close to zero." In Hyde's analysis, there were a few areas in which gender differences loomed larger, but these mostly related to physical difference, such as throwing speed and distance. Hyde also found "large" gender differences in "some, but not all, measures of sexuality," including attitudes towards casual sex outside of committed relationships (men were more in favor). When it came to aggression, the evidence was more ambiguous: Hyde found a "moderate" gender difference in physical aggression (men were, on average, moderately more physically aggressive than women), but the picture was more complex when other forms of aggression were factored in: Women, for instance, may be slightly more "relationally aggressive." In certain contexts, different studies suggest, women may be as (or even slightly more) physically aggressive than men, although men's greater strength makes them more dangerous when they become aggressive.A study in the February 2013 issue of the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology generally confirmed Hyde's findings. It noted that even when there are mean differences between men and women when it comes to certain characteristics, such as physical aggression, those differences are poor predictors of how any given individual is likely to behave. Thus, note study authors Harry Reis and Bobbi Carothers, "The statement that men are more aggressive than women, for example, implicitly" -- but wrongly -- "assumes that there is one group of people who are high in aggression (men) and another group of people who are low in aggression (women)." Such an assumption would lead us to think that "Knowing only that a person was male, we could also infer that he would be relatively aggressive" -- and that he would demonstrate other qualities on which there are, on average, small differences between men and women. For instance, he would be "good in math, poor in verbal skills, primarily interested in short-term mating, less agreeable, and so on."Yet another thing we don't know is whether those women who seek and obtain national leadership positions have psychological traits that differ in measurable ways from those of the "average" woman. Maybe women foreign policy and national security leaders will think and act just like women who choose to be preschool teachers or doctors or accountants -- but maybe the women who seek out national leadership positions are less likely to conform to "typical" gender norms than other women. Certainly, history is replete with examples of women leaders who presided over aggressive foreign policies (consider, for instance, Britain's Queen Elizabeth I and Queen Victoria, neither of whom were noted for their pacifistic, nurturing approach to decisions about military force). Ah. It's time to get back to my mother. Not just because she's a woman who rarely shies away from a scrap (she's pretty tough), but because her own work on the origins of war (Blood Rites, by Barbara Ehrenreich, a.k.a. "Mom") offers a final important reason to be skeptical of claims that more women leaders would make the world more peaceful. Zenko briefly quotes her assertion that "women in the past two centuries have more than adequately demonstrated a capacity for collective violence," but he overlooks her more important point: You just can't extrapolate from individual personality to the actions of nations. As she wrote in the article cited by Zenko, "There is little basis for locating the wellspring of war in aggressive male instincts -- or in any instincts, for that matter. Wars are not bar-room brawls writ large, but, as social theorist Robin Fox puts it, ‘complicated, orchestrated, highly organized' collective undertakings that cannot be explained by any individual impulse." In other words, nations don't use military force simply because individual policymakers, male or female, happen to be "aggressive": Wars are the products of thousands of individual decisions that are driven and enabled by complex institutional arrangements and patterns of behavior. Leaders don't operate in a vacuum, imposing their individual preferences on national decisions large and small. Instead, they are shaped and constrained by past decisions and practices, by politics and ideology, by the availability of different capabilities and resources, by the decision-making structures they create or inherit, and by path-dependent bureaucracies. That is to say: President Obama doesn't preside over drone strikes because he's a naturally aggressive male. He presides over drone strikes because the United States has developed an elaborate military and paramilitary structure designed to use military force against terrorists. An array of past decisions about research, development, training, resource and personnel allocations, law, and targeting procedures lies behind current U.S. drone strike policy. Could President Obama change course? Yes -- but he, like any other leader who wants to change an entrenched practice, will find himself working against the tide. In the end, of course, I wholeheartedly agree with Micah Zenko that the underrepresentation of women in senior national leadership positions is a crying shame. As a card-carrying member of the female sex -- and frankly, as a citizen -- I'd love to see more women in national leadership positions. For one thing, there are a whole lot of talented women out there, and the complex structural factors that keep most women out of senior positions deprive the nation of talent we surely need. It's also about basic fairness: Right now, for reasons I've written about previously, it's just harder for most women to gain entry to the highest echelons of power. But let's not kid ourselves: There's no solid evidence supporting the notion, pleasing as it is, that more women leaders will translate into a foreign policy that's all sweetness and light. Can you say "Margaret Thatcher?" Or, for that matter, "Dianne Feinstein," or "Sarah Palin"? But this, Reis and Carothers argue, is not the case: Any particular man may be far less aggressive than many women, and "Those who score in a stereotypic way on one measure do not necessarily do so on another." In other words, psychological traits are poor predictors of an individual's gender, and an individual's gender is a poor predictor of his or her psychological traits. When it comes to aggression, the picture becomes even more complex if we take away the social context and cues that powerfully affect behavior. In one study, participants who believed that researchers would not know their names or genders defied standard assumptions about gender and aggression. In a simulated conflict setting, men chose to drop more bombs than women when they believed researchers knew their identities, but when study subjects believed themselves to be anonymous, women actually dropped more bombs than male participants. Richard Eichenberg, whose research Zenko cites, looked at attitudes towards the use of military force during six recent U.S. conflicts (from the Gulf War to the war on terror), and found that, on average, 51 percent of men and 43 percent of women supported the use of force. Consider these numbers in the context of recent psychological studies, however: This means that 49 percent of men did not support the use of force, while 43 percent of women did. That's a lot of men opposed to force, and a lot of women who favor it. Would this relatively small difference truly translate into significant differences in national policy if there were more women leaders? That's anyone's guess. We also don't know the degree to which context and cultural norms influenced the answers of those polled (perhaps more women than men felt they were "supposed" to tell pollsters that they opposed force, given prevailing stereotypes about women). If the same women who were polled in these surveys were sitting in a room full of military and national security officials, would that affect their responses? This, too, is anyone's guess -- and it has some bearing on the assumption that more women leaders would bring us a more peaceful world, since at the moment, any given woman leader operating at the national level will find herself in a male-dominated setting. In such a setting, will a woman with "average" female attitudes about aggression and force be driven by those attitudes? Or will women leaders find themselves influenced and co-opted by the contexts in which they find themselves, and end up, like the women in the study mentioned above, choosing to drop more bombs than the men?

