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#### Chinese influence is increasing and replacing Mexico’s need for US involvement

Shahani ’13 – Arjan, “Chinese President Xi Jinping’s Visit to Mexico,” AQ, 6/5/13, <http://www.americasquarterly.org/chinese-president-xi-jinping-visit-to-mexico>

Slowly but surely, from a diplomatic standpoint, Mexico is taking steps to reestablish itself as an outspoken, independent and active player, and is engaging emerging and established world powers beyond its neighbor to the North. In April, Peña Nieto’s participation in the conference of the Boao Forum For Asia—a China-based forum similar to the World Economic Forum—and Chinese President Xi Jinping’s visit to Mexico this week are a clear example of Mexico’s global pivot. President Xi’s visit, foreshadows a stronger bilateral commercial and diplomatic relationship. Fox and Calderón did very little to maintain the strategic alliance that the PRI had built with China, and Calderón angered the Chinese government in 2011 when he received the Dalai Lama at the presidential residence. But now, officials from the federal government and representatives from the private sector involved in President Xi’s visit are predicting the launch of a strategic, integral and functional alliance between China and Mexico. They are not exaggerating: as agreements reached during the visit show, this is much more than Xi making a courtesy call. Amapola Grijalva, vice president of the Mexico-China Chamber of Commerce, told journalist Darío Celis in a June 3 radio interview that “agreements reached between the two delegations will help narrow the commercial balance gap between the countries, will open up a huge market for Mexican exporters, and will allow China to provide financing for important heavy infrastructure projects in the near future.” Grijalva estimates that “during Peña’s administration, up to $81 billion coming from China could go into financing new industrial naval port complexes, airports, telecom projects, and railway transportation systems.” A joint declaration signed and issued by Peña Nieto and Xi on June 4 summarizes the amount of work already invested in the renewed Mexico-China relationship. The two leaders signed memorandums of understanding to formally establish cooperation in energy, mining, emerging industries, infrastructure, private sector collaboration, university alliances, trade, banking, and even the oil industry. In addition, it was announced that sanitary measures have been met to reopen the Chinese market to pork from Mexico, and an agreement was reached to allow all forms of tequila into China. Additionally, to promote tourism in both countries, Peña Nieto and Xi expressed their mutual interest in expanding international flights connecting Mexico and China and in establishing a working relationship between their tourism ministries. In the political arena, Peña Nieto took the opportunity to amend Calderón’s diplomatic gaffe by ratifying the “One China” principle. Peña Nieto stated that it is Mexico’s position that both Taiwan and the Tibet are part of Chinese territory and Tibetan affairs are an internal issue for China. In the statement, both parties declared that “given the improvement of diverse mechanisms in the bilateral cooperation, the conditions are such that Mexico-China relations can be elevated to a new level of benefit to both nations.” They also established a calendar of working visits from high-level government officials to implement the agreements and scheduled future meetings during upcoming international forums including the UN, APEC and the G20. As President Xi’s visit shows, the coming years are certain to bring Mexico and China diplomatically closer and to catalyze economic growth, trade and development in a mutually beneficial way—while breaking Mexico’s trade dependency on the U.S. market.

#### Engagement is zero-sum

Dowd ‘12

Alan Dowd, Senior Fellow with the American Security Council Foundation, 2012, “Crisis in the America's,” <http://www.ascfusa.org/content_pages/view/crisisinamericas>

Reengagement also means revitalizing security ties. A good model to follow might be what’s happening in China’s backyard. To deter China and prevent an accidental war, the U.S. is reviving its security partnerships all across the Asia-Pacific region. Perhaps it’s time to do the same in Latin America. We should remember that many Latin American countries—from Mexico and Panama to Colombia and Chile—border the Pacific. Given Beijing’s actions, it makes sense to bring these Latin American partners on the Pacific Rim into the alliance of alliances that is already stabilizing the Asia-Pacific region.¶ Finally, all of this needs to be part of a revived Monroe Doctrine.¶ Focusing on Chinese encroachment in the Americas, this “Monroe Doctrine 2.0” would make it clear to Beijing that the United States welcomes China’s efforts to conduct trade in the Americas but discourages any claims of control—implied or explicit—by China over territories, properties or facilities in the Americas. In addition, Washington should make it clear to Beijing that the American people would look unfavorably upon the sale of Chinese arms or the basing of Chinese advisors or military assets in the Western Hemisphere.¶ In short, what it was true in the 19th and 20th centuries must remain true in the 21st: There is room for only one great power in the Western Hemisphere.

#### Specifically – key to Chinese oil security

Cerna ‘11 – Michael, China Research Center, China's Growing Presence in Latin America: Implications for U.S. and Chinese Presence in the Region, 4/15/11, <http://www.chinacenter.net/chinas-growing-presence-in-latin-america-implications-for-u-s-and-chinese-presence-in-the-region/>]

China’s thirst for natural resources has sent the country in search of sustainable supplies of oil, soy and iron ore. In South America, China has found some of the most well-endowed partners in the world. China is devouring Latin American commodities and eyeing a market of 500 million people. “Countries in South America have arable land and need our technology and investment, and they welcome our companies. It’s a win-win solution,” said Wang Yunkun, deputy director of the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee of the National People’s Congress, as reported by MercoPress. In 2006, more than 36% of Chile’s total exports were directed toward Asia, with China taking 12% of the total. Chile was the first Latin American country to complete a major bilateral trade agreement with China (Santiso, 2007). Since then China has looked beyond Chile, also targeting Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador, Argentina and Peru. In 2009, China became Brazil’s largest single export market, eclipsing the U.S. for the first time in history. Later, Brazil’s then-president, Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, and his Chinese counterpart, Hu Jintao, signed an agreement that allowed the China Development Bank and Sinopec to loan Brazil’s state-controlled oil company, Petrobras, $10 billion in return for as many as 200,000 barrels a day of crude oil for ten years (Economist, 2009). This is but one example of how China is seizing lending opportunities in Latin America when traditional lenders such as the Inter-American Development Bank are being pushed to their limits. “Just one of China’s loans, the $10 billion for Brazil’s national oil company, is almost as much as the $11.2 billion in all approved financing by the Inter-American Bank in 2008,” according to The New York Times. It was not only in Brazil that China went after oil. In order to meet rising industrial needs and consumer demand, China has pursued investments and agreements with a variety of Latin American oil producers. In 2007 Venezuela agreed to a $6 billion joint investment fund for infrastructure projects at home and for oil refineries in China able to process Venezuelan heavy crude oil (Santiso, 2007). Venezuela planned to increase oil exports to China by 300,000 barrels per day. Then in 2009, Venezuela announced a $16 billion investment deal with the Chinese National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) for oil exploration in the Orinoco River to develop heavy crude oil resources (Economist, 2009). Meanwhile, the CNPC has invested $300 million in technology to use Venezuela’s Orimulsion fuel in Chinese power plants. This exemplifies Venezuela’s desire to break away from the U.S. During a visit to China in 2004, President Chavez said shifting exports to China would help end dependency on sales to the United States (Johnson, 2005).

#### Chinese energy insecurity causes Asia war

Brandenburg 3/24/20**’**11 Colonel James A. – United States Air Force, China’s Energy Insecurity and the South China Sea Dispute, USAWC Strategy Research Project, p. 6-7

In 2010, China reasserted ownership to nearly 80 percent of the South China Sea, supplementing its claims to the Spratly and Paracel Islands. For China and its neighbors, territorial ownership is integral to state sovereignty and security. However, overlapping EEZs, disputes over ownership of the Spratly and Paracel Islands, and China’s mercantilist approach to securing resources stand to raise the energy security stakes of interested parties including the US.16 Feelings of insecurity of those with competing interests in either the EEZ or the Spratly or Paracel Islands could prove challenging especially if China expands its offshore production of oil/natural gas and extends its control over the vessels or pipelines that deliver them via the South China Sea. Experts suggest energy shortages provide the necessary catalyst for arms races, nuclear proliferation, and other forms of instability… in essence, greater energy insecurity equates to the greater probability of geopolitical rivalry.17 Like the US, as China becomes more dependent on oil imports, its ability to ensure access to energy at an affordable price becomes even more critical and could prove difficult given increasing global market uncertainty. Ultimately, China’s dependence on imports could lead to a vicious cycle as it struggles to find ways to mitigate risks and protect its investments in order to offset its insecurity.18 Given global dependence on China’s economy and the potential impact of shrinking energy supplies, this warrants special consideration in the geo-political realm.

#### Goes nuclear

Cirincione 2K Joseph, Director of the Non-Proliferation Project – CEIP, Foreign Policy, 3-22, Lexis

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia, then the international arms control agreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled in its fourth war on the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development. If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.
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#### Interpretation—economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a quid pro quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.

The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.

The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.

The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Violation—the aff is unilateral action

#### Voter for limits—topic snowballs into countless unilateral affs based on small subsets of engagement in each of the topic countries—literally limitless
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#### Unemployment benefits will be restored, but continued pressure on the GOP is key

Jamelle Bouie 12-28, The Daily Beast, Republicans’ Unemployment Shame, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/12/28/republicans-unemployment-shame.html>

The prospects for fixing the lapse are mixed. Most Republicans are opposed to extending benefits, and argue that the program increases dependency, despite research that the opposite is true; with some form of support guaranteed, unemployed workers are more likely to stay in the workforce and continue their search for a job. With that said, there are Republicans in the Senate—like Dean Heller of Nevada—who support a short-term extension of three months. And House Speaker John Boehner has signaled his willingness to consider an extension, provided it’s offset with further cuts to spending.

The problem is that Congress has just passed an agreement that maintains most sequester cuts, and congressional Democrats are unlikely to sign on to another round of deficit reduction, just as Republicans are loath to consider new spending.

If the long-term unemployed have anything on their side, it’s that extending benefits is popular with the public, with 55 percent in favor and 33 percent opposed, according to a recent survey (PDF) commissioned by the National Employment Law Project. Likewise, Public Policy Polling—a Democratic firm—found that in four GOP swing districts, large bipartisan majorities supported an extension. In some areas, in fact, local news outlets are hitting Republicans hard for their resistance to renewing emergency unemployment insurance.

There’s a chance that this pressure will work to move a few GOP lawmakers to the “yes” camp, providing votes to help the unemployed. But, as we saw throughout 2013, you’re almost certain to lose if you bet on Republicans to do the right thing.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico is politically divisive despite supporters

Wilson 13 – Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International. Center for Scholars (Christopher E., January, “A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region,” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new\_ideas\_us\_mexico\_relations.pdf)

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing renaissance is underway in North America and bilateral trade is booming, the United States and Mexico have an important choice to make: sit back and reap the moderate and perhaps temporal benefits coming naturally from the evolving global context , or implement a robust agenda to improve the competitiveness of North America for the long term . Given that job creation and economic growth in both the United States and Mexico are at stake, the choice should be simple, but a limited understanding about the magnitude, nature and depth of the U.S.-Mexico economic relationship among the public and many policymakers has made serious action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.

#### Capital is key to passage – prevents economic collapse

AP 12/28 [“1.3 million are losing unemployment benefits Saturday morning,” http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/million-are-losing-unemployment-benefits-saturday-morning/article\_9d1b52ec-6f81-11e3-9033-10604b9f6eda.html?comments=focus]

WASHINGTON — More than 1 million Americans are bracing for a harrowing, post-Christmas jolt as extended federal unemployment benefits come to a sudden halt this weekend, with potentially significant implications for the recovering U.S. economy. A tense political battle likely looms when Congress reconvenes in the new, midterm election year.¶ Nudging Congress along, a vacationing President Barack Obama called two senators proposing an extension to offer his support. From Hawaii, Obama pledged yesterdayto push Congress to move quickly next year to address the "urgent economic priority," the White House said.¶ For families dependent on cash assistance, the end of the federal government's "emergency unemployment compensation" will mean some difficult belt-tightening as enrollees lose their average monthly stipend of $1,166.¶ Jobless rates could drop, but analysts say the economy might suffer with less money for consumers to spend on everything from clothes to cars. Having let the "emergency" program expire as part of a budget deal, it's unclear if Congress has the appetite to start it anew.¶ An estimated 1.3 million people will be cut off when the federally funded unemployment payments end today.¶ Started under President George W. Bush, the benefits were designed as a cushion for the millions of U.S. citizens who lost their jobs in a recession and failed to find new ones while receiving state jobless benefits, which in most states expire after six months. Another 1.9 million people across the country are expected to exhaust their state benefits before the end of June.¶ The Obama administration says those payments have kept 11.4 million people out of poverty and benefited almost 17 million children. The cost of them since 2008 has totaled $225 billion.

#### Nuclear war

Harris and Burrows ‘9

(Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>, AM)

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.
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#### US-Mexico trade is the prime example of neoliberalism – spills over to other countries

MSN No Date – Mexico Solidarity Network; “Mexico - A neoliberal experiment”; <http://www.mexicosolidarity.org/programs/alternativeeconomy/neoliberalism>

The United States and Mexico have been central to the development of the neoliberal model. We share a 2,000 mile border, the only place in the world where the Global North meets the South. The US-Mexico border is unique, and the relationship between the two nations is equally unique.

In many ways, this geographic marriage represents the most important relationship in the world - a laboratory that is defining the neoliberal model. Three historical markers stand out as central to the development of neoliberalism: the establishment of free trade zones and maquiladoras in 1965, Structural Adjustment Programs initiated by the International Monetary Fund in 1982, and the signing of the North America Free Trade Agreement in 1994.

The US-Mexico relationship has been the proving ground for the practical realities of the Washington consensus: production-for-export replacing production for internal consumption, the use of debt as a lever to force structural adjustment programs, loose investment rules that allow hot money to cross borders in seconds, and a trade agreement (read NAFTA) that is the model for a new legal framework that expands the rights of corporations at the expense of civil society.

Experiments that "work," from the perspective of transnational capital (and all of the above-mentioned experiments "worked") are exported to other countries. This implies a complete restructuring of the economies, politics and cultures around the world, to make them consistent with the neoliberal vision. Nearly everything is on the table for reform: economic policy, public subsidies, social programs, industrial policy, government procurement, intellectual property rights, patents, banking and financial services, agricultural policy, foreign direct investment, energy policy, labor regulations, environmental protection, public education and health care - and the list goes on. Twenty-first century neoliberalism is a project for world domination, and the US and Mexico are at the center of the vortex.

#### Global movements against neoliberal hegemony are emerging now and will be effective – the plan’s consolidation of U.S.-driven economic orthodoxy collapses democracy, causes resource wars, environmental collapse, and extinction

Vandana Shiva 12, founder of the Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology, Ph.D. in Philosophy from the University of Western Ontario, chairs the Commission on the Future of Food set up by the Region of Tuscany in Italy and is a member of the Scientific Committee which advises President Zapatero of Spain, March 1, 2012, “Imposed Austerity vs Chosen Simplicity: Who Will Pay For Which Adjustments?,” online: http://www.ethicalmarkets.com/2012/03/01/imposed-austerity-vs-chosen-simplicity-who-will-pay-for-which-adjustments/

The dominant economic model based on limitless growth on a limited planet is leading to an overshoot of the human use of the earth’s resources. This is leading to an ecological catastrophe. It is also leading to intense and violent resource grab of the remaining resources of the earth by the rich from the poor. The resource grab is an adjustment by the rich and powerful to a shrinking resource base – land, biodiversity, water – without adjusting the old resource intensive, limitless growth paradigm to the new reality. Its only outcome can be ecological scarcity for the poor in the short term, with deepening poverty and deprivation. In the long run it means the extinction of our species, as climate catastrophe and extinction of other species makes the planet un-inhabitable for human societies. Failure to make an ecological adjustment to planetary limits and ecological justice is a threat to human survival. The Green Economy being pushed at Rio +20 could well become the biggest resource grabs in human history with corporations appropriating the planet’s green wealth, the biodiversity, to become the green oil to make bio-fuel, energy plastics, chemicals – everything that the petrochemical era based on fossil fuels gave us. Movements worldwide have started to say “No to the Green Economy of the 1%”.

But an ecological adjustment is possible, and is happening. This ecological adjustment involves seeing ourselves as a part of the fragile ecological web, not outside and above it, immune from the ecological consequences of our actions. Ecological adjustment also implies that we see ourselves as members of the earth community, sharing the earth’s resources equitably with all species and within the human community. Ecological adjustment requires an end to resource grab, and the privatization of our land, bio diversity and seeds, water and atmosphere. Ecological adjustment is based on the recovery of the commons and the creation of Earth Democracy.

The dominant economic model based on resource monopolies and the rule of an oligarchy is not just in conflict with ecological limits of the planet. It is in conflict with the principles of democracy, and governance by the people, of the people, for the people. The adjustment from the oligarchy is to further strangle democracy and crush civil liberties and people’s freedom. Bharti Mittal’s statement that politics should not interfere with the economy reflects the mindset of the oligarchy that democracy can be done away with. This anti-democratic adjustment includes laws like homeland security in U.S., and multiple security laws in India.

The calls for a democratic adjustment from below are witnessed worldwide in the rise of non-violent protests, from the Arab spring to the American autumn of “Occupy” and the Russian winter challenging the hijack of elections and electoral democracy.

And these movements for democratic adjustment are also rising everywhere in response to the “austerity” programmes imposed by IMF, World Bank and financial institutions which created the financial crisis. The Third World had its structural Adjustment and Forced Austerity, through the 1980s and 1990s, leading to IMF riots. India’s structural adjustment of 1991 has given us the agrarian crisis with quarter million farmer suicides and food crisis pushing every 4th Indian to hunger and every 2nd Indian child to severe malnutrition; people are paying with their very lives for adjustment imposed by the World Bank/IMF. The trade liberalization reforms dismantled our food security system, based on universal PDS. It opened up the seed sector to seed MNCs. And now an attempt is being made through the Food Security Act to make our public feeding programmes a market for food MNCs. The forced austerity continues through imposition of so called reforms, such as Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in retail, which would rob 50 million of their livelihoods in retail and millions more by changing the production system. Europe started having its forced austerity in 2010. And everywhere there are anti-austerity protests from U.K., to Italy, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Iceland, and Portugal. The banks which have created the crisis want society to adjust by destroying jobs and livelihoods, pensions and social security, public services and the commons. The people want financial systems to adjust to the limits set by nature, social justice and democracy. And the precariousness of the living conditions of the 99% has created a new class which Guy Standing calls the “Precariate”. If the Industrial Revolution gave us the industrial working class, the proletariat, globalization and the “free market” which is destroying the livelihoods of peasants in India and China through land grabs, or the chances of economic security for the young in what were the rich industrialized countries, has created a global class of the precarious. As Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich have written in “The making of the American 99%”, this new class of the dispossessed and excluded include “middle class professional, factory workers, truck drivers, and nurses as well as the much poorer people who clean the houses, manicure the fingernails, and maintain the lawn of the affluent”.

