### 2ac deforestation

#### Agricultural biotech solves Amazon deforestation and chemical pesticides

McGloughlin 2K, (Martina McGloughlin is a professor @ UC Davis, Journal of Agrobiotechnology Management, Ten Reasons Why Biotechnology Will Be Important to the Developing World, http://www.agbioforum.org/v2n34/v2n34a04-mcgloughlin.htm)//KDUB

Biotechnology companies, national and international organizations, including the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), and numerous academics (e.g., Ruttan 1999) have continued to argue for the need to increase agricultural productivity so that sufficient food supplies exist to meet the demand forthcoming from a swelling world population. Despite Altieri and Rosset's (this issue) assertion, population density is hardly the issue. In the absence of significant productivity gains, or expansion of agriculture into marginal lands (e.g., forests), there will be not be sufficient food quantities to feed the projected levels of population. This simple reality is independent of income distribution or the location of the population. And hardly anyone, including Altieri and Rosset, will argue about the pragmatism of population projections. So in the absence of a good alternative—and in the face of a proven slow down in the productivity gains from the Green Revolution—biotechnology is by default our best, and maybe, only, way to increase production to meet future food needs. My objective in this article is to challenge misconceptions often put forward about biotechnology. Within this context I challenge many of Altieri and Rosset's arguments which are not generally supported by existing scientific evidence. I follow their numbering of arguments to facilitate point-by-point comparisons. The argument that hunger is a complex socioeconomic phenomenon, tied to lack of resources to grow or buy food, is correct. Equally correct is the argument that existing food supplies could adequately feed the world population. But how food and other resources (e.g., land, capital) are distributed among individuals, regions, or the various nations is determined by the complex interaction of market forces and institutions around the world. Unless our civic societies can come up quickly with an economic system that allocates resources more equitably and more efficiently than the present one, 50 years from now we will be faced with an even greater challenge. Calorie for calorie there will not be enough food to feed the projected population of about 9 billion. With the purchasing power and wealth concentrated in the developed countries, and over 90 percent of the projected population growth likely to occur in developing and emerging economies, it is not difficult to predict where food shortages will occur. Unless we are ready to accept starvation, or place parks and the Amazon Basin under the plough, there really is only one good alternative: discover ways to increase food production from existing resources. Bottom line, Altieri and Rosset may want to argue against Western-style capitalism and market institutions if they so choose to—but their argument is hardly relevant to the issue of biotechnology. The assertion that most innovations in biotechnology are not need driven is incorrect. Here are a few well-documented examples of biotechnology innovations targeting pressing needs: Development of a rice strain that has the potential to prevent blindness in millions of children whose diets are deficient in Vitamin A. Vitamin A is a highly essential micronutrient and widespread dietary deficiency of this vitamin in rice-eating Asian countries has tragic undertones: five million children in South East Asia develop an eye disease called xerophthalmia every year, and 250,000 of them eventually become blind. Improved vitamin A nutrition would alleviate this serious health problem and, according to United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), could also prevent up to two million infant deaths because vitamin A deficiency predisposes them to diarrhea diseases and measles. A research team led by Ingo Potrykus of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, in collaboration with scientists from the University of Freiburg in Germany have succeeded in producing the precursor to this vitamin, beta-carotene in rice (Potrykus, 1999). Development of rice strains with increased iron content and lowered anti-nutrients. Approximately 30% of the world's population suffers from iron deficiency, especially in less developed countries. Anemia characterized by low hemoglobin is the most widely recognized symptom of iron deficiency, but there are other serious problems such as impaired learning ability in children, increased susceptibility to infection and reduced work capacity. An adequate supply of iron is crucial during the first two years of life because of rapid body growth. Yet the body can use less than 20% of ingested iron. Most iron found in the soil is in the ferric state, an ionic form that can not be utilized until it is converted to the ferrous form. Plants can convert ferric to ferrous iron, however, humans lack the enzyme needed for such conversion. One approach to treating iron deficiency in people is to create plants that contain more iron. The gene for ferritin, an iron-rich soybean storage protein, has been introduced into rice under the control of an endosperm-specific promoter. Grains from transgenic rice plants contained three times more iron than normal rice. The bioavailability of the mineral has been increased also through biotechnology. Seeds store the phosphorous needed for germination in the form of phytate, which is an anti-nutrient because it strongly chelates iron, calcium, zinc and other divalent mineral ions, making them unavailable for uptake. The same Swiss group that created beta-carotene rice has developed a series of transgenic rice lines designed to deal with this problem by introducing a gene that encodes phytase, an enzyme that breaks down phytate. In addition, sulfur containing proteins enhance iron reabsorption so to further promote the reabsorption of iron, a gene for a cystein-rich metallothionein-like protein has also been engineered into rice by Potrykus (Goto et al., 1999; Potrykus, 1999). Improvements to hybrid rice by introducing the gene of interest directly into maintainer or restorer lines. Early results at transforming rice with the nodulin gene indicate that this staple can be colonized by bacteria that fix nitrogen from the atmosphere. This would improve productivity in the absence of synthetic fertilizers, which are typically unavailable to resource-poor farmers in less developing countries (LDCs) (Dowling, 1998). Edible vaccines, delivered in locally grown crops, could do more to eliminate disease than the Red Cross, missionaries, and United Nations (UN) task forces combined, at a fraction of the cost (Arakawa et al., 1998; Tacket et al., 1998; Hag et al., 1995). All these and numerous other technologies are being advanced and directed towards resource-poor farmers and locations. Biotechnology is being advanced and directed towards resource-poor farmers and locations. Altieri and Rosset ignore the substantial technology pipeline and the efforts of thousands of scientists across the world to safeguard food safety and improve human nutrition and quality of life. They prefer to focus exclusively on the earliest biotechnology products that were broadly commercialized Bt (Bacillus thuringiensis) and Roundup Ready technologies. Equally absent in Altieri and Rosset's arguments is an elementary understanding of market-economics and innovation dynamics. In market-driven economies, need and profit are closely connected. Companies, large and small, profit only when they offer products and services that address needs and induce willingness to pay. Bt and Roundup Ready technologies have been adopted faster than any other agricultural innovation on record (Kalaitzandonakes, 1999). These adoption levels have taken place despite abundant supplies of conventional seed with which farmers can exercise their "age-old right to save and replant." The reason for the quick adoption, of course, is that farmers profit from the use of such technologies through reduced chemical sprays, improved yields, labor savings, shifts to reduced tillage systems and other benefits (Maagd, et al. 1999; Abelson & Hines, 1999). Over half of all economic benefits generated by these technologies have gone to farmers, more than what has been appropriated by biotechnology and seed companies combined (Traxler & Falk-Zepeda, 1999; Falk-Zepeda, Traxler, & Nelson, in press). The argument that the integration of chemical pesticides and seed-use has led to lower returns for farmers is incorrect. To support their argument Altieri and Rosset reference an obscure manuscript while they ignore several comprehensive studies that point to increased net returns and reduced chemical loads (Rice, 1999; Klotz-Ingram et al., 1999; Falk-Zepeda, Traxler, & Nelson, in press; Gianessi, 1999; Abelson & Hines, 1999; USDA/ERS, 1999a, 1999b). Because of their improved production economics, the introduction of Bt- and herbicide resistant crops have forced tremendous competition in herbicide and insecticide markets. Prices of many herbicides and insecticides have been slashed by over 50% in these markets in order to compete with the improved economics of biotechnology seed/chemical solutions. Such price reductions have led to significant discounting of weed and insect control programs and have benefited even farmers who have not adopted biotechnology crops. Because of lower prices and reduced volumes synthetic pesticides from the use of biotechnology crops, the agrichemicals sector has experienced significant financial losses over the last two-three years. There is ample evidence to suggest that Altieri and Rosset's assertion that "the integration of seed and chemical industries appears destined to (deliver) lower returns" is incorrect. What is surprising, however, is the lack of rudimentary understanding of farm economics and decision making. Why would thousands of farmers adopt technologies that lead them to losses year after year while conventional seed and pesticide solutions are readily available and cheaper than before the introduction of biotechnology crops?