# 1NC Culture

#### Status quo solves culture – Santa Maria’s schools

**Lanham, 11/12** – Staff Reporter at Santa Maria Sun (Camillia, “Santa Maria's schools keep Mexican culture alive”, Santa Maria Sun Vol. 14 Iss. 36, 11/12/13, <http://www.santamariasun.com/school-scene/10678/santa-marias-schools-keep-mexican-culture-alive-/>) EK

Ballet Folklorico students from different schools are teaming up to showcase Mexican and Latino culture through traditional music and dance performances on Nov. 15 and 16.¶ Approximately 100 performers from Ernest Righetti, Santa Maria, and Pioneer Valley high schools and Allan Hancock College are coming together in colorful costumes to put on a “Celebration of Mexican Culture.” Performances on both nights are at 7 p.m. in the Ethel Pope Auditorium, 901 S. Broadway St., in Santa Maria.¶ “Our students will use music and dance to engage the Santa Maria community in Latino heritage and culture,” Ricardo Gabaldon, Ernest Righetti Marimba Band and Ballet Folklorico director, said in a press release.¶ Dance selections from the Mexican states of Aguascalientes, Chihuahua, Nuevo Leon, Oaxaca, Sinaloa, Tamaulipas, Vera Cruz, and Jalisco will be showcased. In addition, the Righetti Marimba Band will join dancers in re-creating the 1940s Pachuco Swing with its rendition of “Zoot Suit.”¶ Students have been practicing for the last several months.¶ “This is a great opportunity to share the richness and beauty of my culture with other students and their families,” Fabiola Pérez, a Righetti High senior and dancer, said in the release.¶ Tickets can be purchased at all three high schools. They are $10 in advance and $12 at the door.

