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**Immigration reform will pass now**

Leopold 10/24 David, Immigration Attorney/Immigration Reform Advocate, past president & past general counsel, American Immigration Lawyers Association, Huffington Post, Immigration Reform Is Alive and Kicking on Capitol Hill, 10/24/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-leopold/immigration-reform-is-alive\_b\_4136478.html

As it turns out, reports of the death of immigration reform were greatly exaggerated. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.), Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) and other House Republicans and Democrats are reportedly working on various immigration plans, some of which, including a bill to be released next week by Issa, deal with the toughest issue of all -- what to do about the nation's 11.7 million undocumented immigrants. And Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) says that immigration reform could get to the floor of the House before the end of the year.¶ Is common sense breaking out on Capitol Hill? That might be too much to ask for. But at least the GOP leadership seems to be taking a hard look at political reality.¶ Here are four big reasons why an immigration overhaul is likely to happen by the end of the year:¶ 1. Immigration reform is a political win-win for Democrats and Republicans.¶ I can't say that either the Democrats or Republicans came out of last week's shutdown and debt limit brinksmanship looking good to the American people, but the whole debacle hurt the Republicans much more. A recent NBCNews/Wall Street Journal poll found that the public blames the GOP more than President Obama by 53 percent to 31 percent, a 21 point margin. And approval ratings for the Republican party are at an all-time low -- never before in the history of polling have the numbers shown such blatant disappointment.¶ Immigration reform gives the Republicans a unique opportunity to do something big, to reach across the aisle and work with House Democrats to pass real immigration reform either in a comprehensive package or as a series of bills that ultimately have a chance to fix what's wrong with our immigration system. It would be a colossal mistake for the House GOP not to seize the chance to lead on immigration reform. The American people want it, the country needs it, and it's a pathway to political redemption for the badly bruised Republican party.¶ 2. The immigration reform coalition is unified and ready to make the final push.¶ A broad coalition of business, labor, faith-based and ethnic groups are full of energy and ready to finish the job the Senate started in the spring. In the midst of the combined "shutdown and debt ceiling" crisis, thousands of Americans descended on Washington to join the "March for Dignity and Respect." Eight members of Congress, including civil rights icon John Lewis (D-Ga.), joined together in an historic act of civil disobedience and were arrested near the steps of the Capitol in a show of solidarity with the immigration reform movement. As Rep. Charles Rangel (D-N.Y.) wrote recently in his The Huffington Post column "Why I Went To Jail":¶ Some may call it a publicity stunt. Some may call it a political theater. For whatever reason some may think I stood out there with thousands of clergy and advocates calling for immigration reform, the fact is that it got attention. And immigration reform is a critical issue that desperately needs it. If eight Members of Congress getting thrown in jail is what it takes to get people talking about it, then I'll gladly sit in the slammer. We cannot let ourselves forget that our nation has been built by immigrants, and the story of America began with people from another nation traveling to our shores.¶ Congress needs to fix the twisted morass of rules and regulations that pass for America's immigration policy. No longer can we sit idle as our mess of a "system" ruthlessly breaks up American families, stifles economic growth, and compromises our nation's democratic principles. Now is the time.¶ 3. The DREAMERs have become doers.¶ A funny thing happened since the DREAM Act was first introduced in 2001. The DREAMERs grew up. And they grew up as Americans, watching football, going to homecoming dances, eating hotdogs on the 4th of July and dreaming about giving back to the country they've struggled against all odds to enrich. They are no longer the helpless children who were brought to the U.S. by their parents. Today they are, in effect, undocumented Americans.¶ Through masterful use of 21st century tools like Facebook and Twitter, coupled with old-fashioned organizing and courage, the DREAMERs have become a key voice in the struggle for immigration reform. They, more than any other group, deserve the lion's share of credit for pushing the administration to grant an administrative deportation reprieve to qualified undocumented youth last year.¶ For DREAMERs there is no giving up on their journey toward U.S. citizenship. They will no longer take no for an answer.¶ 4. Now is the time.¶ The passion is there, the energy is there, and, most of all, the American people are there. It's time for both parties to sit down together and create an immigration process that will protect our borders, keep our families safe and together, give our businesses the tools they need to compete in the global economy, and provide a road map to lawful immigration status for the 11 million aspiring citizens currently living in the shadows.¶ Now, not later. Now.