Forced austerity based on the old paradigm allows the 1% super rich, the oligarchs, to grab the planets resources while pushing out the 99% from access to resources, livelihoods, jobs and any form of freedom, democracy and economic security. It is often said that with increasing growth, India and China are replicating the resource intensive and wasteful lifestyles of the Western countries. The reality is that while a small 3 to 4% of India is joining the mad race for consuming the earth with more and more automobiles and air conditioners, the large majority of India is being pushed into “de-consumption” – losing their entitlements to basic needs of food and water because of resource and land grab, market grab, and destruction of livelihoods. The hunger and malnutrition crisis in India is an example of the “de-consumption” forced on the poor by the rich, through the imposed austerity built into the trade liberalization and “economic reform” policies.

There is another paradigm emerging which is shared by Gandhi and the new movements of the 99%, the paradigm of voluntary simplicity of reducing one ecological foot print while increasing human well being for all. Instead of forced austerity that helps the rich become super rich, the powerful become totalitarian, chosen simplicity enables us all to adjust ecologically, to reduce over consumption of the planets resources, it allows us to adjust socially to enhance democracy and it creates a path for economic adjustment based on justice and equity.

Forced austerity makes the poor and working families pay for the excesses of limitless greed and accumulation by the super rich. Chosen simplicity stops these excesses and allow us to flower into an Earth Democracy where the rights and freedoms of all species and all people are protected and respected.

#### The alternative is to vote negative to endorse a radical break from neoliberal market society

Giroux 9/25/13

Henry, currently holds the Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department and a Distinguished Visiting Professorship at Ryerson University, “Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares”

Right-wing market fundamentalists want to root out those considered defective consumers and citizens, along with allegedly unpatriotic dissidents. They also want to punish the poor and remove their children from the possibility of a quality public education. Hence, they develop schools that are dead zones of the imagination for most children and highly creative classroom environments free of the frenzy of empiricism and test-taking for the children of the rich. It gets worse. In Pennsylvania, right-wing Gov. Tom Corbett and Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter are intent on destroying the public school system. Instead of funding public schools, Corbett and Nutter are intent on crushing the teachers union and supporting vouchers and charter schools. They also are fond of claiming that money can’t help struggling public schools as a pretext for closing more than 23 schools “while building a $400 million state prison.”[xv] As Aaron Kase reports, “Things have gotten so bad that at least one school has asked parents to chip in $613 per student just so they can open with adequate services, which, if it becomes the norm, effectively defeats the purpose of equitable public education, and is entirely unreasonable to expect from the city’s poorer neighborhoods.”[xvi] Vouchers and under-regulated charter schools have become the unapologetic face of a vicious form of casino capitalism waging war on the imagination while imposing a range of harsh and punitive disciplinary methods on teachers and students, particularly low-income and poor white minorities.[xvii] The vast stores of knowledge and human creativity needed by young people to face a range of social, economic and political problems in the future are not simply being deferred, they are **being systematically destroyed.** When the emancipatory potential of education does emerge, it is often couched in the deadening discourse of establishing comfort zones in classrooms as a way of eliminating any pedagogy that provokes, unsettles or educates students to think critically. Critical knowledge and pedagogy are now judged as viable only to the degree that they do not make a student uncomfortable. There is more at stake here than the death of the imagination; there is also the elimination of those modes of **agency that make a democracy possible**. In the face of such cruel injustices, neoliberalism remains mute, disdaining democratic politics by claiming there are no alternatives to casino capitalism. Power in the United States has been uprooted from any respect for public value, the common good and democratic politics. This is not only visible in the fact that 1 percent of the population now owns 40 percent of the nation’s wealth or took home “more than half of the nation’s income,” it is also evident in a culture that normalizes, legitimates and thrives in a politics of humiliation, cruelty, racism and class discrimination.[xviii] Political, moral and economic foundations float free of constraints. Moral and social responsibilities are unmoored, free from any sense of responsibility or accountability in a permanent war state. Repression is now the dominant mantra for all of society. As Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyons point out, the American public has been turned into “security addicts,” ingesting mistrust, suspicion and fear as the new common sense for a security state that seems intent on causing the death of everything that matters in a democracy.[xix] The surveillance state works hard to not only monitor our phone conversations or track our Internet communication but to turn us into consumers, ratchet up the desire to be watched, and enforce new registers of social exclusion between those inside and outside the official temples of consumerism, social rights and captainship itself. Confining, excluding and vigilantism is one register of the new face of authoritarianism in the US. As America enters a historical era dominated by an authoritarian repressive state, the refugee camp as a symbol of exclusion and suffering is everywhere, visible in the material encampments for the homeless, urban ghettoes, jails, detention centers for young people, and in the tents propping up alongside highways that hold the new refugees from the suburbs who have lost their jobs, homes and dignity. The refugee camp also has become a metaphor for those who question authority, because they are increasingly rendered stateless, useless and undesirable. Critical thought is now considered dangerous, discomforting and subject to government prosecution, as is evident in the war being waged against whistleblowers in the name of national (in)security.[xx] The technologies of smart missiles hunt down those considered enemies of the United States, removing the ethical imagination from the horror of the violence it inflicts while solidifying the “victory of technology over ethics.”[xxi] Sorting out populations based on wealth, race, the ability to consume and immigration status is the new face of America. The **pathologies of inequality have come home to roost in America**.[xxii] Moreover, as suffering increases among vast swaths of the population, the corporate elite and rich use the proliferating crises to extract more wealth, profits and resources.[xxiii] Crises become the new rationale for destroying the ideologies, values and institutions that give power to the social contract. [xxiv] The ethos of rabid individualism, hyper-masculinity and a survival-of-the-fittest ethic **has created a society of throwaways** of both goods and people. The savage ethic of economic Darwinism also drives the stories we now tell about ourselves. The state of collective unconsciousness that haunts America has its deepest roots not only in the writings of Friedrich Hyek, Ayn Rand, Milton Friedman and other neoliberal philosophers but also in the increasing merging power of private-sector corporations that, as John Ralston Saul has argued, has its roots in the “anti-democratic underpinnings of Fascist Italy in particular, but also of Nazi Germany.”[xxv] Today this “corporatism [is] so strong it that it has taken the guts out of much of daily democratic life.”[xxvi] Combined with the power of the national surveillance state, it is fair to say, again quoting Saul, that “corporatism, with all of the problems attached to it, is digging itself ever deeper into our society, undermining our society.”[xxvii] Clearly, those words echoed a few years ago were not only prescient but vastly underestimated the growing authoritarianism in the United States, in particular. We now live in a society in which leadership has been usurped by models of **corporate management**, self-interest has triumphed over the ethical imagination, and a respect for others is discarded for the crude instrumental goal of accumulating capital, regardless of the social costs. Intellectuals in too many public spheres have become either dysfunctional or they have sold out. Higher education is no longer the city on the hill. Instead it has become a corporate boardroom/factory in which Bill Gates wannabes govern the university as if it were an outpost of Wall Street. Outside of the boardrooms, intellectual violence prevails aimed largely at faculty and students, who are reduced to either grant writers or consumers. To make matters worse academic knowledge is drowning in firewalls of obtuseness, creating a world of dysfunctional intellectuals, at least those who have tenure. Those who don’t have such security are tied to the harsh rhythm and rituals of contingent subaltern labor and barely make enough money to be able to pay their rent or mounting debts - never mind engage in teaching critically and creatively while writing as a sustained act of dissent. At the same time, the wider culture is sinking under a flood of consumer and celebrity idiocy. There are some who suggest that such critiques of the growing authoritarianism and repression in American society are useless and in the long run do nothing more than reinforce a crippling dystopianism. I think this line of argument is not only wrong but **complicitous** with the very problems it refuses to acknowledge. From a left suffocating in cynicism, there is the argument that people are already aware of these problems, as if neoliberal hegemony does not exist and that its success in building a consensus around its ideology as a mode of common sense is passé. At the same time, liberals detest such criticism because it calls into question the totality of American politics rather than focus on **one issue** and gestures toward a radical restructuring of American society rather than **piecemeal** and useless **reforms**. The call for such a restructuring rather than piecemeal reforms sends liberals into fits of hysteria. Of course, the right in all of its varieties views criticism as a virus that destroys everything they admire about America - a society in which democracy has been eviscerated and largely benefits the top ten percent of the population. Most importantly, the banality of evil lies less in the humdrum cruelty of everyday relations but in its normalization, the depolicitizaton of culture, and, at the present moment, in the reproduction of a neoliberal society that eradicates any vestige of public values, the ethical imagination, social responsibility, civic education and democratic social relations. The enemy is not a market economy but a market society and the breakdown of all forms of social solidarity that inform democratic politics and the cultural, political and economic institutions that make it possible. The authoritarianism that now shapes American society is not a matter of fate but one rooted in organized struggle and a vision built on the recognition that there are always alternatives to the existing order that speak to the promise of a **democracy to come**. The contradictions of neoliberalism are unraveling, but the consensus that informs it is alive and well. And it is at that level of educational intervention that the war against market authoritarianism in all of its diverse forms has to be fought first. Commonsense has become the enemy of critical thought. Hope is no longer part of the discourse of the left, only a dreary sense of despair with no vision of how to imagine a radical democracy. Manufactured ignorance has become a virtue instead of a liability in a society ruled by the financial elite. And as such we have no serious crisis of ideas. Instead, we have a crisis of power relations and structures that needs a new political language if it is to be contested at the level of both a pedagogical and political struggle. The current neoliberal drive to ruthlessly extend the never-ending task of accumulating capital is matched only by its ruthless determination to produce a notion of common sense that reinforces the idea that **there is no way to think beyond the present system**. The American public needs to break the authoritarian dysimagination machine that affirms everyone as a consumer and reduces freedom to unchecked self-interest while reproducing subjects who are willingly complicit with the plundering of the environment, resources and public goods by the financial elite. Class and racial warfare are alive and well in the United States. In fact, racism and the class warfare waged by right-wing politicians, bankers, hedge fund managers and the corporate rich are intensifying. Americans need to reject a politics in which public goods are demonized and eradicated, African-American youths become the fodder for wars abroad and the military-prison-industrial complex, the underclass disappears, public servants are disparaged, youths vanish into debt and despair, and the middle class passes into oblivion. While politics must be connected to its material moorings, it is not enough to imagine a different future than the one that now hangs over us like a suffocating sandstorm. Those intellectuals, workers, young people, artists and others committed to a radical democracy need to develop a new vocabulary about how to think about the meaning of politics, human agency and the building of a formative culture through which organized collective struggles can develop in the effort to imagine a new and more democratic future.

## Modelling

#### Embargo is an alt cause to relations

Brinkley ‘12 (Joel Brinkley- professor of journalism at Stanford University, is a Pulitzer Prize-winning former foreign correspondent for The New York Times; “Cuba embargo isn't working but isn't going away”; 12/18/12; http://www.politico.com/story/2012/12/cuba-embargo-isnt-working-but-isnt-going-away-85281.html)

America’s embargo on Cuba began its 53rd year this fall, and it’s hard to find anyone who thinks it’s working. Even Cuban-Americans who hate the Castro brothers and fervently insist that the embargo remain in place generally agree that it has accomplished little, if anything.¶ Still, said Jaime Suchlicki, a Cuban émigré who is the director of the Cuba Transition Project at the University of Miami, “do you give away a policy that has been in place for 50 years, whether you think it’s right or wrong, good or bad, effective or not — for nothing? Without a quid pro quo from Cuba?”¶ Suchlicki came to the United States in the first wave of Cuban refugees in 1960 after the communist revolution. His hardline views mirror those of many in his generation. And for decades, it dominated the Cuba discussion in Florida, a state presidential candidates have long believed they need to win to be elected.¶ But today the Cuban-American population is more diverse, as the U.S. presidential election last month showed. Previously, Cuban-Americans regularly voted in favor of Republicans, who are generally staunch embargo supporters, by 4 to 1. This time, President Barack Obama won half their vote.¶ Now an argument can be made that if the half-century of political paralysis on this issue can be overcome, both Cuba and the United States would benefit. American tourists would most likely pour into Cuba, buying cigars, staying in beachfront hotels — spending money in the Cuban economy. And American businesses would find an eager new market for a range of products beyond the food and medicine they are already authorized to sell.¶ “We cannot afford an obsolete ideological war against Cuba,” Richard Slatta, a history professor at North Carolina State University who specializes in Latin America, wrote in an op-ed last month. “The embargo against Cuba denies North Carolina businesses and farmers access to a major, proximate market.”¶ Cuba experts say many business leaders, particularly, are making the same case, especially now that the American economy has remained in the doldrums for so long. They add that it’s an obvious second-term issue; Obama doesn’t have to worry about winning Florida again.¶ But **for so many people in Washington, “Cuba doesn’t matter any more now,”** said Ted Piccone, deputy director for foreign policy at the Brookings Institution and a former National Security Council official. **“There’s no political incentive” to change the policy** — even though the arguments for changing it are rife. Despite ample provocation, the U.S. doesn’t impose similar embargoes on other authoritarian states.¶ Late last month, for example, Kazakhstan said it planned to shut down the last of its independent and opposition media, meaning “pluralism would quite simply cease to exist in this country,” Reporters Without Borders said in a news release. But has anyone talked about imposing an embargo there?¶ In September, Cambodia, one of the world’s most repressive nations, sentenced Mam Sonando, a 71-year-old radio station owner, to 20 years in jail for criticizing the government on air. He’d been broadcasting for decades. At about the same time, newspaper journalist Hang Serei Odom was found dead in the trunk of his car, hacked to death with an ax. He had been writing about illegal logging, a long-standing problem in Cambodia.¶ Despite that and much more, Obama visited Phnom Penh last month, attending an Association of Southeast Asian Nations conference. Has anyone in Washington advocated imposing an embargo there? Suchlicki said, “Maybe we should.”

#### Relations high now – US business involvement has meant a favorable opinion of the US by Latin Americans

Wilson 7-24-13 (Tim Wilson- freelance journalist for Near Shore America; “Despite Chavez and Snowden, Pro-U.S. Sentiment Grows in Latin America”; http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/chavez-snowden-latin-america-perceptions-us/)

This is a common phenomenon. The Pew Research Center, in tracking attitudes in Latin America’s two biggest economies, found that in 2012 69% of people in both Brazil and Mexico had a favorable attitude to American music, movies, and television. But when it comes to how Americans “do business”, only 43% of Mexicans and 45% of Brazilians had a favorable view. By contrast, the most recent data indicate that favorable views of the United States have experienced a significant boost: 73% for Brazilians (up from 61% in 2012), and 66% for Mexicans (up from 56% in 2012).¶ “You can see the change in U.S. favorability ratings in Mexico in our 2013 report,” Molly Rohal of the Pew Research Center tells Nearshore Americas. “We also have trend data in the Global Indicators Database.”¶ The trend is your friend¶ Specific to Latin America, the trend data is cause for optimism, given that Latin America is a young continent, and younger people have a more positive view of the U.S. In Brazil, for example, 78% of those between 18 to 29 years of age, and 72% of those between 30 to 49, had a positive view of US popular culture. In Mexico, the percentages were 79% and 70% respectively. And for those over 50 years of age? Only 55% of Brazilians had a positive view, and 57% of Mexicans.¶ But Latin America is more than Mexico and Brazil, and the greater region is experiencing an ideological divide between populist left leaning governments (Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Cuba, and Nicaragua) and neo-liberal regimes embracing market reforms (Colombia, Chile, and most of Central America). The populist governments like to ratchet up the anti-US rhetoric, echoing the Cold War divide when the United States supported many repressive right wing dictatorships.¶ The irony is that the overall perceptions are not that bad, and that the lower the economic engagement with the United States, the less favorable the view. This is interesting in that “business” scores low, suggesting that there is a more general challenge faced by the private sector, and not one that is specific to U.S. businesses. In fact, when U.S. business is involved**, the populace tends to have a positive view.**¶Consequently, **high-contact and business friendly governments** like Chile and El Salvador **have favorable views**, at 68% and 79%, respectively. By comparison, 55% of Bolivians see the U.S. in a favorable light. In Argentina – a country that makes a habit of rounding out the bottom of positive attitudes to the U.S. – only 41% of the population has a positive view of the U.S.¶ Other research has revealed that **Latin America, as a region, has a more positive view of the United States and her people than any other**. The tenth joint report by Americas Quarterly and Efecto Naím, for example, has indicated that popular support for the U.S. exists even in those countries that have populist regimes critical of the United States. And ongoing research from Latinobarómetro has shown that majorities in most Latin American countries have a positive view of the United States.¶ As with other research, Latinobarómetro has found that close economic and cultural ties build a positive experience. Trade, remittances, and investment – including in technology driven areas that involve a skilled workforce, such as Business Process and IT Outsourcing – can build goodwill.

