# 1NC

### 1NC – Topicality

#### Engagement” requires direct talks with the target government

Crocker 9 – Chester Crocker, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, “Terms of Engagement”, New York Times, 9-13, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/opinion/14crocker.html?\_r=0

PRESIDENT OBAMA will have a hard time achieving his foreign policy goals until he masters some key terms and better manages the expectations they convey. Given the furor that will surround the news of America’s readiness to hold talks with Iran, he could start with “engagement” — one of the trickiest terms in the policy lexicon.

The Obama administration has used this term to contrast its approach with its predecessor’s resistance to talking with adversaries and troublemakers. His critics show that they misunderstand the concept of engagement when they ridicule it as making nice with nasty or hostile regimes.

Let’s get a few things straight. Engagement in statecraft is not about sweet talk. Nor is it based on the illusion that our problems with rogue regimes can be solved if only we would talk to them. Engagement is not normalization, and its goal is not improved relations. It is not akin to détente, working for rapprochement, or appeasement.

So how do you define an engagement strategy? It does require direct talks. There is simply no better way to convey authoritative statements of position or to hear responses. But establishing talks is just a first step. The goal of engagement is to change the other country’s perception of its own interests and realistic options and, hence, to modify its policies and its behavior.

### 1NC – Disad

#### Mexican economy is stable now but overreliance on the US dooms growth

**Bishop 13** (Marlon, The World, PRI's The World is a one-hour, weekday radio news magazine offering a mix of news, features, interviews, and music from around the globe; High-Tech Manufacturing Driving Economy in Mexico, [http://www.theworld.org/2013/02/mexico-manufacturing/](http://www.theworld.org/2013/02/mexico-manufacturing/" \t "_blank))

Volkswagen first came to Mexico in 1967, when it opened a plant in Puebla, a few hours drive from Mexico City. For decades, the Bug was the biggest-selling car in the country. Today, the Puebla plant has expanded to become the largest auto factory in North America, employing 18,000 people. It’s a state-of-the-art facility full of industrial robots and blinking computer equipment. The plant has the capacity to produce 2,500 cars a day, in popular models such as the Jetta and Golf. After rolling off the line, the cars are packed into trains and shipped off to retailers. Most of them are sold abroad. Mexico is now the eighth biggest auto producer in the world, as well as the world’s fourth biggest exporter, according to the Mexican Automotive Industry Association. In 2012, the country produced almost 3 million cars, a national record. Experts say those numbers are on track to keep growing. “Mexico is becoming quite an automotive powerhouse,” says Thomas Karig, a vice president at Volkswagen Mexico. Karig says Mexico is an attractive place for car companies to set up shop for several reasons: a great location for exporting to North and South America, an open trade policy, and experience in the work force. Last September, Audi, a Volkswagen subsidiary, announced the construction of a new plant nearby. They’ll be assembling the luxury Q5 SUV. Eduardo Solís, president of the Mexican Automotive Industry Association, says it’s a watershed moment for the country. “There is an important element here where Mexico is, currently in the automotive industry, associated with good quality, with good products,” says Solís. “We have been scaling up in the value chain.” VW Factory in Puebla, Mexico (Photo: VW Mexico) VW Factory in Puebla, Mexico (Photo: VW Mexico) Until recently, Mexico’s economy was based on low-paying, labor-intensive industries like textiles. About a decade ago, those industries started fleeing to China or Central America, where it’s even cheaper to operate. But now, Mexico is growing big-time in better-paying industries, like autos, aerospace, and technology, which require better-educated workers. Hector Muñoz, a 48-year-old technician at Volkswagen, is a living example of that change. Muñoz comes from a family of street vendors, and scored a job at Volkswagen after an uncle got him interested in fixing up cars. After 20 years working on the VW line, he makes 12,000 pesos a month. That comes out to only about $30 US a day, but its six times minimum wage in Mexico, putting him squarely in the country’s middle class. Thanks to this job, he’s been able to put his kids through college. Two of them are now engineers, a fact he’s really proud of. “Before there weren’t as many opportunities as there are now,” says Muñoz. In my case, being at Volkswagen has really encouraged me to push my kids to learn more, to get better educations.” There are a lot of others like Muñoz. According to the World Bank, 17 percent of Mexico’s population joined the middle class between 2003 and 2009, now making up almost a quarter of the population. But there’s a long way to go – half of Mexico still lives below the poverty line. Victor Piz, editor of Mexico’s chief financial newspaper El Financiero, says those people are being left out this high-tech boom. “I think the main problem in Mexico is the distribution of revenue coming into the country,” says Piz. “None of it goes into the pockets of Mexico’s poor. This wealth doesn’t matter to them because they’re not receiving any benefit from it.” Piz *also* warns that Mexico could have a problem sustaining its recent growth*– almost 4 percent for two straight years –*because it relies too heavily onone trading partner, the US. Mexico has free trade agreements like NAFTA with 44 countries, but still overwhelmingly exports to its neighbor to the North. “When the United States turns off its engines, inevitably, Mexico also has to turn off its engines as well,” says Piz. Today, Mexico City traffic is no longer a sea of VW Bugs. There are the gleaming Lexuses of the wealthy, and the Nissans of the country’s middle class – not to mention the mini-buses that transport the working poor. But taxis are still being made in Mexico. New York City’s brand new taxi fleet is currently in production at a Nissan plant in Cuernavaca.

