# *Development Assistance Affirmative*

## 1AC

### Contention 1–War on Drugs

#### **Current anti narcotic methods fail in the squo -Mexican Drug Cartel strategies under the “Merida initiative” has not reduced drug trade**

Brewer 2009 (Stephanie Erin Brewer, Stephanie Brewer is the International Legal Officer at the Miguel Agustin Pro Juarez Human Rights Center in Mexico City. Rethinking the Merida Initiative: Why the U.S. Must Change Course in its Approach to Mexico's Drug War 2009 Human Rights Brief Human Rights Brief Spring, 2009 Human Rights Brief 16 Hum. Rts. Br. 9)J.R

In addition to these concerns, the consistently ineffective track record of frontal-combat approaches to reducing drug trafficking leave little doubt that supporting such an approach now will not end the drug trade, despite any short-term increases in the number of arrests or amount of drugs seized. Other large-scale security operations to fight drug traffickers at various points over the past few Mexican administrations have resulted in the arrests of high-profile drug kingpins or shifted drug trafficking routes from one place to another. They have not shown signs, however, of sustainable progress in reducing the drug trade as a whole. n25 Thus, while effective and professional law enforcement is important at all times, the experiences and data cited above [\*11] lead to the conclusion that increased law enforcement is not the panacea to Mexican drug traffick-ing. Deterrence in general does not hold much power over the foot soldiers of Mexico's drug trafficking organizations; such individuals already risk a violent death at the hands of rival traffickers or authorities. Tough law enforcement, even if it achieved increased numbers of arrests, would not stop new drug traffickers from emerging, lured by the promise of economic returns in a social and economic context that frequently offers few other opportunities to earn a dignified income. These points are especially relevant in a context of increasing recognition of the failure of the regional drug war paradigm. In February 2009, the Latin American Commission on Drugs and Democracy, composed of leading political figures including former Presidents of Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil, issued its conclusions on this subject. It strongly criticized as ineffective the U.S.-led drug war paradigm of the past 30 years and called for a public health approach to drug policy centered on treatment and demand reduction. n26 While it recognized the need for effective law enforce-ment against organized crime, the Commission observed, "Colombia is a clear example of the limitations of the repres-sive policies promoted globally by the United States" n27 in the drug war. It concluded that the sustainable solution to the drug problem lay in "demand reduction in the major consumer countries," notably the United States, as well as the European Union. n28 Also noteworthy is that a February 2009 telephone survey of Mexican residents, which measured reactions to the Commission's report, found that 63% agreed with the statement, "Strategies to confront drug trafficking exclusively through the police and military have failed in Latin America." n29 More than half of the participants in the survey (53%) agreed with the perception that, "It has not been possible to debate openly the subject of drugs to find new solu-tions, due to prejudices and the imposition of the United States, which only wants to use the police and military." Despite recent calls to change course in international and regional drug policies, the Merida Initiative fails to break with the philosophy of arresting drug-related criminals as the primary approach to reducing drug trafficking. Given the growing recognition of the need for truly new and more efficient strategies for reducing the flow of drugs, and given the severity of human rights problems in Mexico, now is the time to redefine the United States' role in Mexico's struggle against drug trafficking, beginning with U.S. foreign aid programs including the Merida Initiative.

#### **U.S. Military war on drugs in Mexico has lead to worst conditions and systematic violence all this for the low cost of social services**

Gautreau, School of International Development and Global Studies, University of Ottawa, 2012(Ginette Léa, To Rid the World of the Drug Scourge: A Human Security Perspective on the War on Drugs in Colombia and Mexico, Paterson Review of International Affairs (2012) 12: 61–83, http://diplomatonline.com/mag/pdf/Gautreau\_-Human\_Security\_and\_War\_on\_Drugs.pdf)