**Economic engagement is unpopular – costs PC**

NYT 13

New York Times. “In Latin America, U.S. Focus Shifts From Drug War to Economy” May 4, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=1&

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.

**Capital is key – allows Obama to thread the needle – there’s momemtum now**

McMorris-Santoro 10/15 Evan, BuzzFeed Staff, Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next, 10/15/13, http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for

As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win.¶ The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.¶ “It’s at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can’t govern responsibly and is reckless that they’re going to say, ‘All right, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?’” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America’s Voice. “That’s where immigration could fill the bill.”¶ The White House and Democrats are “ready” to jump back into the immigration fray when the fiscal crises ends, Sharry said. And advocates are already drawing up their plans to put immigration back on the agenda — plans they’ll likely initiate the morning after a fiscal deal is struck.¶ “We’re talking about it. We want to be next up and we’re going to position ourselves that way,” Sharry said. “There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, ‘We’re not going to wait.’”¶ The White House isn’t ready to talk about the world after the debt limit fight yet, but officials have signaled strongly they want to put immigration back on the agenda.¶ Asked about future strategic plans after the shutdown Monday, a senior White House official said, “That’s a conversation for when the government opens and we haven’t defaulted.” But on Tuesday, Press Secretary Jay Carney specifically mentioned immigration when asked “how the White House proceeds” after the current fracas is history.¶ “Just like we wish for the country, for deficit reduction, for our economy, that the House would follow the Senate’s lead and pass comprehensive immigration reform with a big bipartisan vote,” he said. “That might be good for the Republican Party. Analysts say so; Republicans say so. We hope they do it.”¶ The president set immigration as his next priority in an interview with Univision Tuesday.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama said. He also set up another fight with the House GOP on the issue.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”¶ Don’t expect the White House effort to include barnstorming across the country on behalf of immigration reform in the days after the fiscal crisis ends, reform proponents predict. Advocates said the White House has tried hard to help immigration reform along, and in the current climate that means trying to thread the needle with Republicans who support reform but have also reflexively opposed every one of Obama’s major policy proposals.¶ Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on more of the blame from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans.¶ “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”

**Key to the economy**

**Krudy ‘13** [Edward. Politics for Reuters. “Analysis: Immigration Reform could Boost US Economic Growth” Reuters, 1/29/13 ln]