#### **Growth key to prevent drug wars and state collapse**

**Barnes 11** – Bonner Means Baker Fellow at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Rice University (Joe, 4/29/11, “Oil and U.S.-Mexico Bilateral Relations,” <http://bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-BarnesBilateral-04292011.pdf>)

In summary, the slow decline of Mexican oil production, in and of itself, is unlikely to have a dramatic impact on international petroleum markets or prompt any dramatic response from the United States. There is, however, one set of circumstances which this decline would capture Washington's attention. That is the extent to which it contributes to significant instability in Mexico. There is already a short- to medium-term risk of substantial instability in Mexico. As noted, the country is enduring extremely high levels of drug-related violence. Even if the Mexican government eventually succeeds in its efforts to suppress this violence, the process is likely to be expensive, bloody, and corrosive in terms of human rights. A period of feeble economic growth, combined with a fiscal crisis associated with a drop in revenues from Pemex, could create a "perfect storm" south of the border. If this were to occur, Washington would have no choice but to respond. In the longer-term, the United States has a clear interest in robust economic growth and fiscal sustainability in Mexico.4 There is at least one major example of the U.S. coming to Mexico's aid in an economic emergency. In 1994, the United States extended USS20 billion in loan guarantees to Mexico when the peso collapsed, in large part to make U.S. creditors whole.5 Not least, a healthy Mexican economy would reduce the flow of illegal immigration to the United States. To the extent that prospects for such growth and sustainability are enhanced by reform of Pemex, the United States should be supportive. It might be best, in terms of U.S. economic and commercial interests, were Pemex to be fully privatized, but even partial reforms would be welcome. Not all national oil companies are created equal: Pemex's development into something like Norway's Statol would mark an important improvement.36

#### **Economic Collapse causes poverty and disease- makes war inevitable**

Klare, Michael T. Alternet: Foreign Policy in Focus: Economy “Will our economic collapse cause the death of millions abroad?” March 20, 2009 < http://www.alternet.org/economy/132523/will\_our\_economic\_collapse\_cause\_the\_death\_of\_millions\_abroad/>

The likely result: **A looming food crisis in many areas hit hardest by the global economic meltdown.**

**Until now, concern over the human impact of the global crisis has largely been focused -**- understandably so -- **on** **unemployment and economic hardship in the United States, Europe, and former Soviet Union.** Many stories have appeared on the devastating impact of plant closings, bankruptcies, and home foreclosures on families and communities in these parts of the world. **Much less coverage has been devoted to the meltdown's impact on people in the developing world. As the crisis spreads to the poorer countries, however, it's likely that people in these areas will experience hardships every bit as severe as those in the wealthier countries -- and, in many cases, far worse.The greatest worry is that most of the gains achieved in eradicating poverty over the last decade or so will be wiped out, forcing tens or hundreds of millions of people from the working class and the lower rungs of the middle class back into the penury from which they escaped. Equally worrisome is the risk of food scarcity in these areas, resulting in widespread malnutrition, hunger, and starvation. All this is sure to produce vast human misery, sickness, and death, but could also result in social and political unrest of various sorts, including riot, rebellion, and ethnic strife.**The president, Congress, or the mainstream media are not, for the most part, discussing these perils. As before, public interest remains focused on the ways in which the crisis is affecting the United States and the other major industrial powers. But the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and U.S. intelligence officials, in three recent reports, are paying increased attention to the prospect of a second economic shockwave, this time affecting the developing world.

### 1NC – Disad

#### A. Israel-Palestine peace talks will succeed now, but continued focus by Kerry is key

Keinon 9-26-13 (Herb, staff writer, "Kerry says Israel, Palestinian talks to intensify with increased US role" Jerusalem Post) www.jpost.com/Diplomacy-and-Politics/Kerry-Israel-Palestinian-agree-to-intensify-peace-talks-with-increased-US-role-327097

After seven rounds of direct Israeli-Palestinian talks since July, Israel, the Palestinians and the US agreed last week “to intensify the talks” and increase US participation, Secretary of State John Kerry said. Kerry, speaking at a high-level meeting of the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee meeting on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly on Wednesday, said the idea up until now was “to have the Palestinians and Israelis meet together, work this through, build trust, build relationship. But at the same time, we are there to facilitate, to help if there needs to be a bridging proposal to work on the way forward.” Kerry’s comments seem an indication that Washington has moved closer to the Palestinian position that greater hands-on US participation is needed in the talks. The secretary of state, who again stressed that he was the only one with a mandate to discuss the negotiations, and that everything else written or reported about the talks should be largely discounted, said the talks were working on two tracks. The first, formal track was the meetings between Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu’s special envoy, Yitzhak Molcho, and Justice Minister Tzipi Livni with Palestinian negotiators Saeb Erekat and Muhammad Shtayyeh. According to Kerry, that track was working at “discerning the gaps” and defining the issues and “the parameters that they need to work through.” He said there was a second track that included Netanyahu, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and US President Barack Obama. “And as needed, as we think appropriate, as we need to move the process, we will be consulting among each other and working to move this process forward.” Kerry said that all the final-status issues were on the table: territory, security, refugees and Jerusalem. And, he stressed, the sides were not seeking an interim agreement, but rather a final-status accord. He said one lesson he learned from previous peace making efforts was that “if you leave things out there, hanging out there unresolved, people who don’t want things to happen can make them not happen. And so we have to try to find a way to get a resolution o f the fundamental choices here.” Kerry dismissed those saying that the nine months allotted for reaching an accord was too optimistic a goal, saying that the sides had been negotiating these issues for years. “What this really needs – there’s no secret about it – to achieve this status is a dose of courage and a reasonable level of compromise,” he said. Kerry praised Netanyahu and Abbas for taking political risks in making the negotiations possible. “Prime Minister Netanyahu is doing something that is exceedingly difficult. Imagine any of you releasing prisoners, let alone 104 of them at one time, over a period of time, in one fell swoop, announcing it and dealing with the pushback from some people,” he said. “Imagine the willingness to enter into a negotiation which obviously brings with it a political price.” He praised Abbas for bucking those in the Palestinian political system saying that nothing had changed within Israel and “there was no reason to believe this could be different” and that it would be better to pursue their goals through the United Nations. On economic issues, Kerry said that Netanyahu has “bent over backwards to make things happen. He has acted in good faith. The things he said he would do, they’re doing.” Intelligence Minister Yuval Steinitz spoke about the economic steps Israel had taken toward the Palestinians, during a press conference with PA Finance Minister Shukri Bishara.