### 2AC EE C/I

#### Counter interpretation economic engagement is influencing the political behavior of a state through economic means

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

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include: DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa MILITARY CONTACTS Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice versa Arms transfers Military aid and cooperation Military exchange and training programs Confidence and security- measures Intelligence sharing ECONOMIC CONTACTS Trade agreements and promotion Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants CULTURAL CONTACTS Cultural treaties Inauguration of travel and tourism links Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25) Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28) Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement. This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Plan is economic means – promotes trade and investment

State Department (“Science and Technology Cooperation”, http://www.state.gov/e/oes/stc/)

Thirty U.S. S&T Agreements worldwide establish bilateral frameworks to facilitate the exchange of scientific results, provide for protection and allocation of intellectual property rights and benefit sharing, facilitate access for researchers, address taxation issues, and respond to the complex set of issues associated with economic development, domestic security and regional stability. S&T cooperation supports the establishment of science-based industries, encourages investment in national science infrastructure, education and the application of scientific standards, promotes international trade and dialogue on issues of direct import to global security, such as protection of the environment and management of natural resources. S&T collaboration assists USG agencies to establish partnerships with counterpart institutions abroad. These relationships enable them to fulfill their individual responsibilities by providing all parties with access to new resources, materials, information, and research. High priority areas include such areas as agricultural and industrial biotechnology research (including research on microorganisms, plant and animal genetic materials, both aquatic and terrestrial), health sciences, marine research, natural products chemistry, environment and energy research.

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations is infinitely regressive – they’ll always move the goal post

**CICEP, 13** (The Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness and Economic Prosperity (CICEP) is a working group of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). Through regular workshops and meetings, the Commission works on building tools, resources, and standards of practice that universities can use to make the most effective contributions to innovation and economic growth, and to communicate their value in these areas. Members of CICEP include representatives from APLU institution's offices of: academic affairs; research and graduate administration; public and governmental affairs; business and engineering departments; outreach and economic development; technology transfer; and entrepreneurship programs; <http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=4431>) KD

I just javaed the date still camp ev

A university conducts its economic development work in a geographic footprint. Sometimes we refer to this geographic footprint as community or region, or we modify it with words like local, state, national, or international to help clarify the geographic area being served. This document will use the word ‘community’ to define the geographic area being served, recognizing that the service area specified for or assumed by the institution (i.e., the city, county, region, state(s), nation, or world) varies by institution and by the specific program or economic development activity. Similarly, the term “economic engagement” has various interpretations across the higher education community. Its use in this tool is meant to help guide campus conversations, not prescribe a particular view of how an institution defines its contributions to its community.