**The sluggish U.S. economy could get a lift** if President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of senators succeed in what could be the biggest overhaul of the nation's immigration system since the 1980s. Relaxed immigration rules could **encourage entrepreneurship**, increase demand for housing, raise tax revenues and help reduce the budget deficit, economists said. By helping more immigrants enter the country legally and allowing many illegal immigrants to remain, the United States could help offset a slowing birth rate and put itself in a stronger demographic position than aging Europe, Japan and China. "**Numerous industries in the U**nited **S**tates **can't find the workers they need, right now even in a bad economy**, to fill their orders and expand their production as the market demands," said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration specialist at the libertarian Cato Institute. The emerging **consensus among economists** is that **immigration** provides a net benefit. It **increases** **demand** and productivity, helps drive innovation and lowers prices, although there is little agreement on the size of the impact on economic growth. President Barack Obama plans to launch his second-term push for a U.S. immigration overhaul during a visit to Nevada on Tuesday and will make it a high priority to win congressional approval of a reform package this year, the White House said. The chances of major reforms gained momentum on Monday when a bipartisan group of senators agreed on a framework that could eventually give 11 million illegal immigrants a chance to become American citizens. Their proposals would also include means to keep and attract workers with backgrounds in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This would be aimed both at foreign students attending American universities where they are earning advanced degrees and high-tech workers abroad. An estimated 40 percent of scientists in the United States are immigrants and studies show immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses, said Nowrasteh. Boosting legal migration and legalizing existing workers could add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years, estimates Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a specialist in immigration policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. That's an annual increase of 0.8 percentage points to the economic growth rate, **currently stuck at about 2 percent**. REPUBLICANS' HISPANIC PUSH Other economists say the potential benefit to growth is much lower. Richard Freeman, an economist at Harvard, believes most of the benefits to the economy from illegal immigrants already in the United States has already been recorded and legalizing their status would produce only incremental benefits. While opposition to reform lingers on both sides of the political spectrum and any controversial legislation can easily meet a quick end in a divided Washington, the chances of substantial change seem to be rising. Top Republicans such as Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana are not mincing words about the party's need to appeal to the Hispanic community and foreign-born voters who were turned off by Republican candidate Mitt Romney's tough talk in last year's presidential campaign. A previous Obama plan, unveiled in May 2011, included the creation of a guest-worker program to meet agricultural labor needs and something similar is expected to be in his new proposal. The senators also indicated they would support a limited program that would allow companies in certain sectors to import guest workers if Americans were not available to fill some positions. An additional boost to growth could come from rising wages for newly legalized workers and higher productivity from the arrival of more highly skilled workers from abroad. Increased tax revenues would help federal and state authorities plug budget deficits although the benefit to government revenues will be at least partially offset by the payment of benefits to those who gain legal status. In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that proposed immigration reform in that year would have generated $48 billion in revenue from 2008 to 2017, while costing $23 billion in health and welfare payments. There is also unlikely to be much of a saving on enforcement from the senators' plan because they envisage tougher border security to prevent further illegal immigration and a crackdown on those overstaying visas. One way to bump up revenue, according to a report co-authored by University of California, Davis economist Giovanni Peri, would be to institute a cap-and-trade visa system. Peri estimated it could generate up to $1.2 billion annually. Under such a system, the government would auction a certain number of visas employers could trade in a secondary market. "A more efficient, more transparent and more flexible immigration system would help firms expand, contribute to more job creation in the United States, and slow the movement of operations abroad," according to a draft report, soon to be published as part of a study by the Hamilton Project, a think tank. There was no immediate sign that either the Obama or the senators' plan would include such a system. The long-term argument for immigration is a demographic one. Many developed nations are seeing their populations age, adding to the burden of pension and healthcare costs on wage-earners. Immigration in the United States would need to double to keep the working-age population stable at its current 67 percent of total population, according to George Magnus, a senior independent economic adviser at UBS in London, While Magnus says a change of that magnitude may prove too politically sensitive, the focus should be on attracting highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants in the way Canada and Australia do by operating a points system for immigrants rather than focusing mainly on family connections. "The trick is to shift the balance of migration towards those with education (and) skills," he added. HARD ROAD Academics at major universities such as Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology often lament that **many of their top foreign graduates end up returning to their home countries because visas are hard to get.** "We have so much talent that is sitting here in the universities," said William Kerr, a professor at Harvard Business School. "I find it very difficult to swallow that we then make it so hard for them to stay." The last big amnesty for illegal immigrants was in 1986 when President Ronald Reagan legalized about 3 million already in the country. Numerous studies have shown that subsequently their wages rose significantly. Research on how immigration affects overall wages is inconclusive. George Borjas at Harvard says immigration has created a small net decrease in overall wages for those born in the United States, concentrated among the low-skilled, while Giovani Peri at UC Davis found that immigration boosts native wages over the long run. Hinojosa-Ojeda stresses that any reform needs to make it easier for guest workers to enter the country to avoid a new build-up of illegal workers. "If we don't create a mechanism that can basically bring in 300,000 to 400,000 new workers a year into a variety of labor markets and needs, we could be setting ourselves up for that again," said Hinojosa-Ojeda. Nowrasteh at Cato also believes an expanded guest worker program would stem illegal immigration and allow industries to overcome labor shortages. He found that harsher regulations in recent years in Arizona were adversely affecting agricultural production, increasing financial burdens on business and even negatively impacting the state's struggling real estate market. Some large companies have fallen foul of tougher enforcement regulations. Restaurant chain Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc fired roughly 500 staff in 2010 and 2011 after undocumented workers were found on its payrolls. Putting the chill on other employers, it is now subject of an ongoing federal criminal investigation into its hiring. "**The current system doesn't seem to work for anyone**," Chipotle spokesman Chris Arnold said.

**Nuclear war**

**Harris and Burrows 9**

Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a 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>

Increased Potential for Global Conflict

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.

## 1NC

#### The United States federal government should condition [plan] on ending human rights abuses by Mexican forces. The United States federal government should enact a periodic certification process to determine that abuses are effectively investigated and prosecuted.