#### B. Kerry has to deal with Mexico- saps diplomatic energy from the Mid-east

Khaleej Times, 12 ["Kerry's Tough Task," 12-23-12, www.khaleejtimes.com/displayarticle.asp?xfile=data/editorial/2012/December/editorial\_December46.xml&section=editorial&col=, accessed 7-18-13, mss]

Senator Kerry, the quintessential American diplomat, will be taking over at a time when the US is more than eager to sustain and extend its global leadership. Obama’s second-term is ought to be achievement-oriented as unfinished business in terms of the two-state solution in the Middle East and ensuring tranquility in Afghanistan with the complete pullout of troops in 2014 will be under intense scrutiny. Moreover, the US shouldn’t be lost in dealing with the mess in Syria, and it’s high time an astute diplomat who could do some plain talking with the regime in Damascus was mandated with an agenda of bringing the strife-torn Arab country back from the brink. Avoiding another unnecessary war in the region and compelling America’s allies to look out for an amicable solution of the dispute will be Kerry’s roulette. Similarly, the task of manning a neighbour-friendly foreign policy in the backyard of America, especially in ties with border-irritant Mexico and ambitious Brazil and Venezuela, will be no less arduous. Kerry’s hobnobbing with the Western allies in Europe and Russia as the transatlantic alliance, Nato, goes ahead to institutionalise a security decorum in the region will clearly spell out how assertive America could be in times to come. Nonetheless, in an era of recession and capital flight, Kerry, unlike Clinton, has to warm up to China and Japan to ensure that America’s economic interests are onboard.

#### C. US key to Middle East peace

Elsner, 13 -- former Reuters chief political correspondent

[Alan, 30-years’ experience in international journalism, former Reuters State Department correspondent, former professor at Princeton, Dartmouth, American and George Washington University, "Conditions Not Perfect for Israeli-Palestinian Peace -- But May Be as Good as They'll Get," Huffington Post, 7-17-13, www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-elsner/israel-palestine-peace-process\_b\_3606126.html, accessed 7-18-13, mss]

To those who argue that Israel should not make peace with Arab nations because they are insufficiently democratic, the obvious response is that precisely the reverse is true. Only through peace treaties, endorsed and enshrined by the international community, can Israel hope to achieve security and predictability in its relations with its neighbors. Some of the same doubters who bring up Egypt also argue that Kerry is misspending his time in pursuing an Israeli-Palestinians peace deal because there are so many other issues that are more important clamoring for his attention. They are also dead wrong for many reasons. As Kerry realizes, solving this conflict is a prime U.S. national security interest because it is used by our enemies worldwide as a recruiting tool for terrorists and to stoke anti-American feeling and because it undermines our efforts to champion political rights and the cause of democracy and self-determination around the world. Unlike Egypt and Syria, this is the one issue where the U.S. has the leverage and ability to actually play a constructive role. The civil war in Syria and unrest in Egypt are both very important -- but it is not clear what the U.S. can or should do and how much influence it can exert. However, on Israel-Palestine, the U.S. remains the indispensible broker with enormous influence on both parties and a clear policy -- namely the two-state solution. Securing Israeli-Palestinian peace would inject some stability into an unstable region. It would strengthen moderates, bolster the vulnerable government of Jordan, a key U.S. strategic ally, weaken Iran and its allies and proxies and pave the way for relations between Israel and the important Gulf States. It would springboard the Palestinian economy and act as a driver for economic activity throughout the Middle East, eventually boosting Egypt too. Without viable peace talks, the status quo could quickly fall apart; instability will grow between Israel and the Palestinians, heightening the threat of violence in the West Bank and a new crisis between Israel and Hamas in Gaza. Now may not be the perfect time -- but tomorrow is likely to be worse and the next day worse still. This may be the best chance we still have. Finally, although it is a tough task, it is not impossible and there are some reasons for cautious optimism. Both Israelis and Palestinians continue to support two states as recent polls have again demonstrated. Kerry's indirect negotiations have been substantive and have narrowed gaps between the parties forming a better framework for talks than in some past efforts. And neither side wants to be blamed for failure. It's easy to find excuses not to make peace but that attitude achieves nothing. Working for peace is harder, no doubt, but the rewards are so great that it would be criminal not to try.