#### Cultures will inevitably still exist, and loss of indigenous cultures doesn’t cause dehumanization – benefits of globalization check

**Coates, 9** – former adjunct professor at George Washington University, President of the Kanawha Institute for the Study of the Future and was President of the International Association for Impact Assessment and was President of the Association for Science, Technology and Innovation, M.S., Hon D., FWAAS, FAAAS, (Joseph F., Futures 41, 694-705, "Risks and threats to civilization, humankind, and the earth”, ScienceDirect, WEA)

The first category of significant dreadful outcomes: the death of cultures, raises definitional questions of what is a culture, and how to define the boundaries on it and what it means for it to disappear. Obviously, most of the cultures that would be at risk today are small, involving thousands, tens of thousands, or surely well under a million people. Cultures larger than that are becoming increasingly globalized, westernized, and part of an expanding international advanced-nation culture, with local flavors in different parts of the world. When we turn to the smaller cultures, there is not even a good guess as to how many there are, but an excellent surrogate for that is the number of languages that there are. Each culture insofar as it is isolated has created its own language. The linguists tell us that languages are dying in great numbers.¶ Another side of the question is, whether the death of cultures is good or bad. There are, worldwide, people who deplore the loss of any culture. (We are not thinking about people, but about the culture of a people.) Unfortunately, they would like to see functional groups of the people at cultural risk preserved to become parts of a living museum. That is unfair and, to say the least, undemocratic. Consider the case of the people who manage and harvest the reindeer in Finland, the Lapps. Their culture is in large part framed around a great annual cycle. The animals are collected together and moved much like the situation so common in our western movies of taking the herds of cattle from Texas to the Midwest slaughter houses and railroad yards. The snowmobile was introduced into Lapp society and has been rapidly changing their customs. Some outsiders, as noted, deplore this. But remember, no one forced the snowmobile on the Lapps; it is their free choice and it is outrageous to think that we would deprive them of free choice to adopt what they see will enhance the quality of their lives. On net, I see the loss of cultures as, in some romantic sense, regrettable and undesirable, but in terms of the overall benefits to humankind, the integration of the minor cultures into a global culture carries far more benefit for them and for the world than local survival does.

#### All lives infinitely valuable—only ethical option is maximizing number saved

Cummisky, 96(David, professor of philosophy at Bates, Kantian Consequentialism, p. 131)

Finally, even if one grants that saving two persons with dignity cannot outweigh and compensate for killing one—because dignity cannot be added and summed this way—this point still does not justify deontological constraints. On the extreme interpretation, why would not killing one person be a stronger obligation than saving two persons? If I am concerned with the priceless dignity of each, it would seem that I may still save two; it is just that my reason cannot be that the two compensate for the loss of one. Consider Hill’s example of a priceless object: If I can save two of three priceless statutes only by destroying one, then I cannot claim that saving two is not outweighed by the one that was not destroyed. Indeed, even if dignity cannot be simply summed up, how is the extreme interpretation inconsistent with the idea that I should save as many priceless objects as possible? Even if two do not simply outweigh and thus compensate for the loss of one, each is priceless; thus, I have good reason to save as many as I can. In short, it is not clear how the extreme interpretation justifies the ordinary killing/letting-die distinction or even how it conflicts with the conclusion that the more persons with dignity who are saved, the better.

#### Consequences outweigh—fierce dogmatism makes them complicit with the evil they criticize

**Isaac 02** – Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power.

Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

# 1NC Grassroots Democracy

#### Democracy is un-solvable

**Rothkopf, 10 -** (David, Foreign Policy, Blog, “America's credibility takes another blow,”

http://rothkopf.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/01/22/americas\_credibility\_takes\_another\_blow)