#### Aid without human rights conditions send the message that US condones torture and violence – turns the aff and reinforces organized crime

**WOLA 10** – Washington Office on Latin America (“Congress: Withhold Funds for Mexico Tied to Human Rights Performance,” 9/14/2010, <http://www.wola.org/publications/congress_withhold_funds_for_mexico_tied_to_human_rights_performance>) //RGP

However, research conducted by our respective organizations, Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission, and even the State Department’s own reports, demonstrates conclusively that Mexico has failed to meet the four human rights requirements set out by law. As a result, Congress should not release these select Merida funds. Releasing these funds would send the message that the United States condones the grave human rights violations committed in Mexico, including torture, rape, killings, and enforced disappearances.¶ We recognize that Mexico is facing a severe public security crisis, and that the United States can play a constructive role in strengthening Mexico’s ability to confront organized crime in an effective manner. However, human rights violations committed by Mexican security forces are not only deplorable in their own right, but also significantly undermine the effectiveness of Mexico’s public security efforts. Building trust between the Mexican people and the government is essential to gathering information to dismantle organized crime. When security forces commit grave human rights violations and they are not held accountable for their actions, they lose that trust, alienating key allies and leaving civilians in a state of terror and defenselessness. It is thus in the interest of both of our countries to help Mexico curb systematic human rights violations, ensure that violations are effectively investigated and those responsible held accountable, and assess candidly the progress Mexico is making towards improving accountability and transparency. ¶ Evidence demonstrates that Mexico is not fulfilling effectively any of the requirements established by Congress, particularly those dealing with prosecuting military abuses and torture:

## 1NC

#### Interpretation – economic engagement requires expanding bilateral economic relations

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations - is a subject of growing interest in international relations. Most research on economic statecraft emphasizes coercive policies such as economic sanctions. This emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa, 1994; Pollins, 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how often strategies of economic engagement are deployed: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno, 2003). Beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies of economic engagement have been limited to the policies of great powers (Mastanduno, 1992; Davis, 1999; Skalnes, 2000; Papayoanou & Kastner, 1999/2000; Copeland, 1999/2000; Abdelal & Kirshner, 1999/2000). However, engagement policies adopted by South Korea and one other state examined in this study, Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics and that it may be more widespread than previously recognized.

#### This means the plan has to be government-to-government – not civil or private economic engagement

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

#### ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005**

(http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### Violation – the plan targets private and civil businesses in cuba

#### Voting issue-

#### A) limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible

#### B) negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations and trade disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’

### 1nc

#### The United States federal government should condition making available temporary employment-based visas without employer control for acquirement to people in Mexico on ending human rights abuses by Mexican forces. The United States federal government should enact a periodic certification process to determine that abuses are effectively investigated and prosecuted.

#### Aid without human rights conditions send the message that US condones torture and violence – turns the aff and reinforces organized crime

**WOLA 10** – Washington Office on Latin America (“Congress: Withhold Funds for Mexico Tied to Human Rights Performance,” 9/14/2010, <http://www.wola.org/publications/congress_withhold_funds_for_mexico_tied_to_human_rights_performance>) //RGP

However, research conducted by our respective organizations, Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission, and even the State Department’s own reports, demonstrates conclusively that Mexico has failed to meet the four human rights requirements set out by law. As a result, Congress should not release these select Merida funds. Releasing these funds would send the message that the United States condones the grave human rights violations committed in Mexico, including torture, rape, killings, and enforced disappearances.¶ We recognize that Mexico is facing a severe public security crisis, and that the United States can play a constructive role in strengthening Mexico’s ability to confront organized crime in an effective manner. However, human rights violations committed by Mexican security forces are not only deplorable in their own right, but also significantly undermine the effectiveness of Mexico’s public security efforts. Building trust between the Mexican people and the government is essential to gathering information to dismantle organized crime. When security forces commit grave human rights violations and they are not held accountable for their actions, they lose that trust, alienating key allies and leaving civilians in a state of terror and defenselessness. It is thus in the interest of both of our countries to help Mexico curb systematic human rights violations, ensure that violations are effectively investigated and those responsible held accountable, and assess candidly the progress Mexico is making towards improving accountability and transparency. ¶ Evidence demonstrates that Mexico is not fulfilling effectively any of the requirements established by Congress, particularly those dealing with prosecuting military abuses and torture:

## 1NC

#### **The plan is a vehicle for neoliberal exploitation – US economic engagement becomes a tool for military intervention and US security interests while strengthening its economic grip over Latin America**