#### D. Mid-east wars cause extinction

Russell, 9 (James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers//, #26, \_\_http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf\_\_)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

### 1NC – CP

#### CP: The European Union should negotiate with Mexico to include binding workers’ protections for Mexico including: mechanisms for improving basic labor standards based on ILO recommendations, assistance for local organizing education centers, and full public participation in all parts of the dispute settlement process.

#### EU solves – engagement with Mexico is successful and allows for Europe engagement with Latin America at large – they have no reason why NAFTA is key

Carlo Secchi, spring-xx-2008, Professor Senior, Department of Policy Analysis and Public Management @ Bocconi University, “Latin America is Europe’s next big missed business opportunity,” http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home\_old/Article/tabid/191/ArticleType/ArticleView/ArticleID/21072/language/en-US/Default.aspx

Brazil and Mexico are the key Latin American countries. The EU’s association agreement with Mexico is 10 years old, but it doesn’t yet have a strategic partnership with Brazil. This is partly because of the never-ending negotiation process with Mercosur, the troubled Latin American customs union that is still incomplete. The EU is currently negotiating trade liberalisation deals with all of Latin America’s regional blocs; as well as Mercosur, these are the Caribbean Community, the Central America Common Market and the Andean Community. The EU therefore needs to urge its Latin American partners towards further integration. If they were to adopt a common “rule of origin” for their products this would be an incentive to further liberalise their international trade, and thus increase it. Full trade liberalisation in Latin America, although difficult to achieve, must be made central to the European strategy. Greater trade openness would be beneficial for economic growth. But even if tariffs and quotas are progressively reduced, trade flows may remain low if other trade costs remain high. EU co-operation should be directed to lowering trade costs. The crucial issue is market access. Most Latin American countries still get poor results from their export efforts towards Europe, the exceptions being raw materials and energy sources. After the establishment of the EU-Chile free trade area, Chilean exports to the EU were substantially increased. But in the case of EU-Mexico trade liberalisation, the growth of imports from the EU has exceeded the growth of exports to Europe, resulting in a widening Mexican trade deficit with the EU. Ever since the 1999 Rio summit, the European Union has proclaimed that Latin America is a vital strategic political and economic partner. But a huge gap has remained between its words and its actions. An abrupt change in the European approach is now needed if a strategic bi-regional partnership is to be created. The European Commission apparently understands this. Although the EU does not have a strategic partnership with Brazil, its intention is to push ahead with one as fast as possible. In mid-2007 the Commission confirmed that it will be revisiting the EU’s 10-year dialogue with Mercosur, with the aim of giving new impetus to the negotiations. But there is also a keen awareness that the EU’s hope for a special relationship with Brazil must not be allowed to hinder regional integration in South America, or worsen asymmetries and imbalances within the bloc. If Latin America is to become more important as a strategic partner for the EU in the global economy, and as a more attractive market for European companies, European institutions must become more open to the needs of countries in the region. The new start by the EU, focused on the two most important players, Brazil and Mexico, could prove a promising one, because of the “pull” effect it might have on the other countries. However, this must be accompanied by measures to keep all Latin American countries on board. Otherwise, Latin America may well prove to be Europe’s next missed business opportunity.

### 1NC – Kritik

#### Neoliberal engagement of Latin America exacerbates inequality and justifies endless intervention — causing structural violence which cumulates in extinction

Makwana 6 (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

* Neoliberalism has failed to combat poverty, created more inequality, and hampers development
* International agencies are epistemologically flawed
* Growth in developing world countries dropped between 1980-2000
* Nations who reject neoliberalism are demonized by the US
* 50 military invasions since 1846

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.

#### 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)

* ‘No alternative’ reflects a flawed epistemology
* Argentinian collapse, victory of Lula in Brazil, socialism prove that and alt is viable and necessary
* Washington Consensus is collapsing

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.

### 1NC – Case

#### The ends justify the means

Isaac 2 – (Jeffrey, Professor of PoliSci @ Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD Yale, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol 49 Issue 2)

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 [it] 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.

#### In the face of extinction you have to weigh consequences - outweighs all else

Bok 88 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy @ Brandeis University, 1988, Applied Ethical Theory, ed. Rosenthal and Shehadi, pg. 203)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy,” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences.

#### This is particularly true for policymakers

Ignatieff 4 (Michael, Carr Professor of Human Rights @ Harvard, Lesser Evils, p. 18-19)

As for moral perfectionism, this would be the doctrine that a liberal state should never have truck with dubious moral means and should spare its officials the hazard of having to decide between lesser and greater evils. A moral perfectionist position also holds that states can spare their officials this hazard simply by adhering to the universal moral standards set out in human rights conventions and the laws of war. There are two problems with a perfectionist stance, leaving aside the question of whether it is realistic. The first is that articulating nonrevocable, nonderogable moral standards is relatively easy. The problem is deciding how to apply them in specific cases. What is the line between interrogation and torture, between targeted killing and unlawful assassination, between preemption and aggression? Even when legal and moral distinctions between these are clear in the abstract, abstractions are less than helpful when political leaders have to choose between them in practice. Furthermore, the problem with perfectionist standards is that they contradict each other. The same person who shudders, rightly, at the prospect of torturing a suspect might be prepared to kill the same suspect in a preemptive attack on a terrorist base. Equally, the perfectionist commitment to the right to life might preclude such attacks altogether and restrict our response to judicial pursuit of offenders through process of law. Judicial responses to the problem of terror have their place, but they are no substitute for military operations when terrorists possess bases, training camps, and heavy weapons. To stick to a perfectionist commitment to the right to life when under terrorist attack might achieve moral consistency at the price of leaving us defenseless in the face of evildoers. Security, moreover, is a human right, and thus respect for one right might lead us to betray another.