What was left for Americans to cling to? Our moral standing and our fundamental message to the world had been built on the ideas of respect for the rule of law and free markets. And now the world was left to wonder, if not America, then to whom do we turn? Should we embrace other models? Admittedly, the Chinese model, which might have had a shot at greater influence given the damage done to the U.S. brand, wasn't doing itself any favors with its attempt to deny its people both basic rights of all international citizens of the 21st Century ... which would also have the effect of making Chinese workers less competitive in the global economy. Hillary Clinton's speech attacking this was forceful and utterly appropriate. The Chinese whining in response to it was a sign of weakness and with some luck, the Obama administration will ignore it, shrug off the Chinese threats of consequences in other areas of the bilateral relationship, and continue to press home this essential point. But the argument on behalf of the American way was made immeasurably harder yesterday by the Supreme Court's devastating blow to several of the most fundamental precepts of American society -- equal rights, for example, or truly free speech (which is to say the right speak and be heard, without having to pay for it). By a 5-4 vote the justices of the court, with the Republican right in the majority, struck down limits on corporate campaign spending. Further building on the dangerous fiction in American law that corporations ought to have rights akin to those of individuals, the decision effectively unleashes the floodgates of corporate and union money into the political arena. This is certainly a more powerful threat to democracy than terrorism. It may well be a more powerful threat to democracy than was the fatally-flawed Soviet Union. Because to the extent to which politicians depend on donations to remain in power, they are inevitably influenced by those who have the most money. Not surprisingly, corporate entities, representing many people and often vast economic enterprises, have vastly more financial resources than individuals. Arguing, as American right wingers do, that campaign donations are form of free speech and thus cannot be constrained, ignores the reality that by equating money with free speech we effectively say that those with more money have more free speech, are entitled to greater influence within our society. The implications are stark. Should this decision go unreversed by subsequent action of the Congress, a future court or a future constitutional amendment, it tips the balance of power in the United States even farther away from average people and in the direction of elites. Since campaign donations do not flow from companies primarily for ideological reasons but rather to advance narrow self-interests, the business of U.S. political class will necessarily be driven by the politics of the business class. In a nutshell, yesterday's Supreme Court decision made it very likely that America will not be an effective leader in combating global warming or preserving global resources, it will not be able to effectively resolve the internal threats to its own society like a failing health care system, and it will pursue international policies that are driven less by the broad national interest and more by the agenda of companies that in fact, have increasingly little national identity. In this respect, this compromise of the third and most important pillar of U.S. international leadership-democracy, may be the most damaging of all. We can repair, as the Obama administration has attempted to do, the abuses of the Bush years. But if the court's action does in effect institutionalize Calvin Coolidge's old idea that "the business of America is business" it will be impossible to either effectively redress the flaws in the American economic model or for us to continue to argue that the nation that was the most important pioneer of representative democracy will continue to be able to play that role.

# cp

### 2NC Solvency – Business Will Invest

#### CP solves better --- leads to greater and more efficient investment.

Justin Muzinich and Eric Werker, 6/2/2008. Hedge Fund Employee; and assistant professor in the Business, Government & International Economy unit at Harvard Business School. “A Better Approach To Foreign Aid,” Hoover Institution @ Stanford, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/5767.

Frustration with u.s. foreign aid is widespread. The left complains that the United States does not provide enough money to developing countries. The right laments that aid is an inefficient use of resources. Both sides are to some degree correct. While the United States distributed $ 23 billion in 2006 — more than any other country — it was still very little for the billion people living on less than one dollar a day. And for every dollar given to sub-Saharan Africa, less than 44 cents reached the ground, partially because of inefficient spending and corruption.

Given the justifiable frustration with the current system, there have been surprisingly few attempts to fundamentally alter the architecture of foreign aid. Suggestions for change usually take the form of either advocating for more aid or calling for a different distribution of existing resources. Typifying the first of these approaches, Barack Obama recently suggested that the United States double its aid spending to $ 50 billion a year. Epitomizing the second is the Millennium Challenge Corporation, a government initiative touted by President Bush in his 2007 State of the Union address that distributes a portion of U.S. foreign aid based on the political and economic environment in the recipient country.