Like corruption, drug trafficking permeates national borders and ¶ impacts Colombia and Mexico’s relations with other countries. As Seccombe ¶ (1997, 292–93) argues, in addition to the harm done byconflict, U.S. anti-drug¶ policies can have internationalramifications through impacts on economic, ¶ political, and strategic affairs. For instance, Roderic Ai Camp (2010) and ¶ Carpenter (2003) discuss the formidable challenge of reconciling U.S. ¶ demands with Mexican interests in the War on Drugs due to the complex and ¶ tense history between the two countries. The authors note that this history, ¶ distinguished by the supremacy of U.S. interests over Mexican interests, ¶ results in mistrust and animosity between the Mexican and U.S. militaries, ¶ and that many Mexicans perceive the War on Drugs to be an American ¶ war against drug consumption being fought in Mexico with Mexican ¶ resources and against the Mexican people. The same can be argued about ¶ Colombians (ibid., 22). In effect, the War on Drugs also has severe domestic ¶ policy implications by eroding state funds and shifting focus away from social services and programs, including rural development policies, toward ¶ increased militarization of the country. This constitutes one of the main ¶ paradoxes of current anti-drug policies: they demand sacrifices to the human ¶ component, including human rights,when these problems are at the root of ¶ the drug war. The human security approach, on the other hand, complements¶ national security policies with social policies by taking into account the ¶ human component of the drug war. ¶ The War on Drugs is compromising economic security through its crop ¶ eradication campaigns, high security costs, and underfunded alternative ¶ development programs. In addition, corruption, national and international ¶ political tensions, and the neglect of larger social and political conditions ¶ are eroding political security in both Colombia and Mexico. It is crucial for ¶ the governments of both countries to collaborate with the United States to ¶ address their weaknesses by strengthening institutions and re-evaluating the ¶ alternative development component of their drug policies. In doing so, they ¶ could better target deeper issues that allow the drug trade to succeed within ¶ their borders.

#### Open Military force produces a redundant cycle of violence

Brewer 2009 (Stephanie Erin Brewer, Stephanie Brewer is the International Legal Officer at the Miguel Agustin Pro Juarez Human Rights Center in Mexico City. Rethinking the Merida Initiative: Why the U.S. Must Change Course in its Approach to Mexico's Drug War 2009 Human Rights Brief Human Rights Brief Spring, 2009 Human Rights Brief 16 Hum. Rts. Br. 9)G.L

As drug-related violence surges in northern Mexico, U.S. government officials have come to place urgent priority on the need to reduce drug trafficking south of the U.S.-Mexico border. Citing this goal, the U.S. government began in late 2008 to implement a multi-year, $ 1.4 billion foreign aid plan known as the Merida Initiative with the stated purpose of enhancing Mexico's ability to reduce crime, with overwhelming emphasis on the drug trade. This aid package complements other forms of U.S. security aid to its southern neighbor, including millions of dollars in annual military aid from the Department of Defense. n1 Yet an examination of the current Mexican and regional context leads to the conclusion that without a paradigm shift in design, the hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars earmarked for the Merida Initiative and other anti-drug aid to Mexico will fuel a dysfunctional approach to public security--one that is characterized by widespread human rights violations within the framework of an ineffective war against criminals that has not reduced drug-related violence. This misguided public security paradigm contrasts sharply with an alternative approach that, rather than battling the symptoms of the drug trade, would primarily target the engine that drives it: namely, demand for drugs in the United States. The need for a clear break with past strategies and a significant focus on demand reduction is all the more salient in light of the growing recognition by political actors and analysts in the region that the Americas are in dire need of a new approach to reducing drug trafficking--and that the United States could have a decisive role to play in taking this step forward. This article, which forms part two of a two-part series examining Mexico's public security policies from a human rights perspective, presents an overview of the Merida Initiative and discusses its current and potential impact on respect for human rights in Mexico. 2 It concludes that now is the time for the U.S. administration to rethink the Merida Initiative and other public security aid programs, paving a new path that efficiently targets the driving forces behind drug trafficking while respecting and promoting human rights. The Merida Initiative aid package originated in a meeting between Mexican President Felipe Calderon and former U.S. President George W. Bush in March 2007. n3 In the following months, officials of both administrations met to draw up the basic structure of the proposed package, n4 which centered largely on providing material and technical support to Mexico's security forces in their war against drug criminals. The final version of the Merida Initiative, signed into law by Bush on June 30, 2008, channels $ 400 million worth of support from the United States to Mexico in its first year, n5 including $ 116.5 million in military assistance. n6 The detailed spending plan prepared by the U.S. State Department in September 2008 outlines the proposed uses of Merida funding, including the purchase of airplanes and helicopters for the Mexican military for surveillance, counternarcotics, and counterterrorism operations; the purchase of scanners and armored vehicles; n8 the establishment of law enforcement databases; n9 training for specialized police units combating organized crime; n10 and anti-corruption activities in the federal police. n11 At the time of the Initiative's enactment, the U.S. government contemplated at least two more years of funding, with a total anticipated amount of $ 1.4 billion. n12 In 2009, Congress approved a total of $ 300 million in Merida funding for Mexico. n13 This lower amount may signify a reduction in total Merida spending over the contemplated three-year period. The initial Merida spending plan, in addition to its law enforcement components, also mentions prevention activities including online training of drug treatment counselors, n14 as well as "rule of law" and "human rights activities," n15 including technical assistance in the implementation of judicial reforms. As will be explained below, 15% of the money in certain funding categories will be reserved until the U.S. State Department reports that Mexico has achieved four specific human rights goals. Yet viewed in the context of the Initiative's overall design and funding [\*10] distribution, these human rights elements come across as side features to the package. The Initiative's design leaves no doubt that it is overwhelmingly geared toward law enforcement activities, including military operations, undertaken in the current battle against criminals. It is worth underscoring that the Merida Initiative follows years of U.S. counternarcotics aid to Mexican security forces, n16 a process that continues to influence the approach to drug trafficking deployed by the Mexican government.