#### US NOT KEY TO SOLVE

GAO July 2003 (United States General Accounting Office, “Mexico’s Maquiladora

Decline Affects U.S.- Mexico Border Communities and Trade; Recovery Depends in Part on

Mexico’s Actions” Report to Congressional Requesters) *MLW*

Action by Mexico is key to the maquiladoras’ future viability, particularly

since U.S. approaches to trade liberalization and homeland security may

put additional pressure on maquiladora operations. Industry

representatives noted that present U.S. policies in these areas could

undermine current benefits and reduce future competitiveness.

#### **CFO Solves**

CFO Maquiladoras (organization that supports union democracy and workers’ rights in six cities along the Mexico-U.S. border) April 29th, 2005 (“Local/Regional Approaches to Improving Workplace Safety and Health in Developing Countries: Labor and NGO Strategies and Projects” Comité Fronteriz de Obrer@s CFO <http://cfomaquiladoras.org/english%20site/renovado_asalto.en.html>) *MLW*

CFO pursues an integrated strategy for defending labor rights and all human rights, including the right to health. The components of this strategy include: •First, the CFO educates workers regarding their rights under Mexico’s labor code, as well as collective bargaining agreements and work rules. We begin with study sessions and role plays in their homes; then the workers put their knowledge into practice in the maquiladoras. We believe that workers themselves are in the best position to monitor health and safety in the workplace. •We offer workshops on occupational health, with the collaboration of experts on various themes. •As part of this educational effort, the CFO’s promotoras often accompany the workers to Social Security, to help build their confidence in what they want to report or request. Their presence as witnesses makes it harder for doctors to mistreat the workers. They offer guidance to the workers on what steps they can take to ensure they are receiving adequate care for their injuries or illnesses. CFO is not involved in the provision of health services, but in empowering workers to demand the care they are entitled to. •We help workers understand the connections between the health problems they experience and their working conditions, and we connect them with other workers facing similar problems. •We document health and safety problems faced by workers in different sectors of the maquiladora industry; increasingly, we have focused on monitoring conditions in factories owned by three or four large corporations. •We develop educational materials, including pamphlets, flyers, and translations of data sheets on chemicals and hazardous substances. •We support workers in their struggles for democratization of their unions or to unionize shops with no union, with the long-term goal of organizing independent unions. Currently this is a major emphasis for the CFO. •We build collaborative relationships with independent unions in Mexico and other countries, as well as with different labor centers and NGOs. Examples include the UC-Berkeley Labor Occupational Health Program, the Maquiladora Health and Safety Support Network, the Hesperian Foundation, and others. •We try to develop collaborative health projects that emerge organically from the CFO’s own organizing efforts, in order to avoid presenting workshops or health projects suggested or offered by outside groups from the north, which may not have the potential to move beyond isolated activities that are not linked to other efforts or strategies advanced by workers themselves.

#### Guest Worker Program already being modified now: No Inherency

Jacoby June 11, 2013 (Tamar, “Guest Workers are the Best Border Security” Wall Street Journal <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324634304578535823045836956.html>) *MLW*

“The best antidote to illegal immigration is a legal immigration system that works,” says Tamar Jacoby in the Wall Street Journal. Debate began in the U.S. Senate this week on the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. Jacoby argues that the guest-worker program outlined in the bill would be an important change at a time when the United States is facing a wave of baby boomer retirements. We need foreign workers, she says, and the Senate bill is a smart way forward: The work visas in the Senate bill bear little resemblance to traditional guest-worker programs, which generally tie the worker to one employer, opening the door to exploitation and an inefficient labor market. Instead, under the Senate proposal, an immigrant here on a work visa can quit any time and go to work for any other U.S. employer that has been approved to participate in the program. Business owners get access to a more flexible labor force, including the possibility of hiring in real time without going back to the government for approval. The size of the guest-worker program is designed to adjust automatically in response to changing U.S. labor needs, growing in good years when the economy needs more foreign workers and shrinking when more Americans are out of work.

#### 4. Immigration processing results in rape and violent discrimination

**Andrijasevic 09** – Professor, Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS), Open University (Rutvica, “Sex on the move: Gender, subjectivity and differential inclusion,” <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/sub/journal/v29/n1/full/sub200927a.html>)