This focus on either growing the pie or distributing it differently takes as a premise that the current system of government-to-government aid is the best way forward. We suggest a different path. Rather than providing aid according to the wishes of foreign governments, the United States should provide incentives to encourage corporations and individuals to distribute development dollars.

In 2006, $380 billion of foreign direct investment flowed to developing countries and $ 220 billion in remittances was sent home by developing-country migrants. As figure 1 indicates, these numbers far surpassed the $104 billion in official foreign aid flows. Government policy can act to shape the direction of these dynamic flows of private development capital rather than solely relying on the old model of government-to-government transfers.

One simple way to provide incentives for private development finance is to give tax credits to American companies that invest in developing countries. We will argue that shifting money from government-to-government aid to tax credits would allow more total dollars to be distributed without increasing the cost to the taxpayer (addressing the critique of the left); would reduce money lost to mismanagement and corruption (addressing the critique of the right); and would more effectively foster the building of institutions necessary for sustainable economic development. We will outline how such a system can be put into operation, addressing the types of investments that should qualify for tax credits and which countries should be eligible to benefit from them.

#### Err neg --- corporate donations are hard to track --- there’s even more investment than we can know about.

Carol Adelman, Nov/Dec 2003. Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute. “The Privatization of Foreign Aid: Reassessing National Largesse,” Foreign Affairs, Lexis.

Corporate charitable giving abroad, once disallowed by U.S. courts, amounted to at least $2.8 billion in 2000 -- a figure that is surely low, since corporate giving is difficult to track. U.S. businesses give cash and noncash grants, encourage employee volunteer programs, and conduct cause-related marketing, such as that generated by the alliance between Starbucks and care. The most important force in this regard is the pharmaceutical industry, followed by telecommunications and computer firms. In fact, drug donations by pharmaceutical companies in 2002 were valued at $800 million -- almost twice the World Health Organization's budget for that year.

#### Tax credit stimulates foreign spending.

David Roodman and Scott Standley, January 2006. Research Fellow at the Center for Global Development; and Research Assistant. “Tax policies to promote private charitable giving in DAC countries,” www.cgdev.org/files/6303\_file\_WP\_82.pdf.

Tax policy can influence the level of private charitable donations in two ways: (1) through targeted tax incentives that lower the “price” of giving; and (2) via lower taxes overall, which leave citizens and corporations with more after-tax income to give to charity. Targeted tax incentives, usually income tax deductions or credits, increase giving through a “price effect,” where a dollar of forgone after-tax income funds more than a dollar of charity. For deductions, the “price effect” reduces the price of a gift by the marginal tax rate. Lower average taxes, meanwhile, increase private charitable giving through an “income effect,” where individuals and corporations have more after-tax income to spend on charitable donations.

#### a. “Its” is exclusive --- means that a private actor’s agreement cannot be part of the government’s economic engagement.

Douglas F. Brent 10**,** attorney, June 2, 2010, “Reply Brief on Threshold Issues of Cricket Communications, Inc.,” online: <http://psc.ky.gov/PSCSCF/2010%20cases/2010-00131/20100602_Crickets_Reply_Brief_on_Threshold_Issues.PDF>) **Italics and bold in the original**

AT&T also argues that Merger Commitment 7.4 only permits extension of “any given” interconnection agreement for a single three year term. AT&T Brief at 12. Specifically, AT&T asserts that because Cricket adopted the interconnection agreement between Sprint and AT&T, which itself was extended, Cricket is precluded from extending the term of its agreement with AT&T. Id

This argument relies upon an inaccurate assumption: that the agreement (contract) between Sprint and AT&T, and the agreement (contract) between Cricket and AT&T, are one and the same. In other words, to accept AT&T’s argument the Commission must conclude that two separate contracts, i.e. the interconnection between Sprint and AT&T in Kentucky (“Sprint Kentucky Agreement”) and the interconnection between Cricket and AT&T in Kentucky (“Cricket Kentucky Agreement”), are one and the same.