#### **This has profound impacts Drug violence has taken a sharp rise in the Status quo Mexicans live in a vicious terrain of violence**

Dean Et. Al. 2012(William, THE WAR ON MEXICAN CARTELS, Institute of Politics, pages 7-8William Dean Laura Derouin Mikhaila Fogel Elsa Kania Tyler Keefe James McCune Valentina Perez Anthony Ramicone Robin Reyes Andrew Seo Minh Trinh Alex Velez-Green Colby Wilkason September 2012) <http://www.iop.harvard.edu/sites/default/files_new/research-policy-papers/TheWarOnMexicanCartels.pdf>)

The Mexican “Drug War” has killed between 30,000 and 40,000 people – civilians, cartel ¶ henchmen, and federal employees. The impact on the nation has been profound, and the violence has not been contained within it – kidnappings and murders directly related to the drug ¶ cartel violence have spilled over the border into southern Texas. There are three main sources ¶ of violence in this conflict: intra-cartel disputes, inter-cartel rivalries, and the overall war that ¶ Mexican President Felipe Calderón’s government is waging on the cartels. When he entered ¶ office in 2006, Calderón immediately moved on the cartels. He sent in the federal police along ¶ with army units in an attempt to eliminate high value leaders. The cartels “reacted by ¶ unleashing a wave of violence, fighting for turf. Calderón insists this shows the gangs are rattled, ¶ but his critics say his strategy has often made matters worse.”9¶The cartels are now escalating¶ their violence in order to counteract the aggressive strategy of the central government. In a fastpaced arms race, the drug lords are now “firing everything from assault rifles to rocketpropelled grenades.”10 According to the North American Congress on Latin America, “both the ¶ cartels and the Mexican state get the arms from the U.S.”11 In what policy-makers have come to ¶ label the “iron river,” nearly 2,000 small arms cross the border into Mexico daily.12 According to ¶ the Mexican government, in 2005, “U.S. arms [were] recovered in 80% of crimes in Mexico.”13¶ Worsening these conditions is the challenge of police corruption: in August 2010, the Calderón ¶ government fired some “3,200 officers, about 10% of the 34,500-person federal force.”14¶The violence has transformed into something new in recent years. The brutality meted out by ¶ the cartel gangs could potentially be labeled as terrorism.In 2010, the cartels focused in part on ¶ aggression towards public servants, killing 12 mayors and a gubernatorial candidate.15 Intercartel violence is also on the rise as the organizations fracture and begin to struggle for premium ¶ trading routes. As the government moves on one organization, for instance La Familia, and ¶ arrests or eliminates critical leadership, two types of conflicts ensue. Within the cartel, different ¶ factions battle to fill the power vacuum. Outside the cartel, other organizations recognize the ¶ weakness of their competitor and move to assume its territory and trading routes. The result is a ¶ new wave of killings.