#### Their relations card is from 94 – default to more recent ev to provide an accurate depiction of relations in the status quo

#### Countless alt causes to relations

Lobe ’12 (Jim Lobe- joined IPS in 1979 and opened its Washington, D.C. bureau in 1980, serving as bureau chief for most of the years since. He founded his popular blog dedicated to United Stated foreign policy in 2007. Jim is best known for his coverage of U.S. foreign policy for IPS, particularly the neo–conservative influence in the former George W. Bush administration. He has also written for Foreign Policy In Focus, AlterNet, The American Prospect and Tompaine.com, among numerous other outlets; has been featured in on-air interviews for various television news stations around the world, including Al Jazeera English; and was featured in BBC and ABC television documentaries about motivations for the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Jim has also lectured on U.S. foreign policy, neo-conservative ideology, the Bush administration and foreign policy and the U.S. mainstream media at various colleges and universities around the United States and world. A proud native of Seattle, Washington, Jim received a B.A. degree with highest honours in history at Williams College and a J.D. degree from the University of California at Berkeley’s Boalt Hall School of Law; “U.S., Latin America Growing More Distant, Warns Think Tank”; April 11, 2012; <http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/04/us-latin-america-growing-more-distant-warns-think-tank/>)

WASHINGTON, Apr 11 2012 (IPS) - Relations between the United States and Latin America have “grown more distant” in importance part due to the latter’s persistent disagreement with U.S. policies on immigration, drugs, and Cuba, according to a new report released here Wednesday on the eve of this year’s Summit of the Americas in Cartagena, Colombia. “The United States must regain credibility in the region by dealing seriously with an unfinished agenda of problems, including immigration, drugs, and Cuba – that stands in the way of a real partnership,” according to Michael Shifter, president of the Washington-based Inter-American Dialogue (IAD).¶ The [20-page report](http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReport%20FINAL.pdf), entitled “Remaking the Relationship”, described current inter-American relations as “generally cordial but lack(ing) in vigor and purpose”. It suggested that Washington, in particular, has failed to fully come to terms with Latin America’s strong economic and political progress over the past two decades.¶ It also concluded that the two sides “need to do more to exploit the enormous untapped opportunities of their relationship in economics, trade, and energy”, as well as to work more closely together on global and regional problems.¶ “They need to breathe new life and vigor into hemispheric relations,” it stressed.¶ “If the United States and Latin America do not make the effort now, the chance may slip away,” the report warned. “The most likely scenario then would be marked by a continued drift in their relationship, further deterioration of hemispheric-wide institutions, a reduced ability and willingness to deal with a range of common problems, and a spate of missed opportunities for more robust growth and greater social equity.”¶ Coming on the eve of the Cartagena Summit, where many of these same issues are expected to claim centre-stage, the report represents as much of a consensus of elite opinion in both Americas as can be found.¶ Washington’s 40-year-old drug war and its impacts on the region will be major agenda item as a result of an unprecedented push by Latin American leaders to use the forum to discuss alternative strategies that could reduce the level of violence associated with drug trafficking.¶ Most of IAD’s members endorsed the report; there was only one partial dissent – by a former Latin America aide in the George H.W. Bush administration who objected to the report’s suggestion that legalisation of some drugs or decriminalisation could offer viable alternative solutions to dealing with illicit drug trafficking and the violence associated with it in many Latin American countries.¶ Founded 30 years ago, IAD’s membership includes 100 prominent figures divided roughly evenly between U.S. nationals, including one former president (Jimmy Carter) and numerous former cabinet officials and lawmakers from both Democratic and Republican administrations, on the one hand, and leading personalities from Canada, the Caribbean, and Latin Americans, including Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Ricardo Lagos, and Ernesto Zedillo, and nine other former Latin American presidents, on the other.¶ IAD is co-chaired by former Chilean President Michelle Bachelet and former U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills.¶ In addition to leading politicians, members also include important business figures, heads of civil society organisations (CSOs), academics, and former top managers of multilateral or hemispheric organisations, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations, the Organisation of American States ([OAS](http://www.ipsnews.net/2012/04/us-latin-america-growing-more-distant-warns-think-tank/)), and the UN’s Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), among others.¶ Latin America’s recent advances in reducing poverty and inequality, consolidating democratic practices, and establishing promising new ties with countries like China and India contrasts favourably, according to the report, with Washington’s travails resulting from its wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the 2008 financial crisis, growing inequality and political gridlock.¶ As a result, “(m)ost countries of the (Latin American) region view the United States as less and less relevant to their needs – and with declining capacity to propose and carry out strategies to deal with the issues that most concern them,” it said.¶ Moreover, Washington’s failure to deal effectively with three longstanding irritants to inter-American relations – immigration, drug policy, and Cuba – has hardly helped, the report noted.¶ The report noted that Washington’s **failure to achieve meaningful immigration reform** – the result, to a great extent, of its increasingly divisive politics – “**is breeding resentment across the region**, nowhere more so than in …Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean.”¶ Recent signs that immigration from Mexico, in particular, has levelled off should, according to the report, offer an opportunity for U.S. policy makers to revise their views.¶ On drugs, the report called it “critical” that Washington respond to growing calls by Latin American leaders, most recently by Mexican President Felipe Calderon, Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos, and Guatemala’s new president, Otto Perez, to consider alternative strategies, such as regulated legalisation of marijuana and decriminalisation of mere possession of certain drugs.¶ The report endorsed similar conclusions reached by the 2009 Latin American Commission on Drugs and Democracy, which was chaired by Cardoso, Zedillo, and former Colombian President Cesar Gaviria.¶ It said these alternatives, as well as staunching “the flow of dangerous arms southward from the United States” by drug cartels and enhanced U.S. support for national efforts at rehabilitating and re- integrating criminals and other migrants repatriated by Washington to their home countries, should serve as a “starting point for an honest U.S.-Latin American dialogue on the drug question”.¶ On Cuba, the only country whose head of state, at Washington’s insistence, has not been invited to Cartegena, the report asserted that Washington’s 50-year-old embargo “has not worked and, in fact, may have been counter-productive, prolonging Cuba’s repressive rule rather than ending it.”¶ Washington, it said, “needs to do far more to dismantle its severe, outdated constraints on normalized relations with Cuba,” while its “authoritarian regime” should be urged by its Latin and Caribbean neighbours to institute democratic reform.¶ On the more positive side, the report said “expanded trade, investment and energy cooperation offer the greatest promise for robust U.S.-Latin American relations” and that “intensive economic engagement by the United States may be the best foundation for wider partnerships across many issues as well as the best way to energize currently listless U.S. relations with the region.”¶ While the U.S. share of the Latin American market has diminished in recent years, its exports – now greater in value than its exports to Europe – have been growing “at an impressive pace”.¶ The report noted that the ratification of long-pending free trade accords with Colombia and Panama offer a good start, but that Washington should also seek a “broader framework for U.S. economic relations with Latin America,” despite the failure of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) to gain any traction.¶ The growing global influence of Latin America, particularly Brazil and Mexico, also calls for greater cooperation and consultation with the region’s leaders on global issues, including nuclear non- proliferation and climate change, according to the report.¶ It also commended Washington for its accommodation of new regional institutions, such as UNASUR, that currently exclude the U.S., but also suggested the two sides also focus in reforming the hemisphere’s oldest regional grouping, the Organisation of American States, particularly given its importance in establishing democratic norms.

#### Eurozone collapse now

Leo **McKinstry**, Express, staff writer, **9/15/**11, IF IT WASN’T FOR THE EU, EUROPE WOULD BE DOING JUST FINE, <http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/271322/If-it-wasn-t-for-the-EU-Europe-would-be-doing-just-fine/>

THE eurozone increasingly resembles a suicide pact rather than an economic bloc.

Weighed down by gargantuan debts and gripped by a loss of credibility the single currency is accelerating towards a **terminal crisis**. Among Europe’s leaders, now locked in endless emergency talks, there is a sense of panic. With Greece on the verge of a default the contagion of insolvency could spread to other countries such as Ireland, Spain and Italy, bringing down the entire eurozone.

This shambles, which has already destroyed the jobs and savings of millions, was manufactured by Europe’s politicians and bureaucrats. For it was the arrogance of the EU’s ruling elite which drove the creation of the single currency. We were told it would bring a new era of prosperity to Europe by imposing financial stability, opening up markets and improving co-operation. Just the opposite has happened.

The euro has led to unprecedented debts and dole queues, credit bubbles and market chaos. Yet this was always inevitable. It was absurd to pretend that the hugely different economies of the 17 eurozone member states could be successfully joined together.

A single interest rate could not suit nations as divergent as Germany, with its powerful manufacturing base, and Greece, with its reliance on shipping and tourism. Far from encouraging fiscal discipline the single currency promoted a mood of irresponsibility because nations were no longer in charge of their own affairs. This was reflected not only in massive state spending binges throughout Europe but also in destructive property speculation in Ireland and Spain.

Everyone in the EU is now paying a terrible price for this folly. In Britain, though we avoided membership of the euro, we still have to underwrite the mammoth European bailouts while our high street banks are horribly exposed to European debts. According to some estimates the total exposure could be as high as £286billion. The eurozone has been a catastrophe because it was always a political project rather than an economic one.

#### The aff can’t solve—its intractable

Soros, 11

George F'n Soros, October 2011, Does the Euro Have a Future?, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2011/oct/13/does-euro-have-future/>

Unfortunately the euro crisis is more intractable. In 2008 the US financial authorities that were needed to respond to the crisis were in place; at present in the eurozone one of these authorities, the common treasury, has yet to be brought into existence. This requires a political process involving a number of sovereign states. That is what has made the problem so severe. The political will to create a common European treasury was absent in the first place; and since the time when the euro was created the political cohesion of the European Union has greatly deteriorated. As a result **there is no** clearly visible **solution to the euro crisis**. In its absence the authorities have been trying to buy time.
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## Aging

#### Aging makes heg sustainable

Robert J **Lieber 9**, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University, “Persistent primacy and the future of the American era”, International Politics. The Hague: Mar 2009. Vol. 46, Iss. 2-3; pg. 119, 21 pgs

Demography also works to the advantage of the United States. Most other powerful states, including China and Russia as well as Germany and Japan, face the significant aging of their populations. Although the United States needs to finance the costs of an aging population, this demographic shift is occurring to a lesser extent and more slowly than among its competitors. Mark Haas argues that these factors in global aging 'will be a potent force for the continuation of US power dominance, both economic and military' (Haas, 2007, p. 113). Finally, the United States benefits from two other unique attributes, flexibility and adaptability. Time and again, America has faced daunting challenges and made mistakes, yet it has possessed the inventiveness and societal flexibility to adjust and respond successfully. Despite obvious problems, not least the global financial crisis, there is reason to believe that America's adaptive capacity will allow it to respond to future requirements and threats. None of this assures the maintenance of its world role, but the domestic underpinnings to support this engagement remain relatively robust. Thus for the foreseeable future, US primacy is likely to be sustainable. America's own national interest - and the fortunes of a global liberal democratic order - depend on it.

#### They don’t have a normative solvency advocate – the Haas evidence just says that baby boomers live in Mexico now

#### And, it stops Chinese and Russian military modernization

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

Population aging in the great powers will be a potent force for the prolongation of U.S. power dominance in the twenty-ªrst century for three principal reasons. First, the massive costs and probable slowdowns in economic growth created by aging populations will inhibit the other major powers from increasing military expenditures anywhere close to matching U.S. defense spending; these factors are even likely to push many of these states to reduce their military expenditures from current levels. Second, with aging populations and shrinking workforces, the other great powers will have to spend increasing percentages of their defense budgets on personnel costs and military pensions In 2005 the United States spent more than $478 billion on defense. This ªgure was nearly $290 billion more than the next largest military spender (China), and roughly equal to the combined military spending of China, France, India, Japan, Russia, and the United Kingdom.45 Global aging significantly decreases the likelihood of potential competitors closing this huge spending gap. The principal contention of this section is that there is likely to be a strong negative relationship between the magnitude of a state’s aging crisis (the independent variable) and the level of its military expenditures (the dependent variable).With aging populations, governments will be under such pressure to pay for massive new expenditures for the elderly (and most likely in the context of slowing economic growth) that all other discretionary spending will likely be affected. High levels of aging crisis, at a minimum, are likely to be a powerful force inhibiting states from significantly increasing defense spending and, at a maximum, will tend to result in reductions in existing levels of military expenditures.46

#### Demo argument is written by Americans living in Mexico – clearly biased and doesn’t have a warrant

#### Chinese modernization destroys heg

Friedberg, 2009

Aaron Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, Sep-Oct 2009, “Menace,” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/greatdebate/dragons/menace-3818>

FAST-FORWARD to the present. America's ability to project power into the western Pacific, once unchallenged, is now threatened by the maturation of what Pentagon planners refer to as China's "anti-access/area-denial" strategy. The goal here is not to match the Americans ship-for-ship and plane-for-plane but rather to develop certain specialized capabilities designed to make it difficult, if not impossible, for U.S. forces to operate freely anywhere close to China's coasts. In the past decade, Beijing has made considerable progress toward achieving this goal. Every one of the relative handful of bases on which the United States relies to sustain its presence in East Asia will soon be within range of bombardment by repeated salvos of precisely targeted Chinese conventional ballistic and cruise missiles. At the same time, the PLA is in the process of knitting together a network of satellites, onshore radars and other sensors that will permit it to locate and track an enemy's surface ships hundreds of miles off its coasts and then use a combination of torpedoes, high-speed cruise missiles and land-based ballistic missiles to sink or disable them. America's huge and costly aircraft carriers are the key to its global power-projection capabilities. In a future crisis, Washington might have little choice but to pull them far back from China's coasts, well beyond the effective range of their aircraft. This would dramatically reduce their ability to provide air defense for U.S. friends or to conduct strikes against Chinese forces on land or at sea. In addition to these more direct modes of attack, the PLA is experimenting with antisatellite weapons and techniques for taking down an enemy's computer networks, thereby rendering him deaf and blind during the critical opening phases of a war. On the defensive side of the equation, the PLA Navy (PLAN) is turning out attack submarines at a record pace and developing sophisticated undersea mines; it is in the process of completing a massive new submarine base adjacent to the South China Sea, and has reportedly begun to deploy an undersea detection system that would aid it in engaging U.S. submarines operating off its shores. Finally, China is investing heavily in "passive defenses" (hiding or hardening critical facilities) and in advanced radars and surface-to-air missiles, including some that may be effective against "stealthy" Western aircraft and cruise missiles. THIS COMBINATION of rapidly advancing offensive and defensive capabilities is beginning to raise doubts in the region about America's ability to defend its allies and project its power. What is worse, over the next several years there will be an increasing danger that, in an extreme crisis, China's leaders might believe that they have a chance of starting a war by effectively knocking the United States out of the western Pacific and blunting its initial, retaliatory response, all without striking the American homeland and without the need to fire a single nuclear weapon. If it were successful, such an attack would leave a president with some agonizing choices. Much as during the cold war, if faced with the possibility of a quick conventional defeat in Western Europe, American decision makers would have to contemplate the use of nuclear weapons. But, as was true then, the plausibility of escalatory threats will diminish as the probability of retaliation rises. Beijing is fast approaching the point where it will have a secure second-strike force capable of dealing a devastating blow no matter how hard the United States might try to prevent it. As risky as an American attack on Chinese nuclear forces, ports, airfields and communications centers would be today, it will be considerably more so a few years from now. Beijing is in the process of deploying intercontinental-range ballistic missiles (ICBMs) that will be far less vulnerable than their predecessors. In addition to its small force of fixed, single-warhead ICBMs, over the next few years China will place in service several dozen hard-to-locate road-mobile and submarine-launched missiles, each capable of striking the United States with multiple warheads. OF COURSE, there are alternatives to the nightmare of nuclear war. If Washington chose not to use nuclear weapons, it might respond to a Chinese attack by engaging in "horizontal escalation," hitting back at another location where the opponent is vulnerable and U.S. forces still enjoy an overwhelming advantage. The most obvious way to do this, though perhaps not the only one, would be to use America's global naval strength and airpower to cut China off from the sea. This is an arena of military competition in which the United States maintains overwhelming superiority. While the PLAN may be able to contest control of its immediate coastal waters, its capabilities fall off rapidly with distance. If the United States wanted tomorrow to constrict China's maritime access to oil, minerals and markets, there would be very little Beijing could do in direct response. Chinese strategists are acutely aware of this potential vulnerability and they are hard at work on a variety of projects which, taken together, may help to mitigate the danger. Included among these are: a strategic petroleum reserve; transcontinental pipelines to Russia and Central Asia; the pursuit of undersea resources close to China's coasts; new transportation routes through Southeast Asia that would permit oil and gas from the Middle East to bypass the narrow straits off Indonesia; the construction of ports and airfields in Myanmar and Pakistan that could be used in an emergency by a future Chinese air and naval "rapid-deployment force"; a deepening strategic relationship with Iran that could provide a bridgehead to the Persian Gulf; and the development of aircraft carriers and long-range nuclear-powered attack submarines, and the construction of large numbers of diesel subs, which will give the PLAN some capacity to defend China's sea-lanes and perhaps to attack the shipping of its rivals. If produced in sufficient numbers, the same antiship ballistic missiles (ASBM) that will soon threaten American aircraft carriers could also be used against commercial vessels. Using a combination of missiles and submarines, Beijing might be able to impose a blockade of its own on key American allies like Japan, perhaps weakening its will to stay in the fight or, better yet, dissuading it from ever joining with the United States in the first place. AMERICA'S INFLUENCE in and access to Asia will be drastically reduced, with harmful long-term consequences for its security, prosperity and ability to promote the spread of liberal democracy, if it is seen to be in long-term decline relative to China or, even worse, if it appears irresolute, incompetent, unwilling or simply unable to fulfill its commitments. Other governments will then have no choice but to reconsider their national strategies either by developing their own nuclear capabilities or-worse-by bandwagoning with Beijing.

#### Feffer evidence is terrible – it’s three lines and doesn’t isolate a single problem to be overcome

#### No impact – aging prevents great power war

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

Second, global aging increases the likelihood of continued peaceful relations between the United States and the other great powers. Studies have shown that the probability of international conflict grows when either the dominant country anticipates a power transition in favor of a rising state or states, or when such a transition actually takes place.7 By adding substantial support to the continuation of U.S. hegemony, global aging works against either outcome from transpiring. An aging world therefore decreases the probability that either hot or cold wars will develop between the United States and the other great powers.