Upon this unstated (and inaccurate) premise AT&T asserts that “***the ICA*** was already extended”; id. at 14, and “***the ICA*** Cricket seeks to extend was extended by Sprint . . . .”; id. at 15, and, finally, “Cricket cannot extend ***the same ICA*** a second time . . . .” Id. (emphasis added in all). Note that in the quoted portions of the AT&T brief (and elsewhere) AT&T uses vague and imprecise language when referring to either the Sprint Kentucky Agreement, or the Cricket Kentucky Agreement, in hopes that the Commission will treat the two contracts as one and the same.

But it would be a mistake to do so. The contract governing AT&T’s duties and obligations with Sprint is a legally distinct and separate contract from that which governs AT&T’s duties with Cricket. The Sprint Kentucky Agreement was approved by the Commission in September of 2001 in Case Number 2000-00480. The Cricket Kentucky Agreement was approved by the Commission in September of 2008 in Case Number 2008-033 1.

AT&T ignores the fact that these are two separate and distinct contracts because it knows that the merger commitments apply to ***each*** agreement that an individual telecommunications carrier has with AT&T. Notably, Merger Commitment 7.4 states that “AT&T/BellSouth ILECs shall permit ***a requesting telecommunications carrier*** to extend ***its*** current interconnection agreement . . . . As written, the commitment allows any carrier to extend “***its***” agreement. Clearly, the use of the pronoun “its” in this context is possessive, such that the term “its” means - ***that*** particular carrier’s agreement with AT&T (and not any other carrier’s agreement). Thus, the merger commitment applies to each agreement that an individual carrier may have with AT&T. It necessarily follows then, that Cricket’s right to extend its agreement under Merger Commitment 7.4 is separate and distinct right from another carrier’s right to extend its agreement with AT&T (or whether such agreement has been extended).

#### Government economic engagement is distinct from private investment.

**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

#### b. The aff also severs resolved.

**Random House** Unabridged Dictionary **2006** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

[Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)](http://dictionary.reference.com/help/luna.html) - [Cite This Source](http://dictionary.reference.com/cite.html?qh=resolved&ia=luna) - [Share This](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved#sharethis#sharethis)

re·solve  premium  thinsp[speaker](https://secure.reference.com/premium/login.html?rd=2&u=http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)  /rɪˈzɒlv/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[ri-zolv] Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation verb, -solved, -solv·ing, noun

–verb (used with object)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | to come to a **definite** or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full. |

#### And should.

**Random House** Unabridged Dictionary **2006** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should)

[Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)](http://dictionary.reference.com/help/luna.html) - [Cite This Source](http://dictionary.reference.com/cite.html?qh=should&ia=luna) - [Share This](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should#sharethis#sharethis)

should  premium  thinsp[speaker](https://secure.reference.com/premium/login.html?rd=2&u=http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should)  /ʃʊd/ Pronunciation Key - Show Spelled Pronunciation[shoothinspd] Pronunciation Key - Show IPA Pronunciation

–auxiliary verb

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | Pt. of [shall.](http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=shall) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2. | (used to express condition): Were he to arrive, I should be pleased. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3. | must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency): You should not do that. |

### 2NC AT: PICs Bad

#### 4. Key to education --- distinction between private and government assistance is key.

Carol Adelman, Nov/Dec 2003. Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute. “The Privatization of Foreign Aid: Reassessing National Largesse,” Foreign Affairs, Lexis.