### 2AC FW

#### The role of the ballot is to decrease existential risk

Anissimov 4 — Michael Anissimov, science and technology writer focusing specializing in futurism, founding director of the Immortality Institute—a non-profit organization focused on the abolition of nonconsensual death, member of the World Transhumanist Association, associate of the Institute for Accelerating Change, member of the Center for Responsible Nanotechnology's Global Task Force, 2004 (“Immortalist Utilitarianism,” *Accelerating Future*, May, Available Online at http://www.acceleratingfuture.com/michael/works/immethics.htm, Accessed 09-09-2011)

The value of contributing to Aubrey de Grey's anti-aging project assumes that there continues to be a world around for people's lives to be extended. But if we nuke ourselves out of existence in 2010, then what? The probability of human extinction is the gateway function through which all efforts toward life extension must inevitably pass, including cryonics, biogerontology, and nanomedicine. They are all useless if we blow ourselves up. At this point one observes that there are many working toward life extension, but few focused on explicitly preventing apocalyptic global disaster. Such huge risks sound like fairy tales rather than real threats - because we have never seen them happen before, we underestimate the probability of their occurrence. An existential disaster has not yet occurred on this planet. The risks worth worrying about are not pollution, asteroid impact, or alien invasion - the ones you see dramaticized in movies - these events are all either very gradual or improbable. Oxford philosopher Nick Bostrom warns us of existential risks, "...where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential." Bostrom continues, "Existential risks are distinct from global endurable risks. Examples of the latter kind include: threats to the biodiversity of Earth’s ecosphere, moderate global warming, global economic recessions (even major ones), and possibly stifling cultural or religious eras such as the “dark ages”, even if they encompass the whole global community, provided they are transitory." The four main risks we know about so far are summarized by the following, in ascending order of probability and severity over the course of the next 30 years: Biological. More specifically, a genetically engineered supervirus. Bostrom writes, "With the fabulous advances in genetic technology currently taking place, it may become possible for a tyrant, terrorist, or lunatic to create a doomsday virus, an organism that combines long latency with high virulence and mortality." There are several factors necessary for a virus to be a risk. The first is the presence of biologists with the knowledge necessary to genetically engineer a new virus of any sort. The second is access to the expensive machinery required for synthesis. Third is specific knowledge of viral genetic engineering. Fourth is a weaponization strategy and a delivery mechanism. These are nontrivial barriers, but are sure to fall in due time. Nuclear. A traditional nuclear war could still break out, although it would be unlikely to result in our ultimate demise, it could drastically curtail our potential and set us back thousands or even millions of years technologically and ethically. Bostrom mentions that the US and Russia still have huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Miniaturization technology, along with improve manufacturing technologies, could make it possible to mass produce nuclear weapons for easy delivery should an escalating arms race lead to that. As rogue nations begin to acquire the technology for nuclear strikes, powerful nations will feel increasingly edgy. Nanotechnological. The Transhumanist FAQ reads, "Molecular nanotechnology is an anticipated manufacturing technology that will make it possible to build complex three-dimensional structures to atomic specification using chemical reactions directed by nonbiological machinery." Because nanomachines could be self-replicating or at least auto-productive, the technology and its products could proliferate very rapidly. Because nanotechnology could theoretically be used to create any chemically stable object, the potential for abuse is massive. Nanotechnology could be used to manufacture large weapons or other oppressive apparatus in mere hours; the only limitations are raw materials, management, software, and heat dissipation. Human-indifferent superintelligence. In the near future, humanity will gain the technological capability to create forms of intelligence radically better than our own. Artificial Intelligences will be implemented on superfast transistors instead of slow biological neurons, and eventually gain the intellectual ability to fabricate new hardware and reprogram their source code. Such an intelligence could engage in recursive self-improvement - improving its own intelligence, then directing that intelligence towards further intelligence improvements. Such a process could lead far beyond our current level of intelligence in a relatively short time. We would be helpless to fight against such an intelligence if it did not value our continuation. So let's say I have another million dollars to spend. My last million dollars went to Aubrey de Grey's Methuselah Mouse Prize, for a grand total of billions of expected utiles. But wait - I forgot to factor in the probability that humanity will be destroyed before the positive effects of life extension are borne out. Even if my estimated probability of existential risk is very low, it is still rational to focus on addressing the risk because my whole enterprise would be ruined if disaster is not averted. If we value the prospect of all the future lives that could be enjoyed if we pass beyond the threshold of risk - possibly quadrillions or more, if we expand into the cosmos, then we will deeply value minimizing the probability of existential risk above all other considerations. If my million dollars can avert the chance of existential disaster by, say, 0.0001%, then the expected utility of this action relative to the expected utility of life extension advocacy is shocking. That's 0.0001% of the utility of quadrillions or more humans, transhumans, and posthumans leading fulfilling lives. I'll spare the reader from working out the math and utility curves - I'm sure you can imagine them. So, why is it that people tend to devote more resources to life extension than risk prevention? The follow includes my guesses, feel free to tell me if you disagree: They estimate the probability of any risk occurring to be extremely low. They estimate their potential influence over the likelihood of risk to be extremely low. They feel that positive PR towards any futurist goals will eventually result in higher awareness of risk. They fear social ostracization if they focus on "Doomsday scenarios" rather than traditional extension. Those are my guesses. Immortalists with objections are free to send in their arguments, and I will post them here if they are especially strong. As far as I can tell however, the predicted utility of lowering the likelihood of existential risk outclasses any life extension effort I can imagine. I cannot emphasize this enough. If a existential disaster occurs, not only will the possibilities of extreme life extension, sophisticated nanotechnology, intelligence enhancement, and space expansion never bear fruit, but everyone will be dead, never to come back. Because the we have so much to lose, existential risk is worth worrying about even if our estimated probability of occurrence is extremely low. It is not the funding of life extension research projects that immortalists should be focusing on. It should be projects that decrease the risk of existential risk. By default, once the probability of existential risk is minimized, life extension technologies can be developed and applied. There are powerful economic and social imperatives in that direction, but few towards risk management. Existential risk creates a "loafer problem" — we always expect someone else to take care of it. I assert that this is a dangerous strategy and should be discarded in favor of making prevention of such risks a central focus.