#### Quotidian practice of violence is hidden in the backdrop of “peace time” the Drug war creates psychological as well as systematic violence against its collateral damage –this is best described by the continual invisible genocide

**Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois ‘4**(Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn) (Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34).  Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite.  As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematically and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible.  Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002).  In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life.  The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families.  Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989).  Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate.  While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

#### PLAN: United State federal government should substantially increase alternative development assistance for smallholder farming in Mexico.

### Contention 2--Getting to the RooT

#### Small farming is key to development in Latin America and the Caribbean bolstering their economic gains is key to poverty reduction and security of food which leads to food sovereignty

Nwanze '09 (is President of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), an international financial institution and a specialized United Nations agency.) The author Kanayo F.http://www.ifad.org/events/op/2009/editorial\_brazil.htm (J.R)

The impact of the international financial crisis on the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region has been acute and wide-ranging. Though national economic performances will vary, an overall downturn in regional GDP is expected; a drop of 1.5 per cent in 2009, following gains of 5.5 per cent and 4.3 per cent for the past two years. Commodity exporters are being hit by the decline in the terms of trade. Weaker revenues are leading to increased pressure on government budgets.Remittances, which have been growing rapidly in the last fifteen years, have boosted wider economic wellbeing, particularly for rural families and communities. They represent more than 12 per cent of GDP in seven LAC countries. 2009 will see the first ever decline in this important life-line with the sharpest drops predicted in Central American countries, Mexico and the Dominican Republic. While the region as a whole is still on track to meet the first Millennium Development Goal targets (MDG1) – that is halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 -- some countries are likely to fall short, as the global financial crisis risks undoing the progress they have made in poverty reduction. The situation is particularly critical in rural areas, where more than half the people are poor. Now more than ever before, investment in agriculture, particularly smallholder agriculture, is vital**. Small family farms make a fundamental contribution to the economies and the food security of the countries in the region. They account for nearly 40 per cent of agricultural outputs in** Brazil and **Mexico,**and more than 60 per cent in Central America**. Yet, small-scale farmers are still among the poorest people in Latin America because of lack of secure access to land, technologies, financial services and markets. Investment in smallholder farming is an effective way to ensure sustainable and inclusive growth. Not only does it give a strong boost to agricultural productivity and production, thus contributing to food security and poverty reduction, it also supports rural communities which are the backbone of social stability and drives broader economic growth.**Family farming has long been a low priority in policymaking and redressing that imbalance is now more urgent than ever. **The financial crisis demands short-term measures, accompanied by a long-term vision,** to protect vulnerable rural households**. Four sets of interventions are urgently required: first, a step increase in investment in agriculture and rural development across all aspects of the production cycle.** This includes infrastructure, technical assistance and rural financial services. **Second, the strengthening of capacities, within each country, in terms of a policy framework for reducing rural poverty and promoting effective government institutions. Third, more private sector involvement in agricultural services, such as finance and marketing and the development of public-private partnerships. Fourth, the promotion of agricultural research to allow new and improved technologies to be developed and shared**

#### **Combating poverty gets at the root of the problem in regards to the drug trade in Mexico**

Gautreau, School of International Development and Global Studies, University of Ottawa, 2012

(Ginette Léa, To Rid the World of the Drug Scourge: A Human Security Perspective on the War on Drugs in Colombia and Mexico, Paterson Review of International Affairs (2012) 12: 61–83, http://diplomatonline.com/mag/pdf/Gautreau\_-Human\_Security\_and\_War\_on\_Drugs.pdf)