Gauging national generosity solely by government giving ignores new economic realities. Until a decade ago, most international resources flowing into developing countries came from governments. But in 1992, foreign direct investment and financial markets took off in emerging economies. For the first time, developing countries were attracting the kind of private capital that creates and sustains development. As financial flows went private, so did foreign assistance. While ODA stagnated, private giving skyrocketed. Europeans and the Japanese continue to give primarily through their governments, but the OECD's outdated measure fails to take into account how Americans now give abroad. In 2000, the last year for which comparative figures are available, U.S. ODA totaled $9.9 billion. This figure includes the budgets of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Peace Corps, contributions to the World Bank, and some State and Defense Department humanitarian assistance. Together, these programs account for just over one-sixth of total U.S. assistance -- public and private -- to developing countries. Private giving makes up more than 60 percent. The remainder -- $12.7 billion in 2000 -- is government aid that, although not within ODA guidelines, is still foreign assistance. This includes aid to Israel, Russia, the Central Asian Republics, and central and eastern European nations and support for the National Endowment for Democracy and international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund. Private foreign assistance still includes the proverbial food relief shipments and missionary health clinics in rural villages, but its scope has grown considerably in the last decade. Its components now range from $100 million vaccination campaigns to support for small indigenous foundations wherein community members allot grant money to local causes. Immigrants in Maryland can use the Internet to send groceries and medicines to needy relatives in El Salvador or Vietnam. Although the total value of these types of private aid is much bigger than ODA, data on such giving are much weaker. The international development community knows little about where these private funds are spent or how well they work. But in order to grasp the new environment for assistance abroad, and in order to adapt U.S. government assistance in the crucial third wave of foreign aid, it is critical first and foremost to understand this private dimension.

#### 2. Tons of literature about private versus government aid.

Carol Adelman, Nov/Dec 2003. Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute. “The Privatization of Foreign Aid: Reassessing National Largesse,” Foreign Affairs, Lexis.

What such criticism fails to take into account is the new landscape of foreign aid. Current measures of a nation's largesse only count funds doled out by the government, thus ignoring the primary way in which Americans help others abroad: through the private sector. In the last decade, U.S. government aid has been far outstripped by private donations -- from foundations, private voluntary organizations (PVOS), corporations, universities, religious groups, and individuals giving directly to needy family members abroad. There is no comprehensive measure of how much Americans donate overseas, but a conservative estimate, based on surveys and voluntary reporting, puts annual private giving around $35 billion. Even this low-ball figure is more than three and a half times the amount of official development assistance (ODA) given out in a year by the U.S. government. In the third wave of foreign aid, it is private money that is making the difference.

# china soi

**It’s zero-sum- global economic downturn magnifies the link**

**Rachman, 12** – (Gideon, “The End of the Win-Win World: Why China’s Rise Really is Bad for America- and Other Dark Forces at Work”, Chief Foreign Affairs Columnist, Financial Times, 1/24, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/24/the\_end\_of\_the\_win\_win\_world)//VP

In my book Zero-Sum Future, written in 2009**,** I attempted to predict how the global economic crisis would change international politics. As the rather bleak title implied, I argued that relations between the major powers were likely to become increasingly tense and conflict-ridden. In a worsening economic climate, it would be harder for the big economies to see their relationships as mutually beneficial -- as a win-win. Instead, they would increasingly judge their relationships in zero-sum terms. What was good for China would be seen as bad for America. What was good for Germany would be bad for Italy, Spain, and Greece. Now, as the paperback edition of my book comes out, the prediction is being borne out -- which is gratifying as an author, although slightly worrying as a member of the human race. The rise of zero-sum logic is the common thread, tying together seemingly disparate strands in international politics: the crisis inside the European Union, deteriorating U.S.-Chinese relations, and the deadlock in global governance.

# Indigenous Cultures

#### No offense, util is inevitable in their framework, they just warp it

Green, 02 – Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Harvard University (Joshua, November 2002 "The Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Truth About Morality And What To Do About It", 314)