#### Only pragmatic philosophy can evade the logical harms of the K and still take action against great atrocities

Rorty 2 (Richard, U Minn, http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/rorty.htm)JFS

The most powerful reason for thinking that no such culture is possible is that seeing all criteria as no more than temporary resting-places, constructed by a community to facilitate its inquiries, seems morally humiliating. **Suppose** that Socrates was wrong, that **we have not** once **seen the Truth**, and so will not, intuitively, recognise it when we see it again. This means that when the secret police come, **when the torturers violate the innocent, there is nothing to be said** to them of the form “**There is something within you which you are betraying.** Though you embody the practices of a totalitarian society which will endure forever, there is something beyond those practices which condemns you.” This thought is hard to live with, as is Sartre’s remark: Tomorrow, after my death, **certain people may decide to establish fascism**, and the others may be cowardly or miserable enough to let them get away with it. **At that moment, fascism will be the truth of man**, and so much the worse for us. In reality, **things will be as much as man has decided they are**. This hard saying brings out what ties Dewey and Foucault, James and Nietzsche, together- the sense that **there is nothing** deep down **inside us except what we have put there ourselves**, no criterion that we have not created in the course of creating a practice, no standard of rationality that is not an appeal to such a criterion, no rigorous argumentation that is not obedience to our own conventions. **A post-philosophical culture**, then, **would be one in which men and women felt** themselves **alone**, merely **finite, with no links to something Beyond.** On **the pragmatist’s** account, **position was** only a halfway stage in the development of such a culture-the **progress toward**, as Sartre puts it, **doing without God**. For positivism preserved a god in its notion of Science (and in its notion of “scientific philosophy”), the notion of a portion of culture where we touched something not ourselves, where we found Truth naked, relative to no description. **The culture of positivism** thus **produced** endless **swings** of the pendulum **between** the view that **“values are** merely ‘**relative’** (or ‘emotive,’ or ‘subjective’)” **and** the view that **bringing the “scientific method”** to bear on questions of political and moral choice **was the solution to all our problems. Pragmatism**, by contrast, **does not erect Science as an idol** to fill the place once held by God. **It views science as one genre** of literature-or, put the other way around, literature and the arts as inquiries, on the same footing as scientific inquiries. Thus **it sees ethics as neither more “relative”** or “subjective” than scientific theory, **nor as needing to be made “scientific.”** Physics is a way of trying to cope with various bits of the universe; ethics is a matter of trying to cope with other bits. Mathematics helps physics do its job; literature and the arts help ethics do its. Some of these inquiries come up with propositions, some with narratives, some with paintings. The question of what propositions to assert, which pictures to look at, what narratives to listen to and comment on and retell, are all questions about what will help us get what we want (or about what we should want). No. The question of whether **the pragmatist view of truth**-that it is t a profitable topic-**is** itself true is thus **a question about whether a post-Philosophical culture is a good thing** to try for. **It is not a question about what** the word **“true” means, nor** about **the requirements of** an adequate philosophy of **language**, nor about whether the world “exists independently of our minds,” **nor about** whether the intuitions of **our culture** are captured in the pragmatists’ slogans. **There is no way in which the issue between the pragmatist and his opponent can be** tightened up and **resolved** according to criteria agreed to by both sides. **This is one of those issues which puts everything up for grabs at once** -where there is no point in trying to find agreement about “the data” or about what would count as deciding the question. But **the messiness of the issue is not a reason for setting it aside.** The issue between religion and secularism was no less messy, but it was important that it got decided as it did.

### 2AC narcissism

#### The K cannot be divorced from the narcissism of man – causes us to repeat the tragedy of narcissus

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 14, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