#### No disease extinction

Malcolm **Gladwell**, writer for The New Yorker and best-selling author The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 19**95**, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, 1999, p. 31-32

Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adapt a specific strategy but every strategy carries a corresponding cost and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all hut halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability its essential rigidity is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. AIDS is almost invariably lethal because it attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. Viruses are not superhuman. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flue, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms.

#### Burn out

Joshua **Lederberg**, professor of genetics at Stanford University School of Medicine, 19**99**, Epidemic: The World of Infectious Disease, p. 13

The toll of the fourteenth-century plague, the "Black Death," was closer to one third. If the bugs' potential to develop adaptations that could kill us off were the whole story, we would not be here. However, with very rare exceptions, our microbial adversaries have a shared interest in our survival. Almost any pathogen comes to a dead end when we die; it first has to communicate itself to another host in order to survive. So historically, the really severe host- pathogen interactions have resulted in a wipeout of both host and pathogen. We humans are still here because, so far, the pathogens that have attacked us have willy-nilly had an interest in our survival. This is a very delicate balance, and it is easily disturbed, often in the wake of large-scale ecological upsets.

#### New policies and Obama reforms solve global disease spread – including zoonoses

Dr. Fischer, lead research scientist in the Department of Health Policy at George Washington University, and Dr. Katz, associate professor in the Department of Health Policy at George Washington University, February 2013

(Julie and Rebecca, “Global Health Policy in the Second Obama Term,” http://csis.org/files/publication/130214\_Morrison\_GHTransitionVolume\_Web\_FINAL.pdf)

Engaging Health Actors to Support Security Priorities. The Obama administration’s 2010 National Security Strategy committed to building disease surveillance and response capabilities at home and abroad, in order **to detect**, **prevent**, **and contain outbreaks before they affect U.S. interests**.23 In 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton described the objectives for U.S. global health engagement in terms of development, diplomacy, and the need to “invest in global health to protect our nation’s security. To cite one example, the threat posed by the spread of disease in our interconnected world in which thousands of people every day step on a plane in one continent and step off in another. We need a **comprehensive, effective global system** for tracking health data, monitoring threats, and coordinating responses.”24 In 2011, an interagency working group under the National Security Staff developed the “Guidance and Principles for U.S. Government Departments and Agencies to Strengthen IHR Core Capacities Internationally.” President Obama indirectly referenced this strategy in his address to the UN General Assembly in September 2011, stating that “(t)o stop disease that spreads across borders, we must strengthen our system of public health…. And we must come together to prevent, and detect, and fight every kind of biological danger—whether it’s a pandemic like H1N1, or a terrorist threat, or a treatable disease.”25 The Obama administration followed this speech by urging other nations to join the United States in “pursuing a common vision where disease no longer threatens the security and prosperity of nations.”26 A 2011 Memorandum of Understanding with WHO affirmed “that WHO and the U.S. Government seek to establish guiding principles and a framework for collaboration on common goals in the area of global health security and in line with the principles set forth in the International Health Regulations.”27 **These priorities have** also **been increasingly reflected in the policies and programs of key health and development agencies**. HHS, which represents the United States in global health security actions undertaken with WHO, published its first Global Health Strategy in 2011. This included specific strategies “to protect and promote the health and well-being of Americans through global health action,” including working with other agencies and global partners “to enhance health security and **prevent the introduction**, **transmission and spread of infectious diseases** and other health threats within and across borders.”28 The Division of International Health Security in the office of the HHS Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response provides technical guidance and foreign assistance, particularly in IHR implementation, while the Office of Global Affairs coordinates HHS diplomatic and interagency policy and strategy in global health security. The Obama administration reorganized CDC’s global health functions under the new Center for Global Health, which published its own five-year global health strategy in 2012. Within CDC’s Center for Global Health, the Global Disease Detection and Emergency Response Division (GDD) plays a significant role in implementing this strategy through the **seven regional centers** it operates **with partner countries**, support for field epidemiology training programs, and technical assistance in public health surveillance, outbreak response, training, and research. In 2009, WHO designated GDD a Collaborating Center for Implementation of IHR National Surveillance and Response Capacity, recognizing GDD as a technical resource to support partner nation capacity-building.29 USAID’s global health programs generally assist partner countries in strengthening health systems and services. The USAID Emerging Pandemic Threats program launched in 2009 focuses specifically on strengthening capacities for **disease detection at the human-animal health interface**, **aiming to detect emerging infectious diseases in geographic** “**hotspots**” **before they cross into human populations**.

#### There will be no pandemic: humans adapt

Malcolm Gladwell, The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 1995, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, 1999, p. 29

In Plagues and Peoples, which appeared in 1977. William MeNeill pointed out that…while man’s efforts to “remodel” his environment are sometimes a source of new disease. They are seldom a source of serious epidemic disease. Quite the opposite. As humans and new microorganisms interact, they begin to accommodate each other. Human populations slowly build up resistance to circulating infections. What were once virulent infections, such as syphilis become attenuated. Over time, diseases of adults, such as measles and chicken pox, become limited to children, whose immune systems are still naïve.

#### Multiple alternate causalities

Jennifer Brower, science/technology policy analyst, and Peter Chalk, political scientist, Summer 2003, Rand Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, “Vectors Without Borders,” http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/summer2003/vectors.html

This year's outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Beijing, Hong Kong, Taipei, and Toronto is only one of the more recent examples of the challenge posed by infectious diseases. Highly resilient varieties of age-old ailments— as well as virulent emerging pathogens—are now prevalent throughout the world. These illnesses include cholera, pneumonia, malaria, and dysentery in the former case and Legionnaires' disease, acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), Ebola, and SARS in the latter. In the United States, West Nile virus entered New York in 2000 and then spread to 44 states by 2002, and monkeypox struck the Midwest this June. In the latter half of the 20th century, almost 30 new human diseases were identified. The spread of several of them has been expedited by the growth of antibiotic and drug resistance. Globalization, modern medical practices, urbanization, climate change, sexual promiscuity, intravenous drug use, and acts of bioterrorism further increase the likelihood that people will come into contact with potentially fatal diseases.
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#### China’s sphere of influence over Mexico high now – new agreements

Zeal ‘13– New, a reporter’s actual name, June 5, 2013, “The Encirclement Gathers Pace: China Enters Into a “Strategic Partnership” With Mexico,” http://beforeitsnews.com/opinion-conservative/2013/06/the-encirclement-gathers-pace-china-enters-into-a-strategic-partnership-with-mexico-2657822.html

Chinese President Xi Jinping and his Mexican counterpart Enrique Pena Nieto Tuesday announced to upgrade the bilateral relationship to a comprehensive strategic partnership. The Chinese president arrived in Mexico City earlier in the day for a three-day state visit aimed at lifting the China-Mexico strategic partnership to a higher level, and held talks with Pena Nieto on bilateral cooperation. During the talks, the two presidents agreed that strengthening the China-Mexico long-term friendly cooperation serves the fundamental interests of the two countries and two peoples, and helps promote unity and cooperation among developing countries. Xi said the decision to upgrade the bilateral relationship is a realistic requirement, and it also sets a clear target for the development of bilateral relations. Pena Nieto, for his part, said the upgrade of the Mexico-China ties indicates that bilateral cooperation has entered a new stage. The Mexican side is ready to work with China to constantly improve cooperation at higher levels and through more effective mechanisms so as to achieve common development, he said. The two heads of state agreed to push forward the China-Mexico comprehensive strategic partnership by working jointly in the following four aspects. Firstly, the two sides will view their relations from a strategic and long-term perspective and improve political mutual trust. The two countries will accommodate each other’s concerns, and show mutual understanding and support on issues concerning each other’s core interests. China and Mexico will maintain exchanges between high-level leaders, political parties and legislatures, give full play to the existing consultation and dialogue mechanisms, and improve coordination on each other’s development strategies. Secondly, the two sides will improve practical cooperation in accordance with their development strategies, and agree to increase mutual investment in key areas such as energy, mining, infrastructure and high technology. In order to promote trade balance, China supports the increase of imports from Mexico, while Mexico welcomes Chinese enterprises to invest here and promises to create favorable conditions for Chinese investors. Thirdly, as two major countries with rich cultural traditions, China and Mexico will improve cultural exchanges. Both countries will encourage more exchanges between art troupes, promote tourism and strengthen communication among students, academics, journalists and athletes. China will build a Chinese cultural center in Mexico City, the first in Latin America and the Caribbean, and Mexico will establish a Mexican cultural center in Beijing as well. Fourthly, China and Mexico will improve multilateral coordination based on their common interests and responsibilities on major international issues. The two countries will maintain close communication and coordination on global economic governance, energy security, food safety and climate change. They will help developing countries gain a bigger voice in the international community, and safeguard the common interests of the two countries and the developing nations. China and Mexico support the establishment of the China-Latin America forum and promote the overall cooperation between China and Latin America at a higher level. After their talks, Xi and Pena Nieto signed a joint statement between the two countries, witnessed the signing of a host of agreements and jointly met the press. Pena Nieto said at the ceremony that China has become a major global economic engine and an important balancing power in international relations. As two emerging powers, Mexico and China are each other’s important strategic cooperative partners, and the Mexican side is ready to forge closer ties with the Chinese side to achieve common development, the Mexican president said. China is ready to work with Mexico to constantly enrich the content of bilateral strategic partnership, promote mutually beneficial cooperation and contribute to world peace, stability and prosperity, he said. Xi said his visit to Mexico aims to deepen mutual trust, expand cooperation and enhance friendship. “I believe with our joint efforts, China-Mexico relations will enter a new stage,” he said. Latin America is rapidly becoming a Chinese sphere of influence. This latest development can only accelerate this unhealthy trend.

#### Chinese influence increasing – zero-sum with the US

Funaro ‘13 Breaking News writer in Los Angeles, “Xi flies to Mexico as China battles US for influence in Latin America,” Global Post, June 4, 2013 13:51, Online, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/asia-pacific/china/130604/xi-flies-mexico-china-battles-us-influence-latin-ame

Chinese President Xi Jinping is making the most of his four-country tour of the Americas to position China as a competitor to the US and Taiwan's economic influence in the region. Xi arrives in Mexico Tuesday for a three-day visit in which he and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto are expected to discuss their economic ties. The two nations are economic partners but also competitors, particularly when it comes to exports to the United States. Mexico and China both enjoy strong exports to the American market but Mexico itself has been flooded with cheap Chinese goods that are displacing domestic goods. "China is a complicated case" for Mexico, Aldo Muñoz Armenta, political science professor at the Autonomous University of Mexico State told USA Today. "It's not the healthiest (relationship) in diplomatic terms because the balance of trade has been so unequal." When it comes to economic influence, China may be gaining the upper hand in Latin America.

#### China’s president is opening trade floodgates

Fox News Latino ’13 – “China's President Wants To Open The Floodgates Of Trade With Mexico”; June 2, 2013; <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/money/2013/06/02/china-president-wants-to-open-floodgates-trade-with-mexico/>

Over the last few years, China has invested heavily in resource-rich Latin America, striking major trade deals with governments from Venezuela to Argentina.

And now the Asian power house is reaching out to Mexico, one of the few countries in the region where ties have been slow to develop

On Tuesday President Xi Jinping begins a three-day visit to the region just as Mexico debates opening its highly regulated energy sector to more foreign investment.

China's president has said he plans to address Mexico's large trade deficit with the Asian power and discuss ways to increase Mexican exports. Analysts say that could mean oil, which Mexico has and China needs to fuel its expanding economy and the cars of its growing middle class.

"Access to strategic raw materials is key to understanding the dynamic of relations with China," said Hugo Beteta, director for Mexico and Central America of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. "Clearly there is an interest by China in Mexican oil."

The trip is part of a four-country regional tour that ends in the United States. Xi started in Trinidad and Tobago, where he also met with leaders of other Caribbean countries, and he arrives Sunday night in Costa Rica.

China and Trinidad have had diplomatic ties for almost 40 years, and Trinidad is a major trading partner in the Caribbean for China. Costa Rica is the only country in Central America to have diplomatic relations with China.

U.S. trade still dwarfs China's for the three countries Xi is visiting. But China's trade with Costa Rica and with Mexico has tripled since 2006, according to the International Monetary Fund.

Relations with Mexico had been chilly in the past, especially when former President Felipe Calderon hosted the Dalai Lama in 2011, something China's Foreign Ministry said "hurt the feelings of the Chinese people and harmed Chinese-Mexican relations."

President Enrique Pena Nieto, who took office in December, has been aggressive so far about changing that, and the two new presidents reportedly hit if off on a personal level when Pena Nieto visited China and met with Xi in April. That resulted in an unusually quick diplomatic follow-up, just two months into Xi's presidency.

During the April talks, Xi said "he is committed to working with Mexican authorities to help Mexico export more," Mexico's vice minister of foreign relations, Carlos de Icaza, told The Associated Press.

That's key for Mexico, because its trade deficit with China is exploding, far surpassing that of any other Latin American nation.

While China is looking to assure supplies of raw materials, Mexico is looking to diversify its trade and investment, which have long been dominated by its superpower neighbor to the north.

"In the new global geopolitical and economic map, China is, and I think it has arrived to stay, the world's second economic power," De Icaza said. Mexico "has to understand and strengthen relations with a nation that has such great strategic value."

De Icaza said the countries hope to sign at least a dozen agreements in the fields of trade, energy, tourism, science and technology during Xi's visit.

Mexican exports to China came to a bit over $5.7 billion in 2012, while its imports from that country stood at almost $57 billion, according to statistics from Mexico's Economy Department. Cell phones, video games and parts for electronics factories have been pouring into Mexico, which sends China minerals such as copper and lead.

#### Perception frames the uniqueness debate

Ellis ‘13

Evan, professor of national security studies, modeling, gaming, and simulation with the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, Ph.D. in political science with a specialization in comparative politics, “Chinese Soft Power in Latin America,” China Culture, 2013-07-16; <http://www.chinaculture.org/info/2013-07/16/content_468445.htm>

In general, the bases of Chinese soft power differ from those of the United States, leading analysts to underestimate that power when they compare the PRC to the United States on those factors that are the sources of U.S. influence, such as the affinity of the world’s youth for American music, media, and lifestyle, the widespread use of the English language in business and technology, or the number of elites who have learned their professions in U.S. institutions.¶ It is also important to clarify that soft power is based on perceptions and emotion (that is, inferences), and not necessarily on objective reality. Although China’s current trade with and investment position in Latin America are still limited compared to those of the United States,3 its influence in the region is based not so much on the current size of those activities, but rather on hopes or fears in the region of what it could be in the future.¶ Because perception drives soft power, the nature of the PRC impact on each country in Latin America is shaped by its particular situation, hopes, fears, and prevailing ideology. The “Bolivarian socialist” regime of Hugo Chávez in Venezuela sees China as a powerful ally in its crusade against Western “imperialism,” while countries such as Peru, Chile, and Colombia view the PRC in more traditional terms as an important investor and trading partner within the context of global free market capitalism.¶ The core of Chinese soft power in Latin America, as in the rest of the world, is the widespread perception that the PRC, because of its sustained high rates of economic growth and technology development, will present tremendous business opportunities in the future, and will be a power to be reckoned with globally. In general, this perception can be divided into seven areas:■ hopes for future access to Chinese markets ■ hopes for future Chinese investment ■ influence of Chinese entities and infrastructure in Latin America ■ hopes for the PRC to serve as a counterweight to the United States and Western institutions ■ China as a development model ■ affinity for Chinese culture and work ethic ■ China as “the wave of the future.” In each of these cases, the soft power of the PRC can be identified as operating through distinct sets of actors: the political leadership of countries, the business community, students and youth, and the general population.

### Internal

#### China is expanding into LA as part of a zero-sum game because the US is disengaging there now

Frost April ‘09 (Patrick, “Latin America: Bush, China, & Obama,” Hello, I’m Patrick Frost the creator, writer, and host for GPP. I’m a Californian who has a BA in modern history, a MA in International Relations from NYU, write for Foreign Policy Association’s blog network, and have taught political science/international relations at San Diego City College, April 18, 2009; <http://greatpowerpolitics.com/?p=1282>)

The Bush administration’s track record in Latin America had its moments (Free trade agreements with Central America, Chile, and one with Colombia yet to be ratified, effective assistance in helping the Colombian state come close to defeating the FARC), but he rightly deserves criticism for a lack of attention to many of Latin America’s needs and wants. For instance, in his visits to the region he seemed to focus on global terrorism, when the leaders and peoples of the region were really concerned with economic growth and trade. The downside to this lack of attention was the growth of Chinese influence that can now be found in the region.¶ Beijing has effectively utilized its checkbook diplomacy with no strings attached to gain a strong foothold in many South American countries and in many ways this is a zero-sum game where US interests have been compromised. The Chinese have provided aid and loans in the billions of dollars to Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina, securing oil shipments and political influence in return. This has come at a time when the US sponsored and controlled Inter-American Bank is losing money and appears to be struggling to maintain relevance, as Brazil has not even taken billions of dollars put in it for them alone. China’s money must seem welcoming to these South American powers as it comes from a far away power who demands less oversight and domestic changes in return for the financial resources.

#### It’s zero-sum – resources and geographic proximity

Valencia 6/24

Robert, Contributing Writer at Global Voices Online and the World Policy Institute, 6/24/13, “US and China: The Fight for Latin America,” http://www.worldpolicy.org/blog/2013/06/24/us-and-china-fight-latin-america

During the first weekend of June, U.S. President Barack Obama and Chinese President Xi Jinping met in California to discuss cyber espionage and territorial claims in the Pacific Rim. While tension on these topics has hogged the headlines, the fight for influence in another area could be even more important—Latin America. Other emerging markets in Africa, where China has an overwhelming influence due to foreign direct investment in mining and oil, also offer economic opportunities, but Latin America has an abundance of natural resources, greater purchasing power, and geographic proximity to the United States, which has long considered Latin America as its “backyard.”

The key question now is will Latin American countries lean more toward China or the United States, or will it find a way to balance the two against each other? Right now, Latin American countries are increasingly confident thanks to burgeoning economic and political integration by way of trading blocs, and they're demanding to be treated as an equal player.