Jacobs, 04 – Assistant Prof of Polisci at West Virginia University (Jamie Elizabeth, "Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America," Latin American Politics & Society 46.4 (2004) 149-152, MUSE)//VP

The advance of neoliberalism suffers no shortage of critics, both from its supporters who seek a greater balance in the interests of North and South, and from its opponents who see it as lacking any real choice for developing states. The spread of neoliberalism is viewed by its strongest critics as part of the continuing **expression of Western power** through the mechanisms of globalization, often directly linked to the **hegemonic power** of the United States. Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos have assembled a collection of articles that pushes this debate in a somewhat new direction. This compilation addresses the question from a different perspective, focusing not on the neoliberal process as globalization but on neoliberalism as the new guise of panamericanism, which emphasizes a distinctly political overtone in the discussion. The edited volume argues that neoliberalism reanimates a system of relations in the hemisphere that **reinforces the most negative aspects of** the last century's U.S.-dominated panamericanism. The assembled authors offer a critical view that places neoliberalism squarely in the realm of **U.S. hegemonic exploitation of interamerican relations**. This volume, furthermore, articulates a detailed vision of the potential failures of this approach in terms of culture, politics, security, and economics for both North and South. Oliva and Prevost present a view from Latin America that differs from that of other works that emphasize globalization as a general or global process. This volume focuses on the implementation of free market capitalism in the Americas as a continuation of the U.S. history of hegemonic control of the hemisphere. While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as **old wine in new bottles**. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and **intervention** in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the **Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny** in the past, the prospect of hemispheric **economic integration** will be marked by a **dominant view privileging U.S. security**, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to **undermine the stable governance** that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for **instability** could also generate a new period of **U.S. interventionism in Latin America**. Treto also analyzes how the "liberal peace" could be undermined by the "right of humanitarian intervention" in the Americas if the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia served as a model for U.S. involvement in the hemisphere. Hector Luis Saint-Pierre raises the issue of "democratic neoauthoritarianism," responsible for "restricting citizenship to the exercise of voting, limiting its voice to electoral polls of public opinion, restraining human rights to consumer's rights, [and] shutting down spaces to the citizens' participation" (116). While these critiques are leveled from a structuralist viewpoint, they often highlight concerns expressed from other theoretical perspectives and subfields (such as the literature on citizenship and participation in the context of economic integration). These chapters also emphasize the way inattention to economic, social, and political crisis could damage attempts at integration and the overall success of the neoliberal paradigm in the Americas. In general, the section on hemispheric issues offers a suspicious view of the U.S. role in promoting integration, arguing that in reality, integration offers a deepening of **historical asymmetries of power**, the potential to create **new justifications** for **hegemonic intervention**, and the further weakening of state sovereignty in the South. [End Page 150]

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction

Darder, 10 – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.

## Framing

#### Do not evaluate their value system without first assessing the consequences of its actual implementation. Viewing ethics in isolation is irresponsible & complicit with the evil they criticize.

**Issac 02**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacyand international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they arealsovague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility.The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends.Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand.In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goalsand to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

## Case

**Coopti0n DA – you called Vivienne and I guys – you don’t solve**

**Gender doesn’t cause war, they have the relationship backwards**

Goldstein 3— (Joshua S., Professor of International Relations at American University, 2003 War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa, pp.411-412)DF

I began this book hoping to contribute in some way to a deeper understanding of war – an understanding that would improve the chances of someday achieving real peace, by deleting war from our human repertoire. In following the thread of gender running through war, I found the deeper understanding I had hoped for – a multidisciplinary and multilevel engagement with the subject. Yet I became somewhat more pessimistic about how quickly or easily war may end. The war system emerges, from the evidence in this book, as relatively ubiquitous and robust. Efforts to change this system must overcome several dilemmas mentioned in this book. First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices. So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.¶

**No spillover – they cant solve for all gender politics in the squo – one policy does not have that power**

**Multiple alt causes to gender like trafficking**

**GARZA 2011** (Rocio, Candidate for Juris Doctor, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, May 2011; A.B. (2005) Harvard University, CARDOZO J. OF INT’L & COMP. LAW, March, www.cjicl.com/uploads/2/9/5/9/2959791/cjicl\_19.2\_garza\_note.pdf‎)