Some people who talk of balancing rights may think there is an algorithm for deciding which rights take priority over which. If that’s what we mean by 302 “balancing rights,” then we are wise to shun this sort of talk. Attempting to solve moral problems using a complex deontological algorithm is dogmatism at its most esoteric, but dogmatism all the same. However, it’s likely that when some people talk about “balancing competing rights and obligations” they are already thinking like consequentialists in spite of their use of deontological language. Once again, what deontological language does best is express the thoughts of people struck by strong, emotional moral intuitions: “It doesn’t matter that you can save five people by pushing him to his death. To do this would be a violation of his rights!”19 That is why angry protesters say things like, “Animals Have Rights, Too!” rather than, “Animal Testing: The Harms Outweigh the Benefits!” Once again, rights talk captures the apparent clarity of the issue and absoluteness of the answer. But sometimes rights talk persists long after the sense of clarity and absoluteness has faded. One thinks, for example, of the thousands of children whose lives are saved by drugs that were tested on animals and the “rights” of those children. One finds oneself balancing the “rights” on both sides by asking how many rabbit lives one is willing to sacrifice in order to save one human life, and so on, and at the end of the day one’s underlying thought is as thoroughly consequentialist as can be, despite the deontological gloss. And what’s wrong with that? Nothing, except for the fact that the deontological gloss adds nothing and furthers the myth that there really are “rights,” etc. Best to drop it. When deontological talk gets sophisticated, the thought it represents is either dogmatic in an esoteric sort of way or covertly consequentialist.

# democracy

#### Democracy doesn't solve anything – Pakistan proves

**Peters, 5 –** Former Lieutenant Colonel, United States Army and Member, Board of Contributors, USA Today (Ralph, “When democracy fails,” USA Today, 1/10, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/2005-01-10-democracy-pakistan\_x.htm?csp=34)//SY

The problem is that it doesn't always work. As the vital Iraqi elections approach, there is more reason for sober optimism than for pre-emptive declarations of failure. More than 80% of the country's population is anxious to vote, with only foreign terrorists and an embittered minority of Sunni Arabs actively hostile to the balloting. But we need to think beyond the polls to understand how new democracies fail. Pakistan has been the greatest disappointment among the major states that tried democracy. It should have been a contender, having begun its nationhood with a legacy of British legal traditions, an educated political class and a vigorous press. Instead, Pakistan became a swamp of corruption, demagogy and hatred. Those who believe in democracy need to recognize an ugly truth: Military government remains Pakistan's final hope — and even that hope is a slight one. This is painful for us to accept. Well-intentioned Americans with no personal experience of the outrageous criminality that came to characterize every one of Pakistan's major political parties rebel against the notion that any military government can ever be good. Certainly, military regimes are despicable. Gen. Pervez Musharraf's government, albeit imperfect, is the sole exception in the world today.

#### Democracy promotion fails – multiple examples

**Kurlantzick, 11** (Joshua, “The Great Democracy Meltdown,” New Republic, 5/19, http://www.newrepublic.com/article/world/magazine/88632/failing-democracy-venezuela-arab-spring)//SY

If only things were so simple. The truth is that the Arab Spring is something of a smokescreen for what is taking place in the world as a whole. Around the globe, it is democratic meltdowns, not democratic revolutions, that are now the norm. (And even countries like Egypt and Tunisia, while certainly freer today than they were a year ago, are hardly guaranteed to replace their autocrats

with real democracies.

) In its most recent annual survey, the monitoring group Freedom House found that global freedom plummeted for the fifth year in a row, the longest continuous decline in nearly 40 years. It pointed out that most authoritarian nations had become even more repressive, that the decline in freedom was most pronounced among the “middle ground” of nations—countries that have begun democratizing but are not solid and stable democracies—and that the number of electoral democracies currently stands at its lowest point since 1995. Meanwhile, another recent survey, compiled by Germany’s Bertelsmann Foundation, spoke of a “gradual qualitative erosion” of democracy and concluded that the number of “highly defective democracies”—democracies so flawed that they are close to being failed states, autocracies, or both—had doubled between 2006 and 2010. The number of anecdotal examples is overwhelming. From Russia to Venezuela to Thailand to the Philippines, countries that once appeared to be developing into democracies today seem headed in the other direction. So many countries now remain stuck somewhere between authoritarianism and democracy, report Marc Plattner and Larry Diamond, co-editors of the Journal of Democracy, that “it no longer seems plausible to regard [this condition] simply as a temporary stage in the process of democratic transition.” Or as an activist from Burma—long one of the world’s most repressive countries—told me after moving to Thailand and watching that country’s democratic system disintegrate, “The other countries were supposed to change Burma. ... Now it seems like they are becoming like Burma.”