As a sign of its growing importance, China and the United States have courted Latin America more than usual. In May, President Barack Obama visited Mexico and Costa Rica while Vice President Joe Biden visited Colombia, Brazil, and Trinidad and Tobago. Shortly after these trips, President Xi went to Mexico and Costa Rica to foster economic cooperation.

China’s active involvement in Latin American geopolitics can be traced back to 2009. Chinalco, China’s largest mining company, signed a $2.2 billion deal with Peru to build the Toromocho mine and a $70 million wharf in the Callao port. Since then, Peru has sent 18.3 percent of its exports to China, making China Peru’s largest trading partner. China’s imports to Peru, however, rank second with 13.7 percent of the market while the United States holds first place with 24.5 percent.

China has the upper hand with the Latin American leftist countries in terms of infrastructure and technology. In 2009, Chinese telephone manufacturer ZTE played an instrumental role in assembling the first mobile phone in Venezuela known as “El Vergatario” (Venezuela slang for optimal). Former President Hugo Chávez introduced this new phone to low-income families making it the world’s cheapest phone ($6.99 for a handset). Additionally, China landed rail construction projects in Argentina and Venezuela and has become a major buyer of farm products and metal in South America. Between 2011 and 2012, China purchased nearly 58.02 million tons of soy from Argentina, up from 52 million in 2011 and 2010.

### Link

#### Oil is zero-sum – plan crowds out Chinese investment

Pierson 9

(David Pierson is a reporter for the LATimes. He is based in Beijing and covers the Chinese economy. “China's push for oil in Gulf of Mexico puts U.S. in awkward spot”, LATimes, October 22, 2009, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/oct/22/business/fi-china-oil22

A Chinese company's gambit to drill for oil in U.S. territory demonstrates China's determination to lock up the raw materials it needs to sustain its rapid growth, wherever those resources lie. The state-owned China National Offshore Oil Corp., or CNOOC, reportedly is negotiating the purchase of leases owned by the Norwegian StatoilHydro in U.S. waters in the Gulf of Mexico, the source of about a quarter of U.S. crude oil production. China's push to enter U.S. turf comes four years after CNOOC's $18.5-billion bid to buy Unocal Corp. was scuttled by Congress on national security grounds. The El Segundo oil firm eventually merged with Chevron Corp. of San Ramon. Whether CNOOC's second attempt to lock up U.S. petroleum assets will trigger a similar political backlash remains to be seen. The sour U.S. economy and the need for Washington and Beijing to cooperate on potentially larger issues could mute any outcry. The U.S. could also find it difficult to rebuff China when it has long welcomed other foreign investment in the gulf. In addition to StatoilHydro, foreign oil companies with stakes in deep-water projects there include Spain's Repsol, France's Total, Brazil's Petrobras, British oil giant BP and the Dutch-British multinational Shell. The U.S. risks undercutting its foreign policy goals as well. Concern is growing over China's aggressive investment in oil-rich nations with anti-U.S. regimes, including Iran and Sudan. Denying China a shot at drilling in U.S. waters would only encourage Beijing to make deals in volatile regions given that new oil reserves in stable, democratic nations are getting harder to find. "China doesn't have a lot of alternatives," said Ben Simpfendorfer, chief China economist for Royal Bank of Scotland. "They're very late to the game."

## Modeling

## Relations

### High now

#### No uniqueness – relations are high now – high business involvement has bred a positive view of America by Latin America, more so than any other region – our evidence cites how they are a young nation optimistic of relations with the US in the future – that’s Wilson

#### Relations high – Venezuela trade ties and Cuban support for the embargo

Brinkley ‘12 (Joel Brinkley- professor of journalism at Stanford University, is a Pulitzer Prize-winning former foreign correspondent for The New York Times; “Cuba embargo isn't working but isn't going away”; 12/18/12; http://www.politico.com/story/2012/12/cuba-embargo-isnt-working-but-isnt-going-away-85281.html)

“Despite political tensions” with Venezuela, another authoritarian state in Latin America, the State Department says: “The United States remains Venezuela’s most important trading partner. In 2011, bilateral trade topped $55.6 billion.”¶ The State Department endlessly debates this question about foreign aid that applies to Cuba: Cutting off aid to a nation removes any ability to influence it, one side of the debate goes. But the counterargument is: Does that mean the U.S. should continue giving aid to a brutal, repressive government? It’s a quandary with no clear solution.¶ In this debate, Egypt is the state du jour. Last month, Rep. Vern Buchanan (R-Fla.) issued a news release calling on “Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to immediately suspend U.S. aid to Egypt, saying ‘American taxpayer dollars should not be used to aid and abet any nation that stands with terrorists.’” In Congress, he was hardly alone in that view, but the State Department is resisting.¶ Of course, the U.S. embargo of Cuba arose from a totally different set of circumstances, in 1960 at the height of the Cold War and Washington’s unremitting opposition to Communism. Cuba was allying itself with the Soviet Union. Fidel Castro also nationalized American property on the island. (Even as he announced the embargo, President John F. Kennedy sent his aide, Pierre Salinger, to buy him 1,000 Cuban cigars, Petit Upmanns, in the hours before the full embargo took effect.)¶ After the Soviet Union fell in 1991 that reasoning fell away, but at that time the Cuba lobby in Miami was at its strongest. Looking at the embargo today (Cuba calls it “the blockade”), its principal accomplishment is that “it has given Fidel Castro and Raúl Castro the perfect scapegoat on which it can blame all their problems,” argued Ted Henken, a fervent Cuba expert at Baruch College in New York. A few days ago, Cuba’s Ministry of Education asserted that “the 50-year trade embargo imposed by the United States has severely undermined the country’s education efforts.”¶ Piccone said most Cubans aren’t buying that argument. “The average Cuban is not blaming the U.S.” he said. “I’ve seen polling on this. They’re blaming the system.”¶ Henken said the embargo “has strengthened the revolution” and “ceded Cuban policy to the most conservative Cuban-Americans.” Even Suchlicki acknowledges that the embargo has accomplished “nothing substantial,” though he adds: “That’s not an argument for changing it.”

#### Relations high – immigration is the only alt cause

Wilson 7-24-13 (Tim Wilson- freelance journalist for Near Shore America; “Despite Chavez and Snowden, Pro-U.S. Sentiment Grows in Latin America”; http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/chavez-snowden-latin-america-perceptions-us/)

That said, Mexican attitudes are more highly sensitive to U.S. immigration policy than is the case with other Latin American countries. The Arizona immigration law, for example, had a significant short-term effect on attitudes in Mexico: in 2010 the Mexican favorability numbers for the U.S. dropped from 62% to 48%, but those have since rebounded impressively in 2013 to 66%.¶ Clearly, a government is not its people. The most recent fiasco with regard to leaks from former U.S. intelligence contractor Edward Snowden is such example. Assertions that the U.S. has been intercepting phone calls and emails in Argentina, Ecuador, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico, have created a flurry of diplomatic activity – but likely won’t have a long-term effect on perception of the U.S. Similarly, over-arching U.S. policies toward Cuba, the war on drugs, and immigration, may be unpopular, but appear to have little lasting impact on attitudes to the United States and her people.¶ And it would seem that many people in Latin America are suspicious of the efforts by some populist, left-leaning governments to fan the fires of anti-Americanism. For example, Pew Research Center analyst Katie Simmons reports that **“worsening ties with America is something the Venezuelan public wants to avoid,”** with only 22% of all Venezuelans reporting that they would like their country to establish more distance from the U.S.¶ Over the years, “America the beautiful” has been represented by the occasional “ugly American”. However, it would seem now that the majority of people in Latin America maintain a positive view of the United States. And when they encounter American business people, more often than not that understanding is reinforced – a good thing for all involved.

### Alt causes

#### Multiple alt causes to relations prove they don’t solve – immigration and the drug war are breeding massive resentment – if we removed the embargo without addressing immigration it would only hurt relations – that’s Lobe – prefer it – extremely qualified and recent---analyzes polls IN Latin America and empirical data

#### Snowden, immigration, and Maduro sentiments are all alt causes

USA Today ’13 (“Snowden affair chills U.S.-Latin American ties”; July 15, 2013; <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/07/13/snowden-us-latin-america/2514741/>)

WASHINGTON (AP) — America is pivoting to Asia, focused on the Mideast, yet the "backyard," as Secretary of State John Kerry once referred to Latin America, is sprouting angry weeds as the scandal involving intelligence leaker Edward Snowden lays bare already thorny U.S. relations with Latin America.¶ Taking the opportunity to snub their noses at the U.S., Venezuela, Bolivia and Nicaragua have already said they'd be willing to grant asylum for Snowden, who is wanted on espionage charges in the United States for revealing the scope of National Security Agency surveillance programs that spy on Americans and foreigners. Ecuador has said it would consider any request from Snowden.¶ Relations between the U.S. and these countries were already testy, but the Snowden affair also impacted the Obama administration's effort to improve ties with friendlier nations in the region like Mexico and Brazil.¶ **Snowden hasn't been the only recent setback**. Leaders in the region harshly criticized the U.S. earlier this week when a newspaper in Brazil, which was privy to some documents released by Snowden, reported that a U.S. spy program was widely targeting data in emails and telephone calls across Latin America. That revelation came just days after an uproar in Latin America over the rerouting of Bolivian President Evo Morales' plane over Europe amid suspicions, later proven untrue, that Snowden was aboard.¶ And all this comes right after President Barack Obama, Vice President Joe Biden and Kerry have all made recent treks to the region to bolster U.S. engagement in Latin America.¶ "What the Snowden affair has done to the reinvigorated effort to re-engage with Latin America is to dump a pail of cold water on it," said Carl Meacham, a former senior Latin America adviser on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. "It won't stop trade deals, cooperation on energy, but it's going to be harder for the president to portray the image that 'We are here to work with you.' **It's a step back."**¶The U.S. has sought to downplay the fallout from the disclosure of information about its intelligence activities. State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki acknowledged that the United States does gather foreign intelligence just like other nations. ¶ “I can tell you that we have spoken with Brazilian officials regarding these allegations," she said this week. "We plan to continue our dialogue with the Brazilians through normal diplomatic channels, but those are conversations that, of course, we would keep private."¶ Psaki has also said that any country granting asylum to Snowden would create "grave difficulties in our bilateral relationship."¶ While other nations may spy on their friends, the allegations have fueled anti-American sentiment already simmering in the region. Venezuela, Nicaragua, Bolivia and Ecuador are led by populist leaders who have balked at any dominance by the U.S. in the Americas and pursued policies that often run counter to Washington's wishes. Venezuela refers to the United States simply as "The Empire."¶ "What they're saying is 'See, the U.S. hasn't changed. It doesn't matter who is in the White House, the U.S. is the same. The U.S. is the big imperial power ... they are not treating us as equals. Look, they are even spying on us,'" said Meacham, who directs the Americas program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.¶ The flap over the rerouting of the Bolivian president's plane prompted a special session Tuesday of the Organization of American States' permanent council. Bolivian Interior Minister Carlos Romero delivered blistering remarks about the incident, calling it an "act of aggression" conducted "at the behest of the United States.¶ Countries like Ecuador, which has cozied up to U.S. rivals Iran and China, joined the verbal slugfest against the U.S. Ecuador has sheltered WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange in its embassy in London for more than a year and has given mixed signals about offering Snowden asylum.¶ Latin America wants international standing and chafes at any attempt by the United States to downplay its stature, hence the ruffled feathers when Kerry referred to the region as "America's backyard." Latin America is now home to 600 million people. The U.S. looks to the region for oil and is heavily vested in bilateral trade agreements.¶ Together, Mexico and Brazil are responsible for 65% of Latin America's production, and some experts suggest that they are destined to jump into fourth and fifth place on the list of the world's biggest economies, behind the U.S., India and China. Last year alone, trade between the U.S. and Mexico totaled nearly $500 billion, making it the United States' second-largest trading partner and Mexico could eventually overtake Canada for the No. 1 spot.¶ The Snowden affair is not likely to unravel these strong U.S. connections to the region, but it is a roadblock to efforts to improve cooperation, said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based policy forum on Western Hemisphere affairs.¶ "I don't think it's going to paralyze relations," Shifter said. "But I think it's a setback overall — even with countries that have been friendly."¶ Obama got off to a slow start with Latin America. The president spent little time on the region during his first term and uttered few, if any, words about the area during his re-election campaign, though he took more than 70% of the Hispanic vote in winning a second term. In May, he went south to Mexico and also traveled to Costa Rica to meet with Central American leaders.¶ **Passing immigration reform would remove a major irritant in U.S.-Mexico relations and could prevent the U.S. from becoming more isolated in the region, but the U.S. was facing problems in the area before the Snowden affair.**¶ In Bolivia, Morales on May 1 acted on a long-time threat and expelled the U.S. Agency for International Development, saying it was trying to undermine the government — allegations the State Department said were baseless. Morales said Washington "still has a mentality of domination and submission" in the region, and he also harangued Kerry for offending the region when, in congressional testimony in April, he said the "Western Hemisphere is our backyard."¶ Cuba — a possible transit stop for Snowden if he is granted asylum in a Latin American country — has a history of conflict with the United States. Fidel Castro's brother Raul, who now leads the government, has recently explored new diplomatic entrees with Washington. At the same time, he earlier this year assumed the rotating presidency of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States in what was a demonstration of regional unity against U.S. efforts to isolate the communist government through a 50-year-old economic embargo.¶ In Brazil, which wields the most influence in Latin America, former President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva lent support to the Iranian government and also backed Venezuela's late president Hugo Chavez, who spoke out against U.S.-style capitalism and formed alliances with Russia, China and Iran. The new president of Brazil, Dilma Rousseff, appears more moderate. Biden visited Brazil in May, saying stronger trade ties and closer cooperation in education, science and other fields should usher in a new era of U.S.-Brazil relations.¶ During his visit, Biden announced that Obama was hosting Rousseff at the first official state dinner of his second term. The October dinner is a sign of respect and Brazilian officials say the spying allegations won't taint it, yet Rousseff herself has said that any such data collection infringed on the nation's sovereignty and that Brazil would raise the issue at the United Nations.¶ U.S. relations with Venezuela have been a lot thornier.¶ While the new President Nicolas Maduro appears to be more pragmatic than his predecessor, he has loudly voiced his own anti-American rhetoric since taking office — even alleging that the U.S. had a hand in Chavez' death from cancer. Maduro expelled two U.S. Air Force attaches from Caracas, accusing them of trying to foment instability. The Obama administration responded by expelling two Venezuelan diplomats from Washington.¶ In a gesture that could have signaled a thaw in relations, Venezuela released an American documentary filmmaker who had been jailed for alleged espionage in the country. Timothy Tracy, 35, was released just hours before Kerry met with Venezuelan Foreign Minister Elias Jaua on the sidelines of a regional gathering in Guatemala. Kerry said the two agreed to take steps to change the dialogue between the two countries and hopefully, quickly move to appoint ambassadors, which haven't been in either capital since 2010.

#### Immigration reform is a massive border preventing relations - (no pun intended)

IADPP ’12 (Inter-American Dialogue Policy Report; “Remaking the Relationship the United states and Latin America”; April 2012; http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

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

#### Latin America hates America’s drug war policies – plan can’t possibly solve

Huffington Post 6-4-13 (“Latin America Will Push U.S. To Discuss New Drug War Strategies At OAS Meeting”; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/04/new-drug-war-strategy-\_n\_3383786.html)

ANTIGUA, Guatemala — Latin American countries frustrated by the United States' refusal to change its drug war strategy are pushing the U.S. government to look at alternatives to a fight that has killed tens of thousands in a region beset by drug cartels.Guatemalan Foreign Relations Secretary Fernando Carrera said the subject of drugs will top the agenda at the Organization of American States' General Assembly, which began its three-day session in Antigua on Tuesday evening."We have already reached a consensus and agreed that our final declaration will include changes to the current anti-drug model," Carrera said. "We already have some ideas on how to change drug-fighting policies."U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry and Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs William R. Brownfield were attending the meeting, which comes two weeks after the [OAS](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/04/new-drug-war-strategy-_n_3383786.html) released a report calling for a serious discussion on legalizing marijuana.The OAS study doesn't make specific proposals and found there is "no significant support" among the OAS's 35 member states for legalizing cocaine, the illegal drug with the greatest impact on Latin America, or other harsher drugs.The study was commissioned after some Latin American leaders called on President Barack Obama to rethink the war on drugs at last year's Summit of the Americas in Cartagena, Colombia.It urges "assessing existing signals and trends that lean toward the decriminalization or legalization of the production, sale and use of marijuana. Sooner or later decisions in this area will need to be taken."The Obama administration, however, believes it has already adopted a comprehensive counter-narcotics approach that melds cutting demand for drugs and treatment with[law enforcement](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/04/new-drug-war-strategy-_n_3383786.html) and interdiction of supply.A senior U.S. official traveling with Kerry said the OAS would endorse that multi-pronged strategy and pointed out that there is no consensus either within the hemisphere or in individual countries on legalization.This is true even in the United States, where several states have legalized marijuana, said the official, who was not authorized to preview Kerry's discussions publicly. The U.S is open to discussing ideas, but will not as a federal government support decriminalization.Human Rights Watch urged the OAS countries to explore legal regulation as a way to help stem the violence of organized crime and drug traffickers inflicted on many Latin American countries. The international human rights group said that criminalizing personal drug use "undermine" basic human rights."The `drug war' has taken a huge toll in the Americas, from the carnage of brutal drug trafficking organizations to the egregious abuses by security forces fighting them," the group's Americas director, Jose Miguel Vivanco, said in a statement. "Governments should find new policies to address the harm drug use causes, while curbing the violence and abuse that have plagued the current approach."Dozens of human rights organizations from Canada to Argentina signed a letter Monday asking for leaders "to discuss and rethink the existing initiatives with a view to place human rights in the center of the debate."Among those countries pushing for a dialogue on drugs in the Western Hemisphere are many who have been close allies of the United States' fight against drugs, including Colombia and Guatemala.Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos was among those urging a discussion of legalization. He said that while his country extradites hundreds of alleged drug traffickers for trial in the U.S., criminals turn to other countries where law enforcement is weaker. Central America and Mexico in particular have been hit hard as traffickers shifted operations there.President Otto Perez Molina of Guatemala, a hard-hit cocaine transit country along with neighboring Honduras, made headlines shortly after taking office last year when he proposed legalizing drugs."The message has been sent that the hemisphere wants to look at alternative approaches and wants the United States to be part of that discussion," said Cynthia Arnson, director of the Latin American program at the Washington-based Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.Arnson said Latin American leaders will use the meeting to spur a discussion that can be sustained as countries try to go forward with a new strategy."Latin American countries will mostly be looking for ways to diminish the violence and the negative effects on their societies and their economies posed by organized crime and they may increasingly diverge with the United States over what policies to adapt," she said.While the OAS meeting promises to serve as a forum to begin discussing the legalization of marijuana, talking about harder drugs like cocaine, heroin and methamphetamines may be harder to bring to the table, Arnson said."It's one thing to say, `Let's break the ice on talking about these issues,' and it's another thing **to come forward with concrete proposals** for dealing with harder drugs that many countries can sign on to, including the United States," she said.