Young single women's migration is subject to immigration regulations that enforce norms around gender and sexuality. In particular, border has been identified as a key site where control is played out. In the 1960s, the border officers monitoring the US-Mexican border refused to admit lesbians, namely those who they identified as being ‘too’ masculine in manner, dress and look (Luibhéid, 2002). The control at the border is often enforced though violence. Young migrant women working in export assembly plants or maquiladoras at the US-Mexican border have been affected by high levels of violence and abuse. The social movement called Ni Una Mas (Not One More) brought to the public attention the deaths of hundreds of young women who migrated autonomously from rural Mexico to work in maquiladoras. These deaths, initially dismissed by the local authorities as simply being those of prostitutes against whom the use of violence is implicitly justified, need to be seen in relation to the economy of the export processing zones in the border region. Factories are run on the basis of flexible labour employment and give priority to hiring young women migrants who lack family support. Additionally, women are pressured against political organising and are excluded from traditional unions led by men who dismiss women on the basis that they are temporary workers and bring down the level of wages. Women's vulnerability to abuse in the border regions thus needs to be examined in relation to the labour exploitation in the export-oriented zones, women's labour participation away from the domestic sphere and their increased role as independent migrants (Nash, 2006; Wright, 2006). Sexual violence is also used systematically against migrant women crossing the border between Mexico and the United States. Agents of the US Border Control have been known to rape, detain and then release migrant women caught crossing the US-Mexican border illegally. Although not directly expelling a woman migrant from the US, sexual abuse nevertheless constitutes an act of exclusion as it operates as a technology that reproduces gender and sexual hierarchies and norms on the one hand and racial and class divisions on the other. Rape effectively inscribes the border on migrant women's bodies. This border is at the same time an external border that sanctions and maintains the difference between ‘us’ and ‘them’, ‘citizens’ and ‘aliens’, and is also an internal border that confines undocumented migrant women to the low-end service sector of the US economy. Rape thus plays a crucial role in reconstructing national borders and in upholding the exclusionary social order (Luibhéid, 2002, p. 130).

#### c) Indirect benefits make maquilla jobs best

**Sargent and Matthews 99** – John D. Sargent: Assistant professor of Management and International Business at Florida International University; extensive fieldwork experience in Mexico on the maquiladora industry and multinational firms. Linda M. Matthews: Ph.D. candidate in organizational behavior and human resource management at the School of Business Administration at the University of Washington. (Jan. 1999, “Exploitation or Choice? Exploring the Relative Attractiveness of Employment in the Maquiladoras,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/25074047?origin=JSTOR-pdf)

The majority of maquila managers indicated that the direct wages paid to workers were equal to, but not above, the wages paid by other local employers. These managers frequently stated that the wages for unskilled production level employees were set by federal minimum wage laws. These laws have established roughly the same pay rates for maquila employment and for other jobs the typical maquila worker could find. While maquila managers did appear to have some flexibility to increase wages once an employee had been in the organization for a month or two, they were not openly competing with other firms for workers by raising starting wages. The majority of the managers stated that the indirect benefits the maquilas offered were much better than what was available in the local non maquila economy. Benefits mentioned included productivity bonuses, free food at plant cafeterias, educational opportunities, on-site medical staff, medical insurance, a clean environment, and advancement opportunities. A small number of the maquila managers indicated that maquilas were attractive due to their stability and that they complied with their legal obligations as determined by Mexican labor law. One manager characterized many Mexican businesses as small, undercapitalized firms that commonly "fold and screw the employee." Another human resource director who had considerable experience in Mexican firms stated that Mexican companies often try to get away with not paying legally required benefits. This person stated that many small firms have problems meeting payroll expenses and do not have the ability, or in some cases the desire, to meet their legal obligations. She even went so far as to state that the maquilas are attracting migration flows because they follow through with what they promise to their employees. Another common reason given by maquila management was that people found jobs at maquilas because they employ people who do not have other opportunities for formal employment. Many maquila workers had only completed their primary education. Maquila managers stated that non-maquila employers usually require that a person has completed their secondary education to be considered for anything above unskilled labor positions.

# Block

### 2NC

#### Link turn – increases in the U.S. economy increase employment in Maquiladoras

Lederman and Oliver 13

(Daniel & Julia, Journalists for America Economia, The Lessons of Mexico's Maquiladoras: Where Free Trade and Labor Rights Compete, <http://www.worldcrunch.com/business-finance/the-lessons-of-mexico-039-s-maquiladoras-where-free-trade-and-labor-rights-compete/nafta-low-skilled-workers-globalization/c2s11434/>, 4/22/13) C.A.