In its effort to eradicate drug trafficking, the War on Drugs threatens the economic security of thousands of individuals in Colombia and Mexico who depend on the illegal but profitable drug industry for their livelihoods. As Peterson (2002, 437) explains, attempts to implement crop substitution programs through alternative development initiatives in Colombia have been met with numerous geographical, ecological, and climate-related obstacles. Many villages are too far removed from market access points, a situation made worse by the mountainous topography, making it difficult to sell alternative crops, and there are few profitable types of legal crops that can grow in the rocky soil of the Andes. Conversely, coca plants can grow very easily—they become productive within two years—and the expertly established drug trafficking channels allow products to move very quickly (ibid., 428, 437). Plan Colombia failed to take these factors into account in its crop eradication campaigns and many drug-producing regions in Mexico continue to lack sufficient funding for alternative development initiatives. As such, the cultivation of illicit cropsand the salaries of sicarios (cartel hit men) continue to be very attractive in the face of unemployment and poverty(Kelly, Maghan, and Serio 2005; Hill 2010). However, as Wells (2006, 57) indicates, “this does not necessarily imply that the US should support these industries . . . [rather,] they should be aware of the extent to which people’s economic security is linked to drug cultivation and . . . the importance of offering them [viable] alternative economic opportunities.”

In this light, it is clear that drug policies should focus more on economic security by addressing problems of poverty, inequality, and unemployment. By maintaining a narrow perspective on the drug industry as a threat to state security, rather than a problem related to underdevelopment or socioeconomic conditions, the War on Drugs continues to neglect **the roots of the drug industry**. Writing about the Mexican context, Vanda Felbab-Brown (2010, 7) supports this reconceptualization of security: “Addressing the socioeconomic needs of the marginalized areas of both the northern urban belt as well as southern rural areas is critical for reducing the recruitment pool for the DTOs, severing the bonds between marginalized communities and criminal elements, and resurrecting the hope of many Mexican citizens that the Mexican State and legal behavior can best advance their future.” FelbabBrown also underscores one of the most important factors in Mexico’s strategy: the bulk of the anti-drug activities are taking place in northern Mexico’s troubled states, but little action is being addressed in the southern states or poorer communities of the country. A similar situation occurred in Colombia, where security conditions improved in major cities, but rural communities— particularly in the Puntomayo region—have seen little progress.

#### Food sovereignty with an emphasis on small farmers markets is key to combating hunger and poverty

Moore (Farm industry analyst) October 31, 2003 (Melissa, “Food Sovereignty: global rallying cry of farmers movements”, Backgrounder, Volume 9, Issue 4, <http://www.foodfirst.org/fr/node/47>)

As corporate-driven economic globalization and runaway free trade policies devastate rural communities around the world, farmers’ organizations are coming together around the rallying cry of*food sovereignty*.¶ Food sovereignty says that feeding a nation’s people is an issue of national security—of sovereignty. If the people of a country must depend for their next meal on the vagaries of the global economy, on the goodwill of a superpower not to use food as a weapon, or on the unpredictability and high cost of long-distance shipping, that country is not secure in the sense of either national security or food security.¶ Food sovereignty goes beyond the concept of food security, which has been stripped of real meaning**.**Food security means that every child, woman, and man must have the certainty of having enough to eat each day; but the concept says nothing about where that food comes from or how it is produced**. Thus** Washington is able to argue that importing cheap food from the US is a better way for poor countries to achieve food security than producing it themselves.But massive imports of cheap, subsidized food undercut local farmers, driving them off their land. They swell the ranks of the hungry, and their food security is placed in the hands of the cash economy just as they migrate to urban slums where they cannot find living wage jobs. To achieve genuine food security, people in rural areas must have access to productive land and receive prices for their crops that allow them to make a decent living.¶ The only lasting way to eliminate hunger and reduce poverty is through local economic development. One way to achieve such development in rural areas is to create local circuits of production and consumption, where family farmers sell their produce and buy their necessities in local towns. Money circulates several times in the local economy, generating town employment and enabling farmers to make a living. In contrast, if what farmers produce is exported, fetching international market (low) prices, and most everything they buy is imported, all profits are extracted from the local economy and contribute only to distant economic development (i.e., on Wall Street). Thus food sovereignty, with its emphasis on local markets and economies, is essential to fighting hunger and poverty.