On any given day, a Mexican woman will be promised a good paying job as a nanny or waitress in the United States. A Mexican man will be promised employment as a waiter or construction worker. They will be told that they will earn enough money to send back to their families in Mexico. Given that, for many years, undocumented immigrants have been working in the United States and sending money to their families in Mexico, this will be an enticing and believable job offer. Having limited economic resources in their home country and perhaps a lack of formal education, they will take the risk and pay a coyote to transport them to the United States. They will leave behind their families and all that they know for a chance at the elusive American Dream. Their immigration stories are all too common. Many people will arrive in the United States to find jobs in the agriculture, restaurant, construction, and housekeeping industries, joining countless other undocumented immigrants. They will live in the shadows across the United States. Others, however, will be less fortunate. When they arrive in the United States, many people will be told their transportation fees have increased and will be hard-pressed into forced labor or forced prostitution to repay their debts. They may even be coerced into signing “labor contracts,” stipulating wage deductions for food and shelter. They will likely not know how much they owe and the money they earn will go directly to their captors. What begins as a smuggling operation can quickly turn into the heinous crime of human trafficking. 1 Human trafficking is the exploitation of people primarily for labor or sex using force, coercion or fraud. 2 It dehumanizes victims by treating them as commodities3 and by subjecting them to dreadful living conditions.4 Traffickers may recruit, transport, or harbor victims using force, threat, or fraud for the purpose of sexual exploitation, forced labor, or other similar practices.5 Men, women, and children can all be victims of human trafficking. Described as “a modern-day form of slavery,”6 human trafficking manifests itself in a number of forms.7 As of June 2010, the United Nations estimated that “there are at least 12.3 million adults and children in forced labor, bonded labor, and commercial sexual servitude at any given time.”8 However, due to the clandestine nature of human trafficking,9 the exact number of victims is unknown with estimates ranging from four million to twenty-seven million.10 Human trafficking is not a new phenomenon, 11 but no one knows how long it has been in existence. In the last decade, since 2000, governments around the world began to acknowledge the prevalence of human trafficking, its destructive impact on victims, and the need to eradicate it.12 People tend to disassociate themselves from human trafficking, thinking it does not happen within their communities.13 However, in actuality, trafficking touches almost all countries in one way or another.14 A combination of internal motivating factors and external factors make the exploitation of people possible.15 Some of the factors that motivate traffickers to exploit people and make victims vulnerable to exploitation include poverty, lack of economic opportunities, lack of education, lack of information about legal immigration, and social conflicts within countries.16 Among others, external factors include gender discrimination, weak border controls, absence of legislation to address immigration and trafficking, government corruption, and demand for cheap labor and sexual services in receiving countries of human trafficking victims. 17 Enacting anti-trafficking laws is one of the first steps a country must take to prosecute traffickers, protect victims, and prevent trafficking. 18 To date, more than half of all countries have enacted laws prohibiting human trafficking in all its forms,19 yet the problem persists. Although outlawing human trafficking is a positive development, prosecution, protection, and prevention do not immediately follow. Given the complex factors under which human trafficking flourishes,20 more than enacting anti-trafficking legislation is needed to curb these despicable acts.21 The United States enacted federal legislation, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (TVPA), criminalizing trafficking in persons. 22 The TVPA may be utilized to protect victims of “severe forms of trafficking” and to prosecute traffickers.23 A person subjected to forced labor or sexual exploitation, as in the situations described above of the victims who fall into the hands of traffickers, may be able to press charges against their traffickers and get legal protection.24 Similarly, in 2007, Mexico enacted the Law to Prevent and Punish Trafficking in Persons (Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law). However, access to the TVPA is contingent on the victim seeking help or being rescued. Given that victims are usually undocumented, fear being deported, and are intimidated with violence, the chances that the TVPA reaches intended victims is often slim. Similarly, in 2007, Mexico enacted the Law to Prevent and Punish Trafficking in Persons (Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law).25 Despite enacting anti-trafficking legislation, Mexico is not yet in compliance with the United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children (UN Protocol), 26 which sets out the international legal framework to eradicate human trafficking.27 The UN Protocol is a supplement to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.28 Although the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law29 surpasses the minimum requirements for incarceration of traffickers outlined in the UN Protocol, Mexico has failed to adequately implement the law.30 As of June 2009, there had been no convictions under this federal law.31 In December 2009, however, a Mexican federal judge achieved the first conviction under the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law in a case involving six trafficking offenders.32 With only one successful prosecution, Mexico continues to be a transit, origin and destination country for human trafficking victims.33 The porous United States-Mexico border continues to be a significant point of entry for human trafficking victims 34 that are beyond the reach of the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Law and unlikely to benefit from the TVPA. Along the approximately 2,000-mile division, the challenges of eradicating human trafficking are manifold.35 One of these challenges is determining whose responsibility it is to remedy the human trafficking situation. Should the United States expend more resources saving victims and incarcerating traffickers within its borders? Is it Mexico’s responsibility to warn its citizens and keep them safe from traffickers? Should it matter that what makes victims vulnerable to traffickers is their basic human instinct to do better for themselves and their progeny by seeking better economic opportunities? Human trafficking transcends boundaries and so must its solution. The United States and Mexico are both deeply affected and inextricably linked by human trafficking due to their history and extensive shared geographic border. Hence, a solution for addressing human trafficking must take into consideration both countries’ interests through a bilateral partnership.
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#### Neoliberalism must be rejected in every shape and form – ethical obligation – alt is specifically in the language of inclusion of every citizen - that’s the key to solvency