[Mexico](http://worldcrunch.com/business-finance/a-lesson-in-money-laundering-mexican-style/mexico-hsbc-travelers-cheque-cartels/c2s11067/#.UWwjPSspYWw) allows materials used in maquilas to enter duty-free, provided the finished product is then immediately exported out of Mexico. The U.S. in turn charges these products a much lower tariff than products from other countries. Companies using this labor arrangement include Levi’s and Siemens. The world is as interconnected as ever, and there is no better place to see that than the U.S.-Mexico border. Lined with factories, **the border between both countries has become less clear because of NAFTA** (North American Free Trade Agreement), international production chains and other [economic](http://worldcrunch.com/business-finance/a-few-simple-tips-for-chinese-companies-with-global-ambitions/c2s5724/#.UWwjAyspYWw) and social links**. On the Mexican side** of the border, **almost 3,000 factories import components and raw materials**. Workers assemble the products – **most of the finished goods are destined for the U.S. market**. The big question is: does this benefit Mexican workers? These export-oriented industries provide almost two million jobs, which translates into a strong drive for development in Mexico. **But as it turns out, these job posts can disappear very quickly.** In this sense, the economic benefits for the U.S. depend largely on the labor conditions of Mexican workers, who absorb up and down cycles through a series of adjustments. **While the U.S. economy is rarely unstable**, this is an important finding that could have political implications in the whole world. **Mexico resembles a growing number of countries that promote the export-oriented industry as a strategy for development and enact trade reforms that integrate the local economy to the global market.** [**A study conducted** by](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/11/15/000158349_20121115085034/Rendered/PDF/NonAsciiFileName0.pdf) the World Bank International Trade Department, The Inter American Development Bank and Macalester College, **used data** from Mexican social security records and U.S. customs records between 2007 and 2009 **to analyze how economic shocks emanating from the U.S. are transmitted to the offshoring maquiladoras of northern Mexico**. The study produced four specific conclusions: First, the study showed **that when Mexican imports fell during the crisis, employment in the maquiladoras did as well**. This defies common sense with regard to what you would normally expect in [trade](http://worldcrunch.com/business-finance/a-few-simple-tips-for-chinese-companies-with-global-ambitions/c2s5724/#.UWwjAyspYWw). Normally, when imports drop, employment increases because industries that compete with imports thrive. In the typical scenario, a decrease in imports cushions the negative impact of a decrease in export demand. However, the findings in the study are consistent with an environment that relies heavily on imports for the assembly of finished goods, as is the case in northern Mexico. Such an environment, the study showed, is subject to large fluctuations in employment. **In fact, the maquiladora industry is doubly affected when the U.S. economy deteriorates: first, because American consumers buy less, and second, because they stop sending raw goods and U.S.-manufactured components to** [**Mexico**](http://worldcrunch.com/world-affairs/will-mexico-039-s-ambitious-telecom-reform-cut-carlos-slim-down-to-size-/enrique-pe-a-nieto-carlos-slim-televisa/c1s11250/#.UWwjMSspYWw).

#### Although reprehensible, maquiladoras themselves represent an escape from traditional gender oppression

DePaul Law Review (The DePaul Law Review is a scholarly journal published four times a year by students at DePaul University College of Law.  The Law Review serves as a forum for practitioners, judges, professors, and law students to discuss and analyze important topics in the law) 2k, 49 DePaul L. Rev. 729. Copyright (c) 2000 DePaul Law Review

Once married, she knew another side of the life of domestic slavery and unhappiness. Her husband was a batterer; only with some outside help from a friend was she able to leave him. Again, she took on a variety of jobs in domestic service. The separation cost her the custody of two of her children. She lost other children because economic uncertainties forced her to send one daughter to live with a relative. By the time she could afford to support her, the daughter did not want to live with her. For Angela, the point in her life when she would be working in a maquiladora served as an important crossing of the gendered borders that dictated a kind of domestic slavery, where she was under the thumb of demanding male relatives, of a battering husband, and of mistresses who used her domestic services. She would be grateful for her job in Tijuana assembling cassettes because it meant a [\*795] little more security and independence, even if the wages were not much above the pittance she earned as a live-in domestic.

### 1NR

#### EU and Mexico will combat human rights problems better than the US

Council of European Union, 5/16/10, “Mexico – European Union Strategic Partnership Joint Executive Plan” <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/en/er/114467.pdf> 7/2/13

Mexico and the European Union recognise that corruption is an obstacle to democracy and ¶ economic growth. ¶ Mexico and the EU will endeavour to strengthen coordination and cooperation to combat ¶ corruption within the framework of the Conference of parties to the United Nations ¶ Convention against Corruption (Merida Convention) and other anti-corruptions ¶ instruments they are adhering to. ¶ In this context, both sides reiterate their commitment to working to ensure that an ¶ increasing number of countries ratify or accede to the Convention, in order to increase the ¶ number of parties and thereby contribute to universal accession to this instrument. ¶ Both Parties recognize the importance of the mechanism for reviewing the implementation ¶ of the Convention, recently approved at the Third session of the Conference of the States ¶ Parties to UNCACC (Doha, 9-13 November 2009), and commit themselves to encourage ¶ civil society participation in review processes and to publish their review reports in full.

#### **EU empirically solves environmental policy in the Gulf of Mexico – that gets modeled**

Cruz & McLaughlin 8 (Ivonne Cruz, Richard J. McLaughlin, “Contrasting marine policies in the United States, Mexico, Cuba and the European Union: Searching for an integrated strategy for the Gulf of Mexico region,” Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, Ocean & Coastal Management 51 (2008) 826–838, Available online 23 September 2008, AK)

The Gulf of Mexico (GoM) is a center of marine biodiversity, fisheries, oil and gas production, maritime transport, and recreation making it one of the most productive ecosystems in the world. Certainly, protecting its biodiversity while recognizing the impor- tance of valuable socio-economic activities poses serious gover- nance challenges and therefore strategies need to be developed for the sustainable management of resources without compromising important ecosystem services or the human well-being of those who depend on the Gulf. As the nations surrounding the Gulf are experiencing rapidly expanding populations and economic development, an urgent need arises to strengthen the efforts to build inter-governmental collaboration between the United States, Mexico and Cuba. Despite the complex and difficult political relations existing between the three nations, mutually beneficial collaborative efforts are possible. These efforts should concentrate on very clear targets where some success stories can be told. Experiences elsewhere, such as in Europe, show that transnational communities are capable of engaging in the process of ocean and coastal policy planning across international boundaries. For example, the European Union (EU) Green Paper on a European Maritime Policy; an Integrated Maritime Policy for the European Union provides an example of serious commitment and collaboration among parties to tackle unresolved conflicts regarding the sustainability and conservation of marine resources. This effort should provide guidance for the future in other marine regions, including the GoM [2,3].