#### Gun laws are an alt cause – reinforce the drug war and breed violence throughout Latin America

LA Times ’13 (“U.S. gun laws blamed for worsening Latin American violence”; July 31, 2013; <http://www.latimes.com/news/world/worldnow/la-fg-wn-us-gun-laws-violence-latin-america-20130731,0,4015750.story>)

Lax U.S. gun regulations are enabling the international trafficking of high-powered weapons and fueling the spread of gun violence in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Council on Foreign Relations argues in a report urging President Obama to take action on initiatives that have foundered in Congress.¶ More than 70% of the 99,000 weapons recovered by Mexican law enforcement since 2007 were traced to U.S. manufacturers and importers, the council report said, citing data from the eTrace program of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. The figure for guns of U.S. origin recovered in the Caribbean is over 90%, the study noted.¶ “The flow of high-powered weaponry from the United States to Latin America and the Caribbean exacerbates soaring rates of gun-related violence in the region **and undermines U.S. influence in the Western Hemisphere**,” states the council’s policy memo, written by Latin America studies director Julia Sweig.¶ The ATF statistics, as well as those of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, suggest the escalating flow of assault weapons from the United States is connected with a 30% higher rate of per capita gun-related homicides in Latin America than the global average. In Mexico, the U.N. homicide report for 2011 charts a more than tripling of firearms slayings in less than a decade.¶ Mexico's consul general for Los Angeles, Carlos M. Sada, contends that the share of U.S. weapons recovered in his country from scenes of gun violence are even higher than the eTrace statistics have measured. He puts the guns of U.S. origin at more than 80% and says the issue is one of deep concern for his country as it battles to contain raging violence among the drug cartels.¶ “Out of the 60,000, or 70,000 or 80,000 people killed in Mexico, how many were killed by weapons smuggled from the United States?” Sada asked rhetorically. “This is an issue that is there and we haven’t been able to stop it.”¶ In an interview with The Times, Sada noted that it has been months since Obama nominated an ATF director but that his Senate confirmation was still pending early Wednesday, “which gives an idea of how much importance the issue gets in the U.S. Congress.”¶ Obama nominated B. Todd Jones, a U.S. attorney for Minnesota and acting ATF director since 2011, to head the bureau shortly after the December massacre of schoolchildren in Newtown, Conn. Jones has the support of gun-control advocates, which deterred conservative lawmakers from backing his confirmation. In an unexpected move later Wednesday, the Senate confirmed Jones' appointment.¶ Sweig, in her report for the Council on Foreign Relations, suggested that Obama, in the absence of congressional action, take executive and diplomatic steps to reduce trafficking of firearms throughout the Americas.¶ The recommended measures include expanding nationwide a federal rule in place since 2011 in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico that requires gun dealers to report sales of more than two semiautomatic rifles to the same person within a five-day period.¶ The report also proposed closer coordination on anti-trafficking efforts with Brazil, the hemisphere’s other firearms industry leader, and to eliminate weapons and ammunition from an export control initiative that would make it easier for U.S. manufacturers to ship weapons abroad.¶ Sweig said in an interview that she hoped the recommendations would encourage Obama and Vice President Joe Biden to support gun control initiatives at the state level in hope of building momentum toward more effective national restraints.¶ "This is a long-term strategy," she said of the goal of reducing the sources of high-powered weapons available to traffickers supplying Latin American criminal operations.

#### Relations can’t move forward – Alan Gross and the terrorist label

French 12 (Anya Landau French, editor of and a frequent contributor to The Havana Note, “Alan Gross Wants U.S. and Cuba to Negotiate His Release” <http://thehavananote.com/node/1056> 12-4-12)

Three years ago, as he completed his 5th trip of the year to the island, Alan P. Gross was arrested and after a lengthy investigation, was found guilty of crimes against the "sovereignty and territorial integrity" of Cuba. Gross was hired on a $600,000 subcontract (his employer was USAID grantee DAI) to set up several wireless internet networks around the island which could be hidden from the Cuban government using an "alternative SIM card" often used by U.S. intelligence agencies. Three years and more than 100 pounds (lost during his incarceration) later, Gross wants the U.S. and Cuba to sit down together and negotiate a non-belligerency pact.**¶** Given the history between our two countries, such a pact would mark a true turning point, but it may be as hard to come by as ever. The State Department is refusing to move its own agenda forward with Cuba while Gross remains in prison. But having tied its hands thusly, State has also not taken any (visible) steps to secure his release. Though former Governor Richardson made a private trip to Havana more than a year ago to seek Gross's release, and says he suggested "a process" to remove Cuba from the U.S. list of terrorist states, the Cubans rebuffed him, perhaps because they were unwilling to negotiate with someone who did not represent the U.S. government, perhaps because he pushed too hard, too publicly - threatening not to leave until he saw Mr. Gross - and perhaps because Cuban officials were indignant about being offered, as a political trade, removal from a list on which they don't think they belong.¶ Of Mr. Gross’s activities, State officials have said little other than to claim that he was merely trying to connect the Jewish community across Cuba with better access to each other and to the world, and to insist on his immediate, unconditional release. The U.S. government has sought to paint Gross as nothing more than a humanitarian aid worker who broke no Cuban laws. It’s hardly an invitation to a serious discussion with Cuban authorities holding Mr. Gross when it is clear that Gross did break Cuban laws (more than one), and that the U.S. government sent him there specifically to do so.¶ For its part, Cuba has not been much more cooperative. While Cuban officials have made very plain their position that Gross – and the U.S. law that authorized his and other USAID activities on the island – violated Cuban sovereignty, they’ve dropped few and often contradictory clues as to whether Mr. Gross could hope for any early release. It could well be because there are dueling opinions in the highest ranks in Havana about whether to make a gesture which could go unanswered, or to extract something from the U.S. for his return.

#### US will not pursue relations absent Gross’ release

Tamayo 6-20 (Juan O. Tamayo, writer for Miami Herald, “State Department confirms resumption of migration talks with Havana” <http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/06/20/3460271/state-department-confirms-resumption.html> 6-20-13)

Gross is serving a 15-year sentence for giving Cuban Jews sophisticated communications equipment paid for by the U.S. government in what Havana views as a thinly veiled effort to topple the communist-run government.¶ Obama administration officials have said repeatedly that there can be no significant improvement in bilateral relations until Gross is freed. Havana has offered to swap him for four convicted Cuban spies in U.S. prisons, but Washington has rejected that deal.¶ Opponents of warmer U.S. relations with Havana have decried the resumption of the migration talks as a unilateral Obama concession to Cuba at a time when Gross is being held in a Havana prison.

#### Terrorism label is an alt cause

Bender, 02/21/2013 (Bryan Bender, correspondent at the Boston Globe; covers the US military, global terrorism, the international arms trade, and government secrecy, “Talk grows of taking Cuba off terror list”, The Boston Globe, http://www.bostonglobe.com/news/nation/2013/02/21/cuba-label-terrorist-state-longer-justified-some-officials-say/CmVFXsVC4M1R1WbHE8lb0H/story.html)

“They are interested in improving relations because it is in their interest. I feel they are really interested in sitting down and engaging, where everything is on the table — the embargo, the travel restrictions, migration, everything,” McGovern said.¶ The Gross case, he said, can be resolved, but it is “going to take some negotiations.” Gross is an American contractor who was arrested in 2009 while providing communications technology to Cuba’s Jewish community as part of a US-financed democracy-building program.¶ A major impediment to normalizing relations with Cuba, according to McGovern and others, is that Cuba has been listed by the State Department each year since 1982 as a sponsor of terrorist groups. Yet that is a view no longer held by a number of senior US officials. Even North Korea, which the Obama administration has criticized for conducting nuclear tests and making threatening comments toward the United States, is not listed as a terrorism sponsor. That contrast is one reason for calls within the State Department to consider taking Cuba off the list.¶ “There is a pretty clear case . . . that they don’t really meet the standard anymore,” said a senior administration official with direct knowledge regarding US-Cuba policy who was not authorized to speak publicly. “They have neither the wherewithal nor are they doing much.”¶ In addition to Cuba, the list of terrorist sponsors includes Syria, Sudan, and Iran. Inclusion imposes strict sanctions. For example, it prohibits the United States from selling arms, providing economic assistance, and restricts financial transactions between citizens. Countries that were removed from the list in recent years include North Korea, Libya, and Iraq.¶

#### USAID programs destroy relations – external alt cause

Laverty 11 (Collin Laverty, “Cuba’s New Resolve Economic Reform and its ¶ Implications for U.S. Policy” <http://democracyinamericas.org/pdfs/CDA\_Cubas\_New\_Resolve.pdf> Copyright 2011)

Cubans who receive funds or support are subject to great risk, as are **¶** American employees of the program, sadly demonstrated by the case of ¶ imprisoned U.S. subcontractor, Alan Gross.¶ Aside from being wasteful, ineffective and dangerous to those involved in it, **¶** the USAID program actually heightens tensions and limits space for debate. ¶ It allows the Cuban government to label dissident thinkers as “employees” ¶ and “pawns” of the U.S. government, and increases fear among mainstream **¶** economists, politicians and everyday citizens who advocate positions similar ¶ to those of activists associated with the U.S. Interests Section or otherwise ¶ funded by Washington.

#### Alt cause – the U.S. labels Cuba as a sponsor of terrorism

Rausnitz 6-13 (Zach Rausnitz, Editor in the Government Publishing Group at FierceMarkets, “Cuba's inclusion on State Sponsors of Terrorism list bad for U.S., panelists say” <http://www.fiercehomelandsecurity.com/story/cubas-inclusion-state-sponsors-terrorism-list-bad-us-panelists-say/2013-06-13> 6-13-13)

Cuba remains on the list of State Sponsors of Terrorism for political reasons only, and there are downsides for the United States in leaving it there, panelists said at a Center for Strategic and International Studies event June 11.¶ Retaining Cuba on the list "feeds into and prolongs this climate of mistrust which the Obama administration claimed it wanted to overcome," said Tomás Bilbao, executive director of the Washington, D.C.-based Cuba Study Group, which promotes human rights and the rule of law in Cuba.

### Instability ev bad

#### Impact ev is terrible – from ‘94

## Eurozone

### n/u

#### Their impacts already happening – proves no impact to the aff – currency in Greece Italy and spain is on a terminal rate of devaluation – that’s Mckinley – and they don’t solve because it’s locked in – giving medicare to mexico isn’t enough to totally overhaul the system – that’s Soros

#### Europe economic collapse now

Sanati, 11

Cyrus Sanati, Fortune staff writer, 9/13/11, What happens after a Greek default, <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2011/09/13/what-happens-after-a-greek-default/>

A Greek default has already occurred in the eyes of investors, even though it technically hasn't happened yet. The market is now forcing European leaders to quickly decide how they want the rest of the sovereign debt crisis to play out. While the technical default of Greece -- inevitable as it is -- took around 18 months, similar defaults in other peripheral eurozone members will probably come much faster.

A lack of leadership on the part of the core members of the eurozone, namely Germany, could very well bring a swift end to the common currency, setting off an economic meltdown that few would want to imagine. The time has now come for Europeans to either move much closer or break apart.

Tomorrow is the deadline for owners of Greek debt to agree to a haircut on their debt by extending the repayment schedule out a few years. The plan required 90% of existing bondholders to sign on to the plan. But traders say that only 50% to 70% have signed on, complicating Greece's attempts to head off a default.

The restructuring of Greek debt may still occur by the deadline, but the market seems to be fed up with all the dancing around. Even if Greece is able to convince debt holders to effectively take a large haircut on their debt, the country would still ultimately have to pay back, or refinance, 135 billion euro by 2020. To do that, Greece needs to take in more money than it spends – a lot more money.

That will be a problem, considering that all the austerity cuts the government has been forced to make have decimated Greece's fragile economy. The country's GDP contracted 7.3% in the second quarter of the year, far worse than expected. The resulting decrease in tax revenue caused the country's budget deficit to widen to around 10% of GDP. Greece would need to run a primary surplus of around 5% of GDP to stabilize its debt burden at 180% of GDP by 2014 and would have to run almost a 9% primary surplus to reduce its debt to 90% by 2031, according to Citigroup.

Will Europe come tumbling down?

Running those kinds of surpluses is almost impossible for Greece given its economic outlook. So instead of waiting for Greece to miss a payment in the coming years, the market took matters into its own hands over the last few days. Credit default swaps on five-year Greek bonds this morning were trading at rates implying a nearly 100% chance of default by the government. French banks that hold Greek debt have seen their market values fall in the last few days, which imply a total loss on all their Greek debt holdings.

Panic selling

Score one for the market. Unfortunately, the market has a habit of going overboard. Panic is spreading across trading desks at speeds not seen since the dark days of 2008. The European slow motion crisis has now moved into overdrive, threatening to take down banks, businesses, nations and the European common currency. This is the contagion the media has warned about for months – it is already here.

While the technical Greek default isn't causing fireworks like the fall of Lehman Brothers in 2008, the flames are growing. To be sure, this crisis was never really all about Greece's current debt woes anyway. The amount it owed was always too small to move the needle, accounting for just 3% of eurozone's total debt load. The real trouble comes after the default, when Greece has to make a choice about whether it stays in the euro or it takes its chances and moves back to the drachma.

Moving back to its former currency would allow Greek exports to be competitive again with its neighbors, especially those that cater to tourists. Across the Aegean in Turkey, GDP grew by 8.8% in the second quarter. There is no reason why Greece couldn't capture some of that tourist market if it returns to a cheap currency.

But leaving the common currency would also lead to some nasty results. It would force Greece to raise cash to plug its budget shortfall and potentially pay yields that could run as high as 25% over German bonds, something that would probably be impossible. That would force Greece to make even larger cuts in government spending, further exacerbating its economic woes. The Greek banking system would almost certainly collapse in the changeover as the ECB would stop payments currently keeping them afloat. Without that cash infusion from the ECB, the Greek banks would be left with a massive funding gap equal to around 20% of their assets or 100 billion euros, according to an analysis by Citigroup.

#### Tons of factors

Michael **Snyder**, graduate of the McIntire School of Commerce at the University of Virginia, and has two law degrees from the University of Florida, 9/12/**11**, 20 Signs Of Imminent Financial Collapse In Europe, <http://theeconomiccollapseblog.com/archives/20-signs-of-imminent-financial-collapse-in-europe>