One such vital truth that has long been known is the idea of heroism; but in “normal” scholarly times we never thought of making much out of it, of parading it, or of using it as a central concept. Yet the popular mind always knew how important it was: as William James—who covered just about everything— remarked at the turn of the century: “mankind’s common instinct for reality … has always held the world to be essentially a theatre for heroism.”1 Not only the popular mind knew, but philosophers of all ages, and in our culture especially Emerson and Nietzsche—which is why we still thrill to them: we like to be reminded that our central calling, our main task on this planet, is the heroic.\* One way of looking at the whole development of social science since Marx and of psychology since Freud is that it represents a massive detailing and clarification of the problem of human heroism. This perspective sets the tone for the seriousness of our discussion: we now have the scientific underpinning for a true understanding of the nature of heroism and its place in human life. If “mankind’s common instinct for reality” is right, we have achieved the remarkable feat of exposing that reality in a scientific way. One of the key concepts for understanding man’s urge to heroism is the idea of “narcissism.” As Erich Fromm has so well reminded us, this idea is one of Freud’s great and lasting contributions. Freud discovered that each of us repeats the tragedy of the mythical Greek Narcissus: we are hopelessly absorbed with ourselves. If we care about anyone it is usually ourselves first of all. As Aristotle somewhere put it: luck is when the guy next to you gets hit with the arrow. Twenty-five hundred years of history have not changed man’s basic narcissism; most of the time, for most of us, this is still a workable definition of luck. It is one of the meaner aspects of narcissism that we feel that practically everyone is expendable except ourselves. We should feel prepared, as Emerson once put it, to recreate the whole world out of ourselves even if no one else existed. The thought frightens us; we don’t know how we could do it without others—yet at bottom the basic resource is there: we could suffice alone if need be, if we could trust ourselves as Emerson wanted. And if we don’t feel this trust emotionally, still most of us would struggle to survive with all our powers, no matter how many around us died. Our organism is ready to fill the world all alone, even if our mind shrinks at the thought. This narcissism is what keeps men marching into point-blank fire in wars: at heart one doesn’t feel that he will die, he only feels sorry for the man next to him. Freud’s explanation for this was that the unconscious does not know death or time: in man’s physiochemical, inner organic recesses he feels immortal. None of these observations implies human guile. Man does not seem able to “help” his selfishness; it seems to come from his animal nature. Through countless ages of evolution the organism has had to protect its own integrity; it had its own physiochemical identity and was dedicated to preserving it. This is one of the main problems in organ transplants: the organism protects itself against foreign matter, even if it is a new heart that would keep it alive. The protoplasm itself harbors its own, nurtures itself against the world, against invasions of its integrity. It seems to enjoy its own pulsations, expanding into the world and ingesting pieces of it. If you took a blind and dumb organism and gave it self-consciousness and a name, if you made it stand out of nature and know consciously that it was unique, then you would have narcissism. In man, physiochemical identity and the sense of power and activity have become conscious. In man a working level of narcissism is inseparable from self-esteem, from a basic sense of self-worth. We have learned, mostly from Alfred Adler, that what man needs most is to feel secure in his self-esteem. But man is not just a blind glob of idling protoplasm, but a creature with a name who lives in a world of symbols and dreams and not merely matter. His sense of self-worth is constituted symbolically, his cherished narcissism feeds on symbols, on an abstract idea of his own worth, an idea composed of sounds, words, and images, in the air, in the mind, on paper. And this means that man’s natural yearning for organismic activity, the pleasures of incorporation and expansion, can be fed limitlessly in the domain of symbols and so into immortality. The single organism can expand into dimensions of worlds and times without moving a physical limb; it can take eternity into itself even as it gaspingly dies.

#### This narcissism leads to oppressive systems such as Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia and contemporary capitalism

Becker 73 (Earnest, The Denial of Death, pg 15, Ph.D ins Cultural Anthropology, was a professor the University of California at Berkely, San Franciso State College, and Simon Fraser University, and founder of The Ernest Becker Foundation; Kristof)

If we were to peel away this massive disguise, the blocks of repression over human techniques for earning glory, we would arrive at the potentially most liberating question of all, the main problem of human life: How empirically true is the cultural hero system that sustains and drives men? We mentioned the meaner side of man’s urge to cosmic heroism, but there is obviously the noble side as well. Man will lay down his life for his country, his society, his family. He will choose to throw himself on a grenade to save his comrades; he is capable of the highest generosity and self-sacrifice. But he has to feel and believe that what he is doing is truly heroic, timeless, and supremely meaningful. The crisis of modern society is precisely that the youth no longer feel heroic in the plan for action that their culture has set up. They don’t believe it is empirically true to the problems of their lives and times. We are living a crisis of heroism that reaches into every aspect of our social life: the dropouts of university heroism, of business and career heroism, of political-action heroism; the rise of anti-heroes, those who would be heroic each in his own way or like Charles Manson with his special “family”, those whose tormented heroics lash out at the system that itself has ceased to represent agreed heroism. The great perplexity of our time, the churning of our age, is that the youth have sensed—for better or for worse—a great social-historical truth: that just as there are useless self-sacrifices in unjust wars, so too is there an ignoble heroics of whole societies: it can be the viciously destructive heroics of Hitler’s Germany or the plain debasing and silly heroics of the acquisition and display of consumer goods, the piling up of money and privileges that now characterizes whole ways of life, capitalist and Soviet.

### Neolib

#### Policy focus is key to resisting neoliberalism—discursive theorizing actively contributes to ongoing neoliberalism

Rosamond, Professor of Political Science, University of Copenhagen 06 (Ben, “Disciplinarity and the Political Economy of Transformation: The Epistemological Politics of Globalization Studies”, Review of International Political Economy 13:3, August 2006, JSTOR)//AS