#### Without food sovereignty hunger grows, people starve, and unemployment goes up

Moore (Farm industry analyst) October 31, 2003 (Melissa, “Food Sovereignty: global rallying cry of farmers movements”, Backgrounder, Volume 9, Issue 4, <http://www.foodfirst.org/fr/node/47>)

According to Via Campesina, the international farmers’ and peasants’ movement, “food sovereignty gives priority of market access to local producers. Liberalized agricultural trade, which gives access to markets on the basis of market power and low, often subsidized, prices, denies local producers access to their own markets.” (2002; italics in original.) What Via Campesina and others say is that we face a clash of economic development models for the rural world. The contrasts between the dominant model, based on agro exports, neoliberal economic policies, and free trade, versus the food sovereignty model, could not be more stark (see box). Where one model sees family farmers as an inefficient anachronism that should disappear with development, the other sees them as the basis of local economies and of national economic development—as the internal market that enabled today’s industrial economic powerhouses like the US, Japan, China, and South Korea to get off the ground.¶ As for hunger, one model sees boosting exports from giant plantations as the way to generate the foreign exchange needed to import cheap food for the hungry—its adherents say export cropping also creates rural jobs and thus keeps more children from starving. The other sees the conversion of farmland that once belonged to family smallholders to export cropping, as the driving force behind the growth of hunger and immiseration in rural areas. Food sovereignty proponents point out that large-scale export cropping creates much lower levels of employment than family farming—and that the few jobs it creates are low-wage and precarious.¶ And while the dominant model is based on chemical-intensive, large-scale monoculture, with genetically modified (GM) crops, the food sovereignty model sees these industrial farming practices as destroying the land for future generations, and counterposes genuine agrarian reform and a mixture of traditional knowledge and sustainable, agroecologically based farming practices.¶

#### Our interpretation for the impact debate is that ongoing systemic impacts should be prioritized over formulated cataclysmic impacts. Impact calculus that prioritizes isolated, improbable event not only prevent solvency on ongoing harms, but also entrenches us in a mindset that encourages further predictions and preemptions.

#### Only a focus on status quo impacts can solve in the long term-

Ivana Milojević 2001. The University of Queensland, Australia. Gender, Peace and Terrestrial Futures:

Alternatives to Terrorism and War. http://www.metafuture.org/articlesbycolleagues/IvanaMilojevic/Ivana\_Milojevic\_-\_Gender\_peace\_and\_terrestrial\_futures.htm