**Harvey, 09** (David Harvey; Professor of anthropology and geography at the graduate center of the city University of New York; Organizing for the anti-capitalist transition; <http://seminario10anosdepois.wordpress.com/>)//VP

A revolutionary politics that can grasp the nettle of endless compound capital ¶ accumulation and eventually shut it down as the prime motor of human history ¶ requires a sophisticated understanding of how social change occurs. The ¶ failings of past endeavors to build a lasting socialism and communism have to ¶ be avoided and lessons from that immensely complicated history must be ¶ learned. Yet the absolute necessity for a coherent anti-capitalist revolutionary ¶ movement must also be recognized. The fundamental aim of that movement is ¶ to assume social command over both the production and distribution of ¶ surpluses.¶ We urgently need an explicit revolutionary theory suited to our times. I propose ¶ a "co-revolutionary theory" derived from an understanding of Marx's account of ¶ how capitalism arose out of feudalism. Social change arises through the ¶ dialectical unfolding of relations between seven moments within the body ¶ politic of capitalism viewed as an ensemble or assemblage of activities and ¶ practices:¶ a) technological and organizational forms of production, exchange, and ¶ consumption¶ b) relations to nature¶ c) social relations between people¶ d) mental conceptions of the world, embracing knowledges and cultural ¶ understandings and beliefs¶ e) labor processes and production of specific goods, geographies, services, or ¶ affects¶ f) institutional, legal and governmental arrangements¶ g) the conduct of daily life that underpins social reproduction.¶ Each one of these moments is internally dynamic and internally marked by ¶ tensions and contradictions (just think of mental conceptions of the world) but ¶ all of them are co-dependent and co-evolve in relation to each other. The ¶ transition to capitalism entailed a mutually supporting movement across all ¶ seven moments. New technologies could not be identified and practices without ¶ new mental conceptions of the world (including that of the relation to nature ¶ and social relations). Social theorists have the habit of taking just one of these ¶ moments and viewing it as the "silver bullet" that causes all change. They are all wrong. ¶ It is the dialectical motion across all of these moments that really counts even ¶ as there is uneven development in that motion.¶ When capitalism itself undergoes one of its phases of renewal, it does so ¶ precisely by co-evolving all moments, obviously not without tensions, struggles, ¶ fights, and contradictions. But consider how these seven moments were ¶ configured around 1970 before the neoliberal surge and consider how they look ¶ now, and you will see they have all changed in ways that re-define the operative ¶ characteristics of capitalism viewed as a non-Hegelian totality.¶ An anti-capitalist political movement can start anywhere (in labor processes, ¶ around mental conceptions, in the relation to nature, in social relations, in the ¶ design of revolutionary technologies and organizational forms, out of daily life, ¶ or through attempts to reform institutional and administrative structures ¶ including the reconfiguration of state powers). The trick is to keep the political ¶ movement moving from one moment to another in mutually reinforcing ways. ¶ This was how capitalism arose out of feudalism and this is how something ¶ radically different called communism, socialism, or whatever must arise out of ¶ capitalism. Previous attempts to create a communist or socialist alternative ¶ fatally failed to keep the dialectic between the different moments in motion and ¶ failed to embrace the unpredictabilities and uncertainties in the dialectical ¶ movement between them. Capitalism has survived precisely by keeping the ¶ dialectical movement between the moments going and constructively embracing ¶ the inevitable tensions, including crises.