What if scholars doubt the authenticity of the 'globalization hypothesis'? The issue then becomes one of whether our present disciplinary arrange ments allow for effective refutation and critical rebuttal of truth claims that are made around the idea of globalization.Arguments about the need to re-think how we acquire knowledge about or in the context of globaliza tion tend to presuppose a climate of transformation rather than stasis. The assumption of most doubters seems to be that solid, rigorous work using the established tools, axioms and norms of political science, economics and economic history (to name but three fields where such work is especially evident) is capable of showing clearly how claims about globalization as either a structural condition or a set of effects amount to mythology.or hyperbole. Sociologists of knowledge and disciplinary historians often re mind us of how the evolution of (a) forms of academic knowledge and (b) the evolution of modernity are co-constitutive. It follows, therefore, that an incautious rush to formulate a 'global(ization) studies' that presumes a priori that its object is globalized may fall into the trap of contributing to the constitution of that globalized reality. Put simply, the very practice of describing a world without borders where power shifts markedly from the public to the private domains, where the authority and autonomy of the state is reduced and where policy possibilities are heavily circumscribed is likely to accelerate the achievement of very reality. This is of particular importance to those scholars of globalization who choose to study this object out of critical motivations and a desire to contribute to the initia tion of a more just, equitable, democratic and redistributive world order than presently prevails (Rosow, 2003). It could be argued that the most effective strategy for retaining such possibilities might, paradoxically, be to do in what much of the political science of globalization already does: engage with the common sense understandings of economic or hyper globalization and produce results that qualify or refute the claims that are routinely made (Rosamond, 2003). Consequently, those who feel uncomfortable discipline-based discus sions of globalization need to find more powerful arguments in favour of overturning epistemological certainty

#### Perm do both if the alt can solve the squo the plan won’t derail it

#### Perm do the plan and all non mutually exclusive parts of the alt

#### Their view of neoliberalism is academically bankrupt

Clarke,Professor of Social Policy (Social Policy and Criminology) in the Faculty of Social Sciences at The Open University 04 (John, “Dissolving the public realm?: The logics and limits of neo-liberalism”, Journal of Social Policy 33:1, 2004, <http://oro.open.ac.uk/4377/1/download.pdf>)//AS

Globalisation has been identiﬁed as a major driving force – an inexorable economic transition responsible for undermining nation states, rendering public spending indefensible, dismantling welfare states and over-riding democratic political control. This apocalyptic view has a number of problems, only some of which I want to touch on here (there is a growing literature debating the subject, see, inter alia, Deacon,1997; Gough,2000; Sykes, Palier and Prior,2001, and Yeates, 2001 in social policy). First, the apocalyptic or ‘strong’ (Yeates, 2001) view of globalisation overstates the extent and scale of change in the public realm in many of the advanced capitalist societies of the West. Those researching welfare systems have emphasised the (surprising) resilience of public spending and provisioning, and have suggested the need to contrast globalisation with attention to national and local political and social institutions (Esping-Andersen, 1997; Huber and Stephens, 2001; Kuhnle, 2000; Taylor-Gooby, 2001a). Nevertheless, there is a danger of forcing a binary choice here: either transformative globalisation or the persistence of the nation-state/welfare state. Obscured by such binary choices are a range of destabilising processes of apparently settled institute+ions, formations, borders and boundaries – including the ways in which nations, states and welfare are being aligned (these arguments are developed in Clarke, forthcoming, a and b). A different view of globalisation would foreground questions of social and spatial unevenness – rather than treating it as a uniﬁed, unilinear and monological process (see, inter alia, Brah, Hickman and MacanGhaill, 1999; Gupta, 1997, 2000; Ong, 1999). It would avoid the profoundly reductive form of economic determinism of apocalyptic views of globalisation – celebrating, or bewailing, the irresistible capacity of global capital to conform the world to its desires. I think there are political and theoretical reasons to resist such determinism, not least because it marks the coincidence of neo-liberal fantasies and left-wing nightmares in overstating the coherence, power and achievements of capital (see the discussions by Gibson-Graham, 1996; and Morris, 1998). Instead, I want to insist on treating contradiction and contestation as integral elements of these processes. I want to argue that there are contradictions within and between the processes of globalisation, manifested in unevennesses, disturbances and encounters with old and new resistances and refusals. It seems to me that such starting points might allow us to think of globalisation in a more differentiated, more uneven, more contradictory and more unﬁnished way than the view from an apocalyptic political economy. It might also allow us to think of neo-liberal globalisation as one strategy that aims to conform the world to its grand plan, rather than being the whole (and only) globalisation (Massey, 1999). The attempt to create the conditions for US-dominated formations of transnational capital to be mobile, ﬂexible and30 john clarke proﬁtable is certainly the dominant tendency of contemporary globalisation, but it is by no means the only. There are other transnational relations, processes and realignments – from ‘global care chains’ (Hochschild, 2001), through regional and inter-regional migrations (Castles and Davidson, 2000) and new forms of international solidarity and political action (most obviously the antiglobalisation movement). It is also signiﬁcant that neo-liberal globalisation looks more dominant and compelling from the point of view of the Anglophone West (especially the US/UK axis). From elsewhere, it more obviously resembles one way of constructing capitalist modernity. For example, AihwaOng has argued that the attempt to construct a ‘Confucian capitalism’ involves China and other Asian states ‘in the process of constructing alternative modernities based on new relations with their populations, with capital and with the West’ (1999:35).

### 2ac cir – notre dame

#### The plan’s popular

**DeWeerd, 1** – writer in seatte, cites Nick Smith, a republican rep from MI, (Sarah, “Embargoing Science: US Policy toward Cuba and Scientific Collaboration” 2001)ahayes

These relatively streamlined procedures have been in place since 1999, when the Clinton administration announced a new policy to expand people-to-people contacts-such as scientific exchanges-between the United States and Cuba. Scientific collaboration between the two countries continues to enjoy broad bipartisan support in Washington. Rep. Nick Smith (R-MI), who visited Cuba in April as part of a delegation organized by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, says that scientific collaboration is "one area that's reasonable" for contact with Cuba. "There are some things we can learn from them, and certainly many things they can learn from the scientific effort in this country."