Social and economic strategies require radical transformation and restructuring of societies and economies. This means working towards the objectives of equality, development and peace by improving employment, health and education (The Beijing Platform for Action, The Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, in Peterson, Runyan, 1999:218). Approximately 3,000 deaths from terrorist attack on Unites States are 3,000 deaths too many. But so are estimated 24,000 deaths of people who died of hunger on the same day, 6,000 children killed by diarrhea and 2,700 children killed by measles on the 11 September 2001 (New Internationalist, 2001:18-19). If we become aware that the number of malnourished children in developing countries is about 149 million, the number of women who die each year of pregnancy and childbirth about 500,000 and number of illiterate adults 875 million it is clear that where priorities should be. Preventing terrorism by policing is crucial but so is ‘the holy war’ against injustice, structural and cultural violence, poverty. These problems are, as is terrorism, global problems. The understanding of ‘security’ predominately in terms of national security or the security of the state is becoming obsolete by the day. Although the USA did not in any way ‘deserve’ the attacks that occurred on the 11th September, we should still become aware that all violence (in the international, national or family realms) is interconnected (Tickner, 1993:58). Which means that there is an intimate connection between both direct, structural and cultural violence, as well as domestic and international violence**. Thus, any serious attempt to end war must involve significant alterations in local, national, and global hierarchies** (Peterson and Runyan, 1999:228). This includes addressing sexism, racism, classism, heterosexism, and gendered nationalism which have all been vital to sustaining militarism and the ‘us’ and ‘them’ mentality that goes along with it (Peterson and Runyan, 1999:228),  One of the most important strategy, connected to socio-economic trasformations is  demilitarization. Availability of weapons may not be sufficient factor for war and terrorism but certainly it is necessary. Particular cultural cognitive maps determine how are technologies to be used. Still, the general production, availability and the trade of weapons directly support various wars as well as terrorism. Unfortunately, the direction taken after 11th September has been further militarisation, because the new ‘reasons’ for further militarisation have been activated. The logical response should instead had been redirection of resources from the military towards civilian needs and requirements. This would include a redirection of resources towards development of international courts system, towards initiatives that work on inter-cultural understandings, communication and alliances. The overall problem of course is that the patriarchal worldview determines that life-taking activities are better funded than life-giving ones. For example, worldwide, over half the nations of the world still provide higher budgets for the military than for their countries’ health needs. In the USA alone, the Pentagon received $17 billion more than it requested in both 1996 and 1997 (“The Ohio story”, quoted in Peterson and Runyan, 1999:125). The awaited ‘peace dividend’ after the end of the cold war has not materialized because 6 years later the Pentagon in the USA still receives 5 times what is spend on education, housing, job training and the environment combined  (“The Ohio Story”, in Peterson and Runyan, 1999:120).

Demands for de-militarisation are underlined by the more acute awareness that peace is not a state but a process. The focus is on peace-building, peace-making and peace-keeping, contesting the belief that peace is “a kind of condition or state which is achieved or simply occurs” (Boudling, 1990:141). Or as something that happens only after the military intervention is over. The awareness that “peace never exists as a condition, only as a process” (Boulding, 1990:146) means that military involvement – or ‘doing war’ - is seen as directly opposite from ‘doing peace’, that is, from various peace-making activities. The patriarchal worldview implies that waging wars is sometimes necessary to maintain the peace. Alternative perspectives to this worldview imply that peace cannot be defined only as the absence of war and that both direct and structural forms of violence need to be addressed. Therefore, peace does not merely depends on the absence of war, but rather on constant efforts to achieve equality of rights, equal participation in decision making processes and equal participation in distribution of the resources that sustain society (Borelli in Brock-Utne, 1989:2). In that sense, peace either happens now, as well as yesterday and tomorrow, or it does not. Its temporal and geographical locations almost entirely depend on peace activities and result from active practicing of peace promoting activities. ‘Doing war’ is therefore, not a necessary condition for achieving reconciliation, but directly opposite condition that can best be defined as the absence of peace, and peace promoting activities.  The list of previously mentioned strategies is by no means exclusive, but it is an example of how different visions for the future as well as a different worldview bring different understanding of how conflicts are to be understood and resolved. Current and traditional means of resolving conflicts have resulted in a well-documented violent history. If future histories are to be changed, traditional, neo-liberal, ‘realists’ and patriarchal discourses, with their trademark short-term orientation, need to be abandoned. They could be replaced with alternatives that provide an expanded sense of time and long-term orientation as well as a more balanced views on war/violence, human nature, history, conflict, power, sovereignty, security, strength, identity, peace and future. This means that it is those alternatives that are, in effect, more ‘pragmatic’, ‘realistic’ and viable. The emerging global order requires constant negotiations and building of alliances between all our diversities. It requires global justice and fairness rather then the ‘might is right’ approach currently practiced by individualistically oriented and self-centered nation states. In our globalized, ‘compressed’, ‘hyperreal’ and ‘hybrid’ world the alternatives that aim to develop both unified and diversified terrestrial futures have not become less, but rather more urgently needed and necessary. Consequently, they could potentially be one important path that can be taken in order to, epistemologically and strategically, support the efforts and struggles toward global peace and global security.