#### Mexican Gov. says yes to EU relations

HSU 13 (Hispanic speaking news is a anon. reporter for the Latino daily newspaper and is an expert on foreign affairs with Mexico, Venezuela, and Columbia <http://beforeitsnews.com/alternative/2013/04/mexico-wants-to-deepen-trade-relations-with-european-union-2624002.html>. 4/18/13.)

The Mexican government plans to “deepen” its trade relations with the European Union this year via negotiations set to start in a few months, Economy Secretary Ildefonso Guajardo said. “The dialogue should start some time in the summer,” Guajardo told reporters after taking part in the “Mexico: Opportunity and Growth” forum. Mexico is not looking to renegotiate the free trade agreement signed in Lisbon in 2000 but to “expand the treaty” to promote development in a knowledge-based economy, Guajardo said. The trade agreement should incorporate “issues of technological modernization,” such as information technology and e-commerce, that were not discussed when the pact was being drafted, the economy secretary said. Mexico may also introduce an “agricultural chapter” in the talks with the EU, Guajardo said. JW

#### EU soft power can work in Mexico – civil society reforms prove

**Reed ’12** (John Reed, 2/12, Issue 14-ofi press magazine, <http://theofipress.webs.com/eumexicorelations.htm>)

 The other major political development contained in the Global Agreement was the human rights conditionality clause.  This clause is a fundamental part of the projection of EU soft power, and was the first time the EU had successfully done so.  Mexico signed the Global Agreement with the full understanding that it could be suspended in the face of serious human rights abuses.  For some this was seen as a violation of sovereignty, but it clearly was a new political frontier, from which all future dialogue was based. (Szymanski & Smith, 2005)The one area where there have been substantial efforts has been engagement with Civil Society, most visible through a series of four EU-Mexico Civil Society Forums that have taken place over the years, the last one being in October 2010 in Mexico.  Discussions have been wide and varied, and there has been considerable EU influence in the establishment of a Mexican civil society, given that Mexico has no direct equivalent of the institutionalised European Economic and Social Committee. (EESC)  The continual conclusion of the Civil Society forums has been the need for an EESC equivalent, but this has not yet come to pass. (Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 2010)

#### **EU policy in Latin America focuses on partnership – crucial to equity---US doesn’t get it**

Grugel ’04 [December 2004. Jean Grugel is Director of the Sheffield Institute of International Development (SIID). “New Regionalism and Modes of Governance - Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America” European Journal of International Relations. <http://search.proquest.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/docview/211959768?accountid=12861>]

The language the EU talks when speaking to or about the South and within the new regionalist constructions is significantly different from that employed by Washington. In particular, the European model is explicitly couched in terms of 'partnership' - a word that became almost the mantra of EU development policy in the 1990s (Maxwell and Riddell, 1998). Although to some extent merely a linguistic device, the concept of partnership is not entirely without significance. Despite the vagueness of the term, partnership can be understood to represent an idealized relationship based around notions of equity and cooperation that ignores or transcends the underlying power inequalities (Listen 2003). Partnership challenges the notion of hierarchy and, as such, does not fit easily with openly hub-andspoke models of new regionalism. Instead, the EU has endorsed the pursuit of `inter-regionalism', that is an agreement between two distinct but equal regions (see Patten, 2002). A new `inter-regionalism' emerged in the 1990s, bringing EU policy up to date with global transformations. It is based on the promotion of good government and development through dialogue and the implementation of mutually agreed and negotiated policies between two geographically distinct regions (Gilson, 2002). The new inter-regionalism attempts to go beyond economic governance to embrace political and institutional reform and social inclusion and, at the same time, seeks a discursive mediation of the power inequalities between Europe and the South. It is, therefore, more explicitly concerned with politics and institution-building than the US market-led pattern of new regionalism and endorses a North-South model of global cooperation in which `the North' assumes some responsibilities for the development of `the South'.

#### **EU involvement in Latin America promotes subregional integration – US only supports hemispheric**

Grugel ’04 [December 2004. Jean Grugel is Director of the Sheffield Institute of International Development (SIID). “New Regionalism and Modes of Governance - Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America” European Journal of International Relations. <http://search.proquest.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/docview/211959768?accountid=12861>]

If the EU's project of economic governance is similar to that of the US, then the EU's notion of the kind of political and institutional environment in which open markets are embedded is rather different. The EU has a longstanding vision of itself as a mirror for the political and institutional development of the Southern Cone. Political and cultural similarities mean that the countries of the Southern Cone tend to be viewed by EU elites as `Europe in exile', in the telling phrase of the Argentine writer Jose Luis Borges. As a result, the EU has developed a conscious political leg to its new regionalism, absent from the FTAA, and which is based around the promotion of its own model of democracy, social welfare, and regional integration. These latter come as a 'package' - regional integration is seen as a way of managing social and political conflict and a device for spreading the cost of regional public goods and for embedding liberal democracy. Social inclusion is thought to minimize the risk of zero-sum politics, the collapse of democracy and the end of economic growth. The EU, in other words, endorses a model of liberal economic governance in which the market is mediated by authoritative supranational regional institutions (European Commission, 2004). Moreover, it offers a strong endorsement of subregional integration within Latin America, in contrast to the US view that subregional integration in Latin America should function principally as a building block for hemispheric integration.

**C**