#### Won’t pass

Bolton 10/29 (Alex Bolton - 10/29/13; “Ted Cruz looms large over comprehensive immigration reform”; The Hill; <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/188422-ted-cruz-looms-large-over-comprehensive-immigration-reform>; KDUB)

Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) has shaped the view of Republican leaders on immigration reform, and his sway with grassroots conservatives will make passing comprehensive legislation significantly more difficult.¶ Cruz scored a victory in the battle for the hearts and minds of his party over the weekend when Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) backed away from the Senate’s overhaul of immigration laws.¶ GOP leaders, after President Obama’s reelection last year, sounded more open to moving broad legislation on immigration, but their interest in doing so has waned as Cruz’s power has grown.¶ “There are going to be a lot of Republicans who don’t want to be on the other side of Ted Cruz,” said Rosemary Jenks, director of government relations at NumbersUSA, a group that advocates for reduced immigration flows.¶ Cruz told Rubio and other Senate Republican colleagues earlier this year that a bill including a pathway to citizenship for an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants could not pass Congress and suggested removing the controversial provision.¶ Cruz has yet to decide what strategy he will pursue in the weeks ahead as Obama and Democrats try to ramp up pressure on the House to pass immigration reform.¶ “He’ll definitely be engaged,” a Senate GOP aide said.¶ Cruz’s influential stands against funding the Affordable Care Act and passing comprehensive immigration reform have made him a hero among conservative activists in Iowa, which hosts the first contest in the GOP presidential primary election.¶ “If the caucuses were held today, he would lap the field,” Steve Deace, a nationally syndicated radio host based in Iowa, told The Hill last week.¶ Deace said “Rubio is a nonstarter here” because of his partnership with Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.) to pass the Senate immigration bill.¶ Cruz spent the weekend in Iowa with Rep. Steve King (R-Iowa), the most outspoken critic of comprehensive immigration reform in the lower chamber. It’s a potentially fruitful relationship for both lawmakers.¶ Cruz, who has become an influential voice among House Tea Party conservatives, can help cement opposition to merging the broad Senate package with one of the narrower House bills that could pass there this fall. ¶ King does not want any immigration reform proposal to pass, fearing that one of the House piecemeal bills could later be used as vehicle to move the 1,200-page Senate bill.¶ King’s support could be crucial in the 2016 Iowa caucuses if Cruz decides to launch a bid for the White House.¶ Cruz pointedly clashed with Schumer, the chief Democratic sponsor of the Senate bill, and McCain on the need to pass a comprehensive bill in April.¶ “Any attempt to say in the House that you will not have a path to citizenship, will be a nonstarter,” Schumer warned reporters at a breakfast sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor. “I say that unequivocally. It will not pass the Senate.” ¶ “There’s no way of getting this job done without giving people a path to citizenship,” McCain told reporters.¶ At a Judiciary Committee hearing a few days earlier, Cruz warned a comprehensive bill could not pass¶ “I think if instead the bill includes elements that are deeply divisive — and I would note that I don’t think there is any issue in this entire debate that is more divisive than a path to citizenship for those who are here illegally — in my view, any bill that insists upon that jeopardizes the likelihood of passing any immigration reform bill,” Cruz said.¶ Conservative strategists say Cruz’s aggressive push to defund ObamaCare, which resulted in a 16-day government shutdown, has slammed the door on the Senate bill.¶ “The defund fight has affirmatively closed door on passing amnesty because it soured the relationship between the White House and Republicans,” a conservative strategist said.¶ Cruz’s popularity among Tea Party voters soared during the shutdown. A recent Pew poll showed he had a 74 percent favorable rating among Tea Party Republicans.¶ Conservatives warn that if GOP leaders attempt to negotiate a comprehensive reform bill with Senate Democrats, they would risk another intraparty blowup.¶ “They have no credibility to push through something so unpopular with the base,” the conservative strategist said.¶ Rubio, a likely 2016 presidential candidate, tempered his support for the Senate bill over the weekend.¶ “An ‘all or nothing’ strategy on immigration reform would result in nothing,” Alex Conant, Rubio’s spokesman, said Monday.¶ “What is keeping us from progress on a series of immigration issues on which there is strong consensus is the fear that a conference committee on a limited bill will be used to negotiate a comprehensive one. We should take that option off the table so that we can begin to move on the things we agree on,” he added.

#### Forcing controversial fights key to Obama’s agenda- try or die for the link turn

Dickerson 13 (John, Slate, Go for the Throat!, 1/18 www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. That's the old way. He has abandoned that. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

#### Piecemeal passage is more likely

Foley 10/29 (Elise Foley, reporter; Huffington Post; 10/29/2013; “Conservatives Pushing Immigration Reform Say Piecemeal Approach Gains Steam”; <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/29/immigration-reform-conservatives_n_4175758.html>; KDUB)

House Republican leaders have rejected a comprehensive approach, saying they will instead vote on individual pieces of legislation. Though some immigration-related bills have been approved by House committees, they haven't gone to the floor for a vote.¶ Other bills are being drafted, but haven't been released, such as one led by Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) and Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) to give legal status to undocumented young people. Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) reportedly plans to introduce a bill that would allow undocumented immigrants to stay in the U.S. temporarily while they seek long-term solutions. It's unclear if such a measure could win support, given Republican opposition to so-called "amnesty" and Democratic reluctance to support something without a path to citizenship.¶ House Democrats have introduced a bill of their own and won support from nearly all of their own caucus and two Republicans: Reps. Jeff Denham (R-Calif.) and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.). The Democratic bill is a combination of the Senate-passed comprehensive reform legislation -- which includes a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- and a separate border security measure approved by the House Homeland Security Committee. The House Democrat-led bill won't get a vote, according to GOP leadership.¶ Based on what he heard from House members, Bailey said he doesn't think a path to citizenship "is going to happen." But Democrats, he said, may be realizing they're better off taking what they can get now and pushing for expanded reforms later.