The following are 20 signs of imminent financial collapse in Europe.... #1 The yield on 2 year Greek bonds is now over 60 percent. The yield on 1 year Greek bonds is now over 110 percent. Basically, world financial markets now fully expect that Greece will default. #2 European bank stocks are getting absolutely killed once again today. We have seen this happen time after time in the last few weeks. What we are now witnessing is a clear trend. Just like back in 2008, major banking stocks are leading the way down the financial toilet. #3 The German government is now making preparations to bail out major German banks when Greece defaults. Reportedly, the German government is telling banks and financial institutions to be prepared for a 50 percent "haircut" on Greek debt obligations. #4 With thousands upon thousands of angry citizens protesting in the streets, the Greek government seems hesitant to fully implement the austerity measures that are being required of them. But if Greece does not do what they are being told to do, Germany may withhold further aid. German Finance Minister Wolfgang Schaeuble says that Greece is now "on a knife’s edge". #5 Germany is increasingly taking a hard line with Greece, and the Greeks are feeling very pushed around by the Germans at this point. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard made this point very eloquently in a recent article for the Telegraph.... Germany’s EU commissioner Günther Oettinger said Europe should send blue helmets to take control of Greek tax collection and liquidate state assets. They had better be well armed. The headlines in the Greek press have been "Unconditional Capitulation", and "Terrorization of Greeks", and even “Fourth Reich”. #6 Everyone knows that Greece simply cannot last much longer without continued bailouts. John Mauldin explained why this is so in a recent article.... It is elementary school arithmetic. The Greek debt-to-GDP is currently at 140%. It will be close to 180% by year’s end (assuming someone gives them the money). The deficit is north of 15%. They simply cannot afford to make the interest payments. True market (not Eurozone-subsidized) interest rates on Greek short-term debt are close to 100%, as I read the press. Their long-term debt simply cannot be refinanced without Eurozone bailouts. #7 The austerity measures that have already been implemented are causing the Greek economy to shrink rapidly. Greek Finance Minister Evangelos Venizelos has announced that the Greek government is now projecting that the economy will shrink by 5.3% in 2011. #8 Greek Deputy Finance Minister Filippos Sachinidis says that Greece only has enough cash to continue operating until next month. #9 Major banks in the U.S., in Japan and in Europe have a tremendous amount of exposure to Greek debt. If they are forced to take major losses on Greek debt, quite a few major banks that are very highly leveraged could suddenly be in danger of being wiped out. #10 If Greece goes down, Portugal could very well be next. Ambrose Evans-Pritchard of the Telegraph explains it this way.... Yet to push Greece over the edge risks instant contagion to Portugal, which has higher levels of total debt, and an equally bad current account deficit near 9pc of GDP, and is just as unable to comply with Germany's austerity dictates in the long run. From there the chain-reaction into EMU's soft-core would be fast and furious. #11 The yield on 2 year Portuguese bonds is now over 15 percent. A year ago the yield on those bonds was about 4 percent. #12 Portugal, Ireland and Italy now also have debt to GDP ratios that are well above 100%. #13 Greece, Portugal, Ireland, Italy and Spain owe the rest of the world about 3 trillion euros combined. #14 Major banks in the "healthy" areas of Europe could soon see their credit ratings downgraded. For example, there are persistent rumors that Moody's is about to downgrade the credit ratings of several major French banks. #15 Most major European banks are leveraged to the hilt and are massively exposed to sovereign debt. Before it fell in 2008, Lehman Brothers was leveraged 31 to 1. Today, major German banks are leveraged 32 to 1, and those banks are currently holding a massive amount of European sovereign debt. #16 The ECB is not going to be able to buy up debt from troubled eurozone members indefinitely. The European Central Bank is already holding somewhere in the neighborhood of 444 billion euros of debt from the governments of Greece, Italy, Portugal, Ireland and Spain. On Friday, Jurgen Stark of Germany resigned from the European Central Bank in protest over these reckless bond purchases. #17 According to London-based think tank Open Europe, the European Central Bank is now massively overleveraged.... "Should the ECB see its assets fall by just 4.23pc in value . . . its entire capital base would be wiped out." #18 The recent decision issued by the German Constitutional Court seems to have ruled out the establishment of any "permanent" bailout mechanism for the eurozone. Just consider the following language from the decision.... "No permanent treaty mechanisms shall be established that leads to liability for the decisions of other states, especially if they entail incalculable consequences" #19 Economist Nouriel Roubini is warning that without "massive stimulus" by the governments of the western world we are going to see a major financial collapse and we will find ourselves plunging into a depression.... “In the short term, we need to do massive stimulus; otherwise, there's going to be another Great Depression” #20 German Economy Minister Philipp Roesler is warning that "an orderly default" for Greece is not "off the table".... ''To stabilize the euro, we must not take anything off the table in the short run. That includes, as a worst-case scenario, an orderly default for Greece if the necessary instruments for it are available.'' Right now, Greece is caught in a death spiral. The more austerity measures they implement, the more their economy slows down. The more their economy slows down, the more their tax revenues go down. The more their tax revenues go down, the worse their debt problems become. Greece could end up leaving the euro, but that would make their economic problems far, far worse and it would be very damaging to the rest of the eurozone as well. Quite a few politicians in Europe are touting a "United States of Europe" as the ultimate solution to these problems, but right now the citizens of the eurozone are overwhelming against deeper economic integration. Plus, giving the EU even more power would mean an even greater loss of national sovereignty for the people of Europe. That would not be a good thing. So what we are stuck with right now is the status quo. But the current state of affairs cannot last much longer. Germany is getting sick and tired of giving out bailouts and nations such as Greece are getting sick and tired of the austerity measures that are being forced upon them. At some point, something is going to snap. When that happens, world financial markets are going to respond with a mixture of panic and fear. Credit markets will freeze up because nobody will be able to tell who is stable and who is about to collapse. Dominoes will start to fall and quite a few major financial institutions will be wiped out. Governments around the world will have to figure out who they want to bail out and who they don't want to bail out.

## Aging

## Solves heg

#### Aging makes heg stronger – other countries will have to pay for pensions instead of weapons and they’ll have fewer soldiers – that’s lieber

#### Short circuits balancing efforts

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

Global population aging will influence U.S. foreign policies in five major ways in coming decades. First, this phenomenon will be a potent force for the continuation of U.S. power dominance, both economic and military. Aging populations are likely to result in the slowdown of states’ economic growth at the same time that governments face substantial pressure to pay for massive new expenditures for elderly care. This double economic dilemma will create such an austere fiscal environment that the other great powers will lack the resources necessary to overtake the United States’ huge power lead. Investments designed to improve overall economic growth and purchases of military weaponry will be crowded out. Compounding these difficulties, although the United States is growing older, it is doing so to a lesser extent and less quickly than all the other great powers. Consequently, the economic and social costs for the United States created by social aging (although staggering, especially for health care) will be significantly lower for it than for potential competitors. Global aging is therefore not only likely to extend U.S. hegemony (because the other major powers will lack the resources necessary to overtake the United States’ economic and military power lead), but deepen it as these others states are likely to fall even farther behind the United States. Thus despite much recent discussion in the international relations literature and some policymaking circles about the likelihood of China (and to a lesser extent the European Union) balancing U.S. power in coming decades, the realities of social aging and its economic and military effects make such an outcome unlikely.6

#### Power is relative – we will be the least affected

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

The argument that currently younger states such as China and India have time to balance the United States before their aging problems become ªscally overwhelming ignores, however, the fact that power is relative. To balance the United States, competitors must not only spend signiªcantly more money on their militaries than they do presently, but spend signiªcantly more than the United States will in coming decades. The United States’ fairly advantageous demographic position, though, makes the likelihood of such an outcome low. Moreover, each year that goes by in which the United States’ military lead remains roughly the same increases the odds of the continuation of U.S. hegemony. The closer that potential balancers of the United States come to experiencing the full effects of their aging crises, the more likely crowding out of military spending in favor of geriatric care will occur, and the more likely U.S primacy will continue.

## 2nc heg d

#### Data should frame the impact debate – wars have never correlated to US military spending or international activism – that’s Fettweis.

#### Heg doesn’t solve war

Mastanduno, 9 – Professor of Government at Dartmouth

(Michael, World Politics 61, No. 1, Ebsco)

During the cold war the United States dictated the terms of adjustment. It derived the necessary leverage because it provided for the security of its economic partners and because there were no viable alter natives to an economic order centered on the United States. After the cold war the outcome of adjustment struggles is less certain because the United States is no longer in a position to dictate the terms. The United States, notwithstanding its preponderant power, no longer enjoys the same type of security leverage it once possessed, and the very success of the U.S.-centered world economy has afforded America’s supporters a greater range of international and domestic economic options. The claim that the United States is unipolar is a statement about its cumulative economic, military, and other capabilities.1 But preponderant capabilities across the board do not guarantee effective influence in any given arena. U.S. dominance in the international security arena no longer translates into effective leverage in the international economic arena. And although the United States remains a dominant international economic player in absolute terms, after the cold war it has found itself more vulnerable and constrained than it was during the golden economic era after World War II. It faces rising economic challengers with their own agendas and with greater discretion in international economic policy than America’s cold war allies had enjoyed. The United States may continue to act its own way, but it can no longer count on getting its own way.

#### Empirics prove heg is useless

Mearsheimer, professor of political science – University of Chicago, 12/16/’10

(John, <http://nationalinterest.org/print/article/imperial-by-design-4576>)

U.S. grand strategy has followed this basic prescription for the past twenty years, mainly because most policy makers inside the Beltway have agreed with the thrust of Fukuyama’s and Krauthammer’s early analyses.

The results, however, have been disastrous. The United States has been at war for a startling two out of every three years since 1989, and there is no end in sight. As anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of world events knows, countries that continuously fight wars invariably build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behavior; and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators. The Founding Fathers understood this problem, as is clear from James Madison’s observation that “no nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.” Washington’s pursuit of policies like assassination, rendition and torture over the past decade, not to mention the weakening of the rule of law at home, shows that their fears were justified.

To make matters worse, the United States is now engaged in protracted wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that have so far cost well over a trillion dollars and resulted in around forty-seven thousand American casualties. The pain and suffering inflicted on Iraq has been enormous. Since the war began in March 2003, more than one hundred thousand Iraqi civilians have been killed, roughly 2 million Iraqis have left the country and 1.7 million more have been internally displaced. Moreover, the American military is not going to win either one of these conflicts, despite all the phony talk about how the “surge” has worked in Iraq and how a similar strategy can produce another miracle in Afghanistan. We may well be stuck in both quagmires for years to come, in fruitless pursuit of victory.

The United States has also been unable to solve three other major foreign-policy problems. Washington has worked overtime—with no success—to shut down Iran’s uranium-enrichment capability for fear that it might lead to Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons. And the United States, unable to prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons in the first place, now seems incapable of compelling Pyongyang to give them up. Finally, every post–Cold War administration has tried and failed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict`; all indicators are that this problem will deteriorate further as the West Bank and Gaza are incorporated into a Greater Israel.

The unpleasant truth is that the United States is in a world of trouble today on the foreign-policy front, and this state of affairs is only likely to get worse in the next few years, as Afghanistan and Iraq unravel and the blame game escalates to poisonous levels. Thus, it is hardly surprising that a recent Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey found that “looking forward 50 years, only 33 percent of Americans think the United States will continue to be the world’s leading power.” Clearly, the heady days of the early 1990s have given way to a pronounced pessimism.

#### Can’t contain newer threats

G. John **Ikenberry** Millennium - Journal of International Studies 2010 38: 509 originally published online 10 May 2010 G. John Ikenberry is Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and a Global Eminence Scholar at Kyung Hee University, Korea. His forthcoming book is Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Triumph, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order 10. “The Liberal International Order and its Discontents” World Politics 61, no. 1 (20**09**): 5. Millennium: Journal of International Studies 38 (3)

The sources of insecurity in world politics have also evolved since the early decades that shaped American liberal hegemony. As noted earlier, the threat to peace is no longer primarily from great powers engaged in security competition. The result has been a shift in the ways in which violence is manifest. In the past, only powerful states were able to gain access to the destructive capabilities that could threaten other societies. Today, it is possible to see technology and the globalisation of the world system as creating opportunities for non-state actors – or transnational gangs – to acquire weapons of mass destruction. As a result, it is now the weakness of states and their inability to enforce law and order within their own societies that provide the most worrisome dangers to the inter- national system. In contrast to earlier eras, there is no single enemy – or source of vio- lence and insecurity – that frames and reinforces the American-led liberal order. The United States and other states face a diffuse array of threats and challenges. Global warming, health pandemics, nuclear proliferation, jihadist terrorism, energy scarcity – these and other dangers loom on the horizon. Any of these threats could endanger Western lives and liberal ways of life either directly or indirectly by destabilising the global system upon which security and prosperity depend. Pandemics and global warming are not threats wielded by human hands, but their consequences could be equally devastating. Highly infectious disease has the potential to kill millions of people. Global warming threatens to trigger waves of environmental migration and food shortages, further destabilising weak and poor states around the world. The world is also on the cusp of a new round of nuclear proliferation, putting mankind’s deadliest weapons in the hands of unstable and hostile states. Terrorist networks offer a new spectre of non-state transnational violence. The point is that none of these threats are, in themselves, so singularly pre-eminent that they deserve to be the centrepiece of American national security as were anti-fascism and anti-communism in an earlier era.

## 2nc no solvency advo

flow

## 2nc modernization

#### Answers to modernization were off the mark – this is a TURN to the aff they’ve functionally dropped

#### More old people means China and Russia have less money to spend on weapons – that’s Haas

#### That prevents buildup of area denial capabilities that destroy power projection and collapse our leadership – that’s Friedberg

#### Specifically prevents access to the global commons which outweighs their internal links

Weitz, 9

[Richard, Senior Fellow and Director of the Center for Political-Military Analysis at Hudson Institute, “China, Russia, and the Challenge to

the Global Commons,” Pacific Focus, Vol. XXIV, No. 3 (December 2009), 271–297.]

China and Russia have launched major campaigns to contest the American presence in the global commons. These dimensions include the world’s oceans, outer space, and the cyber domain. The prosperity and security of the USA and its allies depends heavily on the global networks embedded in the continued freedom of the seas, the free use of the Internet, and the unhindered employment of satellites and other space-based assets. Overcoming Chinese and Russian anti-access efforts to these global commons is essential for preserving US security. In particular, as the US military has reduced its forward bases in Japan, South Korea, and other Asia–Pacific countries, it has become increasingly dependent on being able to use the global commons to rapidly deploy forces based in the USA to potential conflict regions. A failure to overcome anti-access threats could lead Asia–Pacific countries to call into question US security guarantees, which could result in their seeking new allies, exploring nuclear weapons options, or pursuing other policies adverse to American interests. US Security Depends on Accessing the Global Commons During the second half of the twentieth century, the USA enjoyed unfettered freedom to use the global commons – those domains that remain outside the territory of any single nation state but provide the means for connecting much of the world. As Professor Barry Posen observed in 2003, “Command of the commons is the military foundation of US political preeminence.” 1 During wars, the US armed forces were able to conduct military operations throughout the globe. In peacetime, US forces helped establish a stable international environment in which world trade could flourish, globalization could evolve, and world peace and prosperity could increase. The global commons remain vitally important today even as their technologies and manner of use change. The most prominent of these domains concern the world’s oceans (still the main thoroughfare for trading goods between countries), outer space (the domain used by most long-distance communications and broadcast media), and the Internet (increasingly the most effective media for storing and moving large quantities of information great distances at low cost). Billions of people access these domains each day, but they are especially important for commercial and military actors. The USA depends on the world’s oceans to move people and goods to and from the US homeland. The 2005 US National Strategy for Maritime Security points out that, “The right of vessels to travel freely in international waters, engage in innocent and transit passage, and have access to ports is an essential element of national security. The free, continuing, unthreatened intercourse of nations is an essential global freedom and helps ensure the smooth operation of the world’s economy.”2 The USA and its key allies also depend on unhindered access to outer space assets to provide critical capabilities in communications, navigation, missile guidance as well as imagery, weather, signals, and signature information. The USA has greater military and commercial assets in space than any other country. It owns or operates approximately half of the hundreds of active satellites now orbiting the earth.3 Space-based defense assets have proved invaluable in the recent US-led coalition successes in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq. Prior to becoming Secretary of Defense during the Bush administration, Donald Rumsfeld chaired a congressionally chartered panel that warned of a “space Pearl Harbor” in which a weaker adversary would employ asymmetric capabilities to blind US space-based intelligence.4 Partly in response to these perceived threats, the Bush administration approved a new National Space Policy in October 2006. The unclassified version stresses the vital interest of the USA in remaining a major space power. Although the document acknowledges the value of international cooperation in space and the right of “free passage” for all countries’ satellites and other space-based objects, the policy directive affirms the intent of the USA to protect its use of outer space by all available means, including by “deny[ing], if necessary, adversaries the use of space capabilities hostile to U.S. national interests.”5 In a speech this June, moreover, US Deputy Secretary of DefenseWilliam J. Lynn has confirmed that the US Department of Defense has now “formally recognized cyberspace for what it is: a domain similar to land, sea, air and space; a domain that we depend upon and need to protect,” adding that, “Just as we need freedom of navigation of the seas, we need freedom of movement online.” Lynn warned that the cyber threat environment represents “an unprecedented challenge to our national security by virtue of its source, its speed and its scope.” He reviewed the diverse range of public and private actors whose capabilities could threaten US cyber security, pointed out that information operations can occur nearly instantaneously, and discussed the extensive scope of US targets – ranging from military and other US government websites to privately owned critical US infrastructure, which encompasses most of the transportation, telecommunications, power, and financial networks in the USA – that are vulnerable to attack.6 The security imperative of retaining US access to the global commons will increase for at least the next few years given current Department of Defense plans to reduce overseas military deployments and instead rely more on sending US-based forces on foreign missions when necessary. The USA will need to enjoy unfettered access to the sea, space, and cyber domains to move and support these forces as well as to sustain its plans to rely more on space-based tracking and Internet-centered communications and intelligence. Without the freedom to project power far from the US homeland, the USA will not be able to deter potential foreign adversaries or reassure friends and allies. The July 2008 US National Defense Strategy, adopted under current Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, correctly observes that, “The United States requires freedom of action in the global commons and strategic access to important regions of the world to meet our national security needs.” In a speech this April, Secretary Gates argued that potential adversaries will not try to match US capabilities directly but instead would invest “in weapons geared to neutralize our advantages – to deny the US military freedom of movement and action while potentially threatening our primary means of projecting power: our bases, sea and air assets, and the networks that support them.” He warned that, “We ignore these developments at our peril.”7 Chinese and Russian Challenges to US Access Recent annual editions of the US Department of Defense report, Military Power of the People’s Republic of China, detail China’s increasing economic and military power. The Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA) is transforming into a modern, technologically advanced and mobile force prepared for international power projection and anti-access/area denial, even beyond Beijing’s traditional focus of the Taiwan Strait. Although China’s growing strength can prove beneficial to the USA and the rest of the world if it continues to pursue a peaceful path, the report points to uncertainties about the future course of the Peoples’ Republic of China (PRC) that give reason for concern. For example, the authors complain about China’s limited transparency regarding the extent and scope of its military modernization program. In addition, they express unease about the PLA’s development of cyber-warfare capabilities and other “disruptive” technologies that could threaten traditional US military advantages.8 The defense white paper released earlier this year by the PRC affirms Beijing’s intention to continue ongoing military modernization programs, which are enhancing China’s power-projection capabilities. The Chinese military has also been strengthening logistics and other support networks for all its individual services. Chinese strategists have placed special importance on making their C4ISR (Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance) systems more “reliable, survivable, interoperable, and integrated.”9 In a 10 August 2009 interview, General Kevin Chilton, commander of US Strategic Command, noted that Chinese strategists have discussed “in their military open documents, about how they believe future conflicts will involve conflict in both cyberspace and space.”10 During the last few years, Russia has reemerged as Washington’s main geopolitical rival, exerting its influence throughout much of the world, especially in the former Soviet republics, in ways often unwelcome by US policy makers. Even before the August 2008 GeorgianWar, the Russian government had made a series of bellicose statements and actions trumpeting Moscow’s revised military strength and, reinforced by the heightened value of its energy assets, diplomatic influence. Since winning that conflict, Russian military units have conducted an unprecedented range of operations, from massive live-fire exercises at home to naval and air deployments throughout much of the globe. Russian leaders have insisted that other governments recognize Russia’s status as a global power with legitimate interests in setting the rules and norms of the 21st-century international system. These claims extend from nuclear arms control to proposals to restructure the global financial system.