#### Capital isn’t key to immigration reform

Hirsh ’13 (Michael Hirsh is chief correspondent for National Journal. He also contributes to 2012 Decoded. Hirsh previously served as the senior editor and national economics correspondent for Newsweek, based in its Washington bureau. He was also Newsweek’s Washington web editor and authored a weekly column for Newsweek.com. (“There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital”, National Journal, 2/7/2013, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>)

Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all.

#### **XO solves**

The Hill 2-16 (“Dems: Obama can act unilaterally on immigration reform”

http://thehill.com/blogs/regwatch/administration/283583-dems-recognize-that-obama-can-act-unilaterally-on-immigration-reform#ixzz2LEvg4R5R)

President Obama can – and will – take steps on immigration reform in the event Congress doesn't reach a comprehensive deal this year, according to several House Democratic leaders. While the Democrats are hoping Congress will preclude any executive action by enacting reforms legislatively, they say the administration has the tools to move unilaterally if the bipartisan talks on Capitol Hill break down. Furthermore, they say, Obama stands poised to use them. "I don't think the president will be hands off on immigration for any moment in time," Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), the head of the House Democratic Caucus, told reporters this week. "He's ready to move forward if we're not." Rep. Joseph Crowley (N.Y.), vice chairman of the Democratic Caucus, echoed that message, saying Obama is "not just beating the drum," for immigration reform, "he's actually the drum major." "There are limitations as to what he can do with executive order," Crowley said Wednesday, "but he did say that if Congress continued to fail to act that he would take steps and measures to enact common-sense executive orders to move this country forward." Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), who heads the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said there are "plenty" of executive steps Obama could take if Congress fails to pass a reform package. "The huge one," Grijalva said, is "the waiving of deportation" in order to keep families together. "Four million of the undocumented [immigrants] are people who overstayed their visas to stay with family," he said Friday. "So that would be, I think, an area in which … there's a great deal of executive authority that he could deal with." The administration could also waive visa caps, Grijalva said, to ensure that industries like agriculture have ample access to low-skilled labor. "Everybody's for getting the smart and the talented in, but there's also a labor flow issue," he said. To be sure, Obama and congressional Democrats would prefer the reforms to come through Congress – both because that route would solidify the changes into law and because it would require bipartisan buy-in. Still, House Republicans have been loath to accept one of the central elements of Obama's strategy: A pathway to citizenship for the estimated 11-12 million undocumented people currently living in the country – a move which many conservatives deem "amnesty." Indeed, when the House Judiciary Committee met earlier this month on immigration reform, much of the discussion focused on whether there is some middle ground between citizenship and mass deportation. “If we can find a solution that is … short of a pathway to citizenship, but better than just kicking 12 million people out, why is that not a good solution?” Rep. Raul Labrador (R-Idaho) asked during the hearing. Obama on Tuesday spent a good portion of his State of the Union address urging Congress to send him a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year. Central to that package, he said, should be provisions for "strong border security," for "establishing a responsible pathway to earned citizenship" and for "fixing the legal immigration system to cut waiting periods and attract the highly-skilled entrepreneurs and engineers that will help create jobs and grow our economy." "We know what needs to be done," Obama said. "So let’s get this done." Becerra said he and other immigration reformers have had two meetings with the White House on immigration this month, one with the executive team working on the issue and, more recently, with Obama himself. Becerra said administration officials "essentially" know what reforms they want – "and they have communicated that to both House and Senate members, bipartisanly" – but they also want Congress to take the lead. "They're giving Congress a chance to work its will to move this," Becerra said. "But … I don't think he's going to wait too long. "If you were to ask him would he be prepared to submit a bill if Congress isn't ready … he would tell you, I have no doubt, 'I can do it in a heartbeat,'" Becerra added. "The president will move forward where he can if Congress doesn't act."

**Small farms fail internationally**

**Hazell 3** – principal economist in the World Bank's Agriculture and Rural Development Department (Peter B.R., “IS THERE A FUTURE FOR SMALL FARMS?” International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington DC)

If most small farmers are to have a viable future, then there is need for a concerted effort by governments, NGOs and the private sector to create a more enabling economic environment for their development. This must include assistance in forming effective marketing organizations, targeted agricultural research and extension, revamping financial systems to meet small farm credit needs, improved risk management policies, tenure security and efficient land markets, and where all else fails, targeted safety net programs. In addition, the public sector needs to invest in the provision of basic infrastructure, health, education and other human capital to improve market access and to increase the range of nonfarm opportunities available to small farm households, including permanent migration to urban areas. These interventions are possible and could unleash significant benefits in the form of pro-poor agricultural growth. But they do not seem very likely at the moment and current trends are moving in the opposite direction. For example, research and extension for small farms is declining, credit for small farms has virtually disappeared, and donor and government investment in crucial rural infrastructure is stagnant at best. The question remains: Is there a future for small farms?