## 2nc no war

#### Great power war will soon be impossible because of aging – that’s haas

#### First, militaries will get smaller and less aggressive which reduces the threat of invasions

#### Second, heg will get relatively more secure – power transitions are inversely correlated with great power war

#### Third, it makes cooperation more likely

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

The preceding analysis demonstrates how global aging creates considerable security benefits for the United States. In the context of slowing economic growth, shrinking military expenditures, and increasing substitution of labor for capital within these budgets, no state or combination of states will be able to overtake the United States’ position of economic and military dominance. The same factors that help to preserve U.S. primacy also increase the likelihood of continued peace between the United States and the other most powerful states in the system. Numerous studies have shown that power transitions, either actual or anticipated, signiªcantly increase the probability of international conºict. By implication, the continuation of U.S. hegemony supported by the effects of global aging will decrease the probability of either hot or cold wars developing with the other powers.

#### And, the UK fills in – solves their impacts

Mark L. **Haas 7**, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duquesne, “A Geriatric Peace?”, International Security, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112–147

By virtually all accounts, however, Britain is better poised to address the challenges created by its aging society than are China, France, Germany, Japan, and Russia.81 Thanks to various pension reforms begun in the 1980s and comparatively low health-care costs, spending on the elderly in Britain is expected to increase in the next four decades by less than 6 percent of GDP, which is by far the lowest growth of any of the great powers.82 Moreover, Britain’s national debt is 43 percent of GDP, which is the lowest of all the industrialized great powers.83 With regard to military spending, Britain over the last decade has exhibited similar patterns and levels (as a percentage of GDP) as France.84 The United Kingdom, however, possesses two important advantages in this area relative to the other European powers. These advantages are tied to the level of states’ aging crises. First, Britain spends roughly one-third less than France and Germany on personnel costs as a percentage of the overall military budget. This fact allows Britain to purchase more of the most advanced weaponry available. Second, and relatedly, Britain’s military pension costs, as a percentage of total defense expenses, are relatively small (roughly one-third as small as this percentage in France, for example), which allows it to dedicate relatively more of its military budget to weapons purchases and salaries of active personnel.
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### Impact ov

#### And - Economic stability solves all conflict

Griswold 5 – director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12-29-2005, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)

Buried beneath the daily stories about car bombs and insurgents is an underappreciated but comforting fact during this Christmas season: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place.

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable. In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war. In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm institute reports in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts." Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa -- the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and domestic entrepreneurship. Advocates of free trade and globalization have long argued that trade expansion means more efficiency, higher incomes, and reduced poverty. The welcome decline of armed conflicts in the past few decades indicates that free trade also comes with its own peace dividend.

#### Econ specifically key in Latin America

VOA News, 3/11

(<http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2009-03/2009-03-11-voa85.cfm?CFID=188768142&CFTOKEN=39443163&jsessionid=6630d2dca2d59e8f19aa6f6f1c2b6d4b521f>)

The best way to improve U.S. relations with Latin America is by fixing the U.S. economy, according to analysts who testified before a Congressional committee in Washington on Wednesday. They told U.S. lawmakers that President Barack Obama should address the issue at next month's Summit of the Americas in Trinidad.   Analysts say when President Obama introduces himself to Latin American leaders at the Summit of the Americas, the attention will be on his plans to fix the U.S. economy.  "It is very, very vital that as we work on our economic problems, we recognize that the way we go about solving them will have an enormous impact on Latin America and the rest of the world," said President of the Inter-American Dialogue policy group Peter Hakim, speaking to the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### UQ

#### Bill close to passage now – needs every ounce of capital

Sargent 1/3 (Greg, writer for Washington Post, “Unemployment insurance extension hangs in the balance”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/01/03/unemployment-insurance-extension-hangs-in-the-balance/)

Next week, as early as Monday, Senate Democrats will move to vote on a three month extension for unemployment benefits for the 1.3 million people who lost them just after Christmas.¶ But the chances of passage for the measure are “hanging in the balance,” the Democratic Senator who is taking the lead on rounding up Senate votes for the legislation tells me.¶ “It’s not determined yet, but we’re going to do everything we can,” Senator Jack Reed of Rhode Island said in an interview. “Hanging in the balance is probably the right way to say it.”¶ However, Reed sought to project confidence, noting that he thought the bill had “momentum” and vowing to “work straight through” to win over Senators and make it happen.¶ Reed is co-sponsoring the legislation with GOP Senator Dean Heller, and Reid is lobbying both Republican and Democratic Senators to support the bill, but no GOP Senator other than Heller has publicly come out for it.¶ Asked whether he had lined up any other Republican Senators to support it, Reed declined to answer directly. “We’re getting people sincerely saying they’re thinking very seriously about this,” Reed said about his GOP colleagues.¶ Reed noted that a number of GOP Senators represent high unemployment states. If the 55 Dem-aligned Senators vote for an extension, which isn’t assured but is very likely, Dems need five Republicans.¶

And – pressure solves GOP opposition, there’s massive public support

Bernie Becker 12-26, The Hill, Poll: Majority backs renewal of jobless aid, <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/194038-poll-majority-backs-extending-jobless-benefits>

A solid majority of voters think Congress should extend expiring jobless benefits, a new poll said Thursday, a development Democrats believe could give them a potent issue in next year’s election.

The poll from Hart Research Associates found 55 percent of voters believe that benefits for the long-term unemployed, which expire on Saturday, should be extended.

Only around a third of voters, the Democratic pollster said, believe unemployment insurance should be allowed to expire. The poll was conducted on behalf of the National Employment Law Project.

Around 1.3 million people are expected to lose their benefits when the program expires on Dec. 28, and almost 2 million others could be affected in 2014, if Congress doesn’t act next year.

On a conference call, Democratic lawmakers made clear they would continue to pound the issue, and they believed their efforts to get the House and Senate to approve a short-term extension of the program were starting to be successful.

Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) and Rep. Sandy Levin (D-Mich.), two core supporters of the program, said the Saturday deadline had helped put a human face on the benefits, with stories about the impact of their expiration rolling out across the country.

“I think there is a sense that this is indeed a lifeline,” said Levin, the top Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over unemployment programs.

“Now we’re seeing the faces,” Levin added. “People are no longer numbers.”

The two lawmakers also said the stories helped advocates for the program respond to Republicans like Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.), who have said that expanded benefits are a “disservice” to workers.

“These benefits are very modest,” Reed told reporters. “This is not a program that people are leaving a good job for, or not looking for a job for.”

The Rhode Island Democrat added that the benefits offer “barely enough” for some unemployed people to stay afloat.

The Senate is scheduled to vote on a proposed three-month extension of the benefits, from Reed and Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.), when they return to Washington in January.

That measure would not offset the roughly $6 billion the program costs over three months, but Democrats say they would use the added time to discuss reforms to the programs with Republicans.

Reed specifically mentioned paying for the program on a more long-term basis by slicing tax loopholes, but that sort of proposal has been a nonstarter among Republicans in recent years.

Levin told reporters that he would work to get the measure to the House floor, but Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has so far taken a hands-off approach to the expiration of the benefits.

But Guy Molyneux of Hart Research Associates says that tactic could come back to bite Republicans. The extended benefits, Molyneux said, had broad backing across the country, and among both men and women.

Plus, Molyneux said that groups that have started to lean Republican — like seniors and white voters without a college education — also strongly supported the program.

“This is, I think, a politically very powerful issue,” Molyneux told reporters.

#### Momentum

George Zornick 12-26, Washington Post, Campaign to restore unemployment benefits hits the airwaves, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/12/26/campaign-to-restore-unemployment-benefits-hits-the-airwaves/>

For now, the idea is to get a bill passed, which is far from impossible. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has said he will bring a simple three-month extension for a vote as soon as Congress returns, and one Senate Republican is already on board. That means only four more votes are needed there. A small number of House Republicans also favor an extension and are reportedly pressuring Boehner.

To that end, the ad asks viewers to contact their member of Congress and demand the emergency unemployment program be restored. What is particularly useful about this approach is that there’s no pressure coming from the other side — unlike, say, the debate over “Obamacare,” there are no well-funded conservative groups out there pressing for an end to the emergency unemployment program. Based on the polls showing bipartisan support for an extension, the conservative grass roots don’t appear to be fired up about the issue. The passion and activism over jobless benefits is essentially just running in one direction, which is a promising sign.

### Link

#### Plan is perceived as being soft on Mexico—drains capital and specifically derails immigration passage

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

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

#### Congress doesn’t trust Mexico—engagement sparks backlash

AP ’13 (5/2/13, Associated Press, “Obama to Pitch Immigration Overhaul in Mexico” <http://www.newsmaxworld.com/Newsfront/obama-immigration-mexico-trip/2013/05/02/id/502393>)

For Pena Nieto, Obama's visit is a chance for him to showcase his country's economic gains. After suffering along with the U.S. during the recession, its economy is now growing at a better clip than that of the U.S. Per capita income has gone from an annual $7,900 two years ago to $10,146. ¶ ¶ But Diana Negroponte, a Latin America expert at the Brookings Institution, says corruption remains endemic, human rights are still a problem, and efforts to change and improve the judicial system have been too slow.¶ ¶ "There is concern on our side of the border that greater help needs to be given in order for Mexico to reform its system," she said.¶ ¶ Pena Nieto's changes in the security relationship with the U.S. have prompted some U.S. officials to speculate that the new president might be embracing the policies of his Institutional Revolutionary Party, which long has favored centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ ¶ Among those watching the new steps is Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., who has held up $228 million sought by the Obama administration for Mexico under a security cooperation agreement. Under the agreement, known as the Merida Initiative, Congress has already given Mexico more than $1.9 billion in aid since 2008.¶ ¶ But Leahy, chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the State Department budget, has been a critic of how the money has been used and with the results.¶ ¶ "Congress has been asked for a significant new investment, but it's not clear what the new Mexican government's intensions are," Leahy said in a statement to The Associated Press. "We're in a period of uncertainty until we know enough to be able to reset that part of our relationship. I'm not ready to sign off on more money without a lot more details."

#### Real policy changes with Mexico require political capital—recent commitments prove

Corcoran 9 (Patrick, “Shift in Tone Not Enough for U.S.-Mexico Relations”, April 16, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/3618/shift-in-tone-not-enough-for-u-s-mexico-relations>)

But while the shift in tone is laudable, the impact of rhetoric alone will be limited in both duration and depth. Unfortunately, while Obama's team has reinforced cooperative security measures already in place to help Mexico battle against drug cartels, it has remained unwilling to commit to more fundamental changes in U.S. policy. Among such possible transformations to the bilateral status quo, two U.S. legislative initiatives stand out for the impact they might have on the drug war in Mexico. ¶ First, the Obama administration should pursue a new ban on assault weapons, much like the one that expired in 2004, but without the loopholes that allowed slightly modified machine guns to qualify as legal. Since Mexico is already overrun with weapons, such a ban wouldn't drive violence down overnight, and the larger criminal organizations would still be able to find willing suppliers elsewhere. However, a strengthened ban would force drug gangs to divert a larger proportion of their profits to weapons purchases, which would make it harder for smaller groups to stockpile arsenals. It would also eventually reduce the number of weapons in the country, making Mexico less prone to outbreaks of warfare between criminal gangs. However, when asked about a new ban last month on Face the Nation, Obama demurred.¶ Second, the Obama administration should seek the legalization of marijuana, which remains the most profitable source of revenue for Mexican smugglers. Polls show that close to half of the U.S. public favors the move, which would have a greater direct impact on the profitability of Mexico's drug gangs than any other single action. A growing chorus of mainstream analysts, including Time's Joe Klein and the Washington Post's Eugene Robinson, has also called for the regulated, legal sale of cannabis in recent weeks. ¶ Yet, when questioned about the possibility of legalizing marijuana at his recent online town hall meeting, Obama -- who has himself admitted to having smoked marijuana -- poked fun at those interested in the issue before summarily dismissing it. The context of the War on Drugs, which demonizes all discussions of legalization, might make such a reaction good politics. But it remains poor policy. ¶ In other realms, Obama has been similarly timid. He has been unwilling to expend **political capital** to renew a program that would allow Mexican trucks to traverse U.S. roads, much to the dismay of Mexican exporters and NAFTA supporters. More significantly, while Obama has ratcheted up his rhetoric on immigration reform, it remains at best the third-highest priority on his domestic agenda. ¶ All of this means that despite the wave of Mexican enthusiasm for the new U.S. government and the tone it has struck, the bilateral relationship won't differ fundamentally from that under former presidents George W. Bush and Bill Clinton. While Obama and his administration deserve credit for reappropriating the terms of the bilateral conversation, his administration shouldn't be surprised if Mexico soon loses its infatuation with attractive rhetoric wrapped around the same old problems.

#### Engaging Mexico drains PC

Farnsworth 12 – VP of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society (Eric, “The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward”, Nov 30, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/>)

The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### NAFTA proves Mexican engagement is divisive

Villarreal and Fergusson 13 – Specialists in International Trade and Finance (M. Angeles, Ian F., 02/21, “NAFTA at 20: Overview and Trade Effects,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42965.pdf)

NAFTA was controversial when first proposed, mostly because it was the first FTA involving two wealthy, developed countries and a developing country. The political debate surrounding the agreement was divisive with proponents arguing that the agreement would help generate thousands of jobs and reduce income disparit y in the region, while opponents warned that the agreement would cause huge job losses in the United States as companies moved production to Mexico to lower costs. In reality, NAFTA did not cause the huge job losses feared by the critics or the large economic gains predicted by supporters. The net overall effect of NAFTA on the U.S. economy appears to have been relatively modest, primarily because trade with Canada and Mexico account for a small percentage of U.S. GDP. However, there were worker and firm adjustment costs as the three countries adjusted to more open trade and investment among their economies.

### PC Debate

Obama’s political capital is key to getting republicans on board

Caren Bohan, Reuters, 12/30 [“Obama, Democrats push for extension of unemployment benefits,” https://bangordailynews.com/2013/12/30/politics/obama-democrats-push-for-extension-of-unemployment-benefits/]

WASHINGTON — On the eve of the expiration of federal benefits for the long-term unemployed, President Barack Obama and his Democratic allies are stepping up pressure on Republicans to renew the program.¶ Top White House economic adviser Gene Sperling said in a statement issued on Friday that a failure to renew emergency jobless benefits would harm the economy and he urged Congress to move quickly to pass a short-term extension of the aid.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Democrat, has vowed to bring to a vote a bill extending federal unemployment insurance benefits as soon as Congress returns from its holiday recess on Jan. 6.¶ “While we remain disappointed that Congress did not heed the president’s call to extend emergency unemployment benefits for next year before the holidays, the president as well as the Democratic congressional leadership have made clear the importance of extending the benefits immediately upon Congress’s return,” Sperling said in a statement.¶ Sperling, director of the White House National Economic Council, endorsed legislation introduced by Sen. Jack Reed, D-RI, and Dean Heller, R-Nev., that would extend the unemployment benefits for three months. He said passage of the temporary bill would allow time to consider an extension for all of 2014.¶ Without an extension, some 1.3 million unemployed Americans are scheduled to lose their federal jobless benefits on Saturday.¶ Under an emergency program created during President George W. Bush’s administration in 2008, federal benefits kick in for Americans who have exhausted their state unemployment benefits. In many states, unemployment benefits run out after 26 weeks.¶ The federal jobless aid has been renewed every year since 2008. Many Republicans oppose an extension of jobless benefits, arguing the program was always intended to be temporary. They have also said an extension would add to the federal deficit unless it is offset by spending elsewhere in the budget.

Obama’s backing is key to a deal

Peter Schroeder 12-27, The Hill, Pelosi: End of jobless aid 'simply immoral', <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/194052-pelosi-blasts-immoral-end-to-jobless-benefits>

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said he plans to bring up an extension as his first order of business in 2014, but some Republicans have indicated they would only be willing to extend the program if the cost of another extension is offset elsewhere.

The emergency federal benefits were first put in place during the 2008 recession, and Congress has opted extending them repeatedly since then.

The program allows the federal government to help states provide much longer unemployment benefits than normally permitted, running up to 73 weeks so long as people are looking for work.

But with the extended benefits headed for a Saturday expiration, roughly 1.3 million unemployed Americans will immediately lose those benefits, while millions more could lose benefits throughout 2014 if they are not extended.

Some Republicans, including Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.), have opposed another extension, arguing the economy has recovered enough to end the emergency lifeline.

Other GOP lawmakers have not said they would oppose an extension, but are concerned about the roughly $26 billion cost of extending the program for another year. Pelosi has said she does not believe that cost has to be offset, arguing the program does more good for the economy than it costs.

President Obama has also called on Congress to extend the benefits, while Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has said he is willing to consider a specific proposal if the president offers it.

## AT no internal link

#### Collapses the economy – already lost $400 million in a week

Schroeder 1/3 (Robert, writer for Market Watch, “Workers lose $400 million in first week without jobless benefits: report”, http://blogs.marketwatch.com/capitolreport/2014/01/03/workers-lose-400-million-in-first-week-without-jobless-benefits-report/)

Jobless Americans and state economies have lost more than $400 million since the expiration of federal unemployment insurance last week, according to a report released Friday by House Democrats.¶ Congressional Democrats and the White House have been pushing to renew the program, which expired on Dec. 28. It provides up to 47 weeks of benefits to about 1.3 million workers who have exhausted their state benefits. House Republicans say the cost of the program must be offset.¶ Rep. Sander Levin of Michigan, the top Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee, sought to turn up the pressure on Republicans Friday.¶ “Every week that Republicans fail to act, tens of thousands of additional long-term unemployed Americans lose this vital lifeline as they look to get back on their feet after the worst recession in generations, and the economy in each state is taking a hit,” he said in a statement.¶ Democrats view jobless benefits as a stimulus because recipients often spend the money quickly.¶ But Republicans have balked at extending the program without offsetting spending cuts or changes to the program, which costs about $25 billion. The issue is poised to be the first congressional battle of 2014, with the Senate planning action on a bill next week.