#### Neoliberalism transforms everything and anything into a commodity, leading to dehumanization and globalized violence.

Brand and Sekler,professor of International Politics at Vienna University and junior researcher in the area of international politics in the Department of Political Science at Vienna University , 2009 (Ulrich and Nicola, “Postneoliberalism – A beginning debate,” Development Dialogue, no. 51, page 6, January 2009,http://rosalux-europa.info/userfiles/file/DD51.pdf#page=173 )//CS

Fifth, the four already noted crises create such great economic, social, cultural and political tensions in and between states and groups of states that violence necessarily increases. The answer to this at the moment has been a new armaments spiral and the growth of a preventative security state (Braml 2004).Armament expenditures have grown by around 50 per cent in the last decade, above all in the USA. They have not only created a latent civil war domestically(with the highest share of prisoners worldwide – 2.3 szmillion in 2005, every tenth black man between 21 and 29 incarcerated at some point in his life) ,but have also transformed the Cold War against the Soviet Union into a global civil war ‘against terror’, using military bases in 130 countries. They have built a network of illegal prisons and concentration camps, similar to what occurred in the heyday of the old imperialism. Worldwide, there are estimated to be many thousands of people who are held and tortured in such prisons. At the same time, an asymmetrical terrorist war against the dominance of the USA and the West has begun.Water, raw materials, access to the sea, migration, knowledge, capital, cultural identity – in neoliberalism, everything and anything becomes not only a commodity, but also cause of violent confrontations. With the globalisation of capital, violence has also been globalised.There is a security crisis.

#### Neolib engenders its own crises – pure focus on production and consumption makes solutions to structural inequalities impossible – their failure to recognize social injustices created by capital dooms solvency and naturalizes exploitative structures – only the critique accesses root cause – best piece of evidence – their authors are all bought off, reject them

**Holleman 12** – Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon (Hannah, “ENERGY JUSTICE AND FOUNDATIONS FOR A SUSTAINABLE SOCIOLOGY OF ENERGY”, <http://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/jspui/bitstream/1794/12419/1/Holleman_oregon_0171A_10410.pdf>)//VP

The current version of capitalist ideology, which absorbs energy scholars (and even environmental socialists) often unwittingly, was consciously shaped to co-opt the language of social movements seeking freedom from the yolk of capitalism and imperialism. It is no surprise that the market would co-opt green rhetoric today. Economists having the greatest ideological influence on political debates and social science today, the architects of neoliberal ideology, have sought to re-write the history of capitalist development as “the constitution of liberty,” and the basis of free society (Hayek 1960; Friedman 1962; Van Horn, Mirowski, and Stapleford, eds. 2011). There can be no acknowledgement of slavery, racism, sexism, or ecological destruction among other issues, because all of these undermine the basic thesis neoliberal writers actively promote as political ideology. To make their argument, these writers must present capitalism as raising all boats, color-blind, gender-neutral, and free of class coercion, the globalization of which results in a “flat,” happy world, even if it is hot (Friedman 2005, 2008). Unfortunately, these ideas dominate the political sphere, and contemporary notions of organizational, community, and national development. In academia, many “theorists celebrate the alleged leveling of social differences owing to globalization” (Pellow 2007, 41). The blinders imposed by this view continue to infect energy studies despite the work of critical energy scholars. Spreading capitalism thus becomes the solution for poverty associated with inequalities caused by oppression based on race, class, gender, and position in the world system, as well as the solution to environmental and energy crises. This is the basic modernization thesis. The Ecological Modernization Reader (Mol, Sonnenfeld, and Spaargaren 2009) presents these systematized views regarding the environmental crisis, which are increasingly influential in environmental sociology. York and Rosa (2003) and Foster (2012) have pointed out the empirical, theoretical, and philosophical roots of, and problems associated with this perspective as a basis for understanding ecological and social crises and solutions. But, we can expect this view to persist as long as social relations remain intact because the logic of modernization is seductive precisely because it is the logic of capitalism (Foster 1999b, 2002, 2009, 2012). The processes of capitalism, including its ideological developments, are the “background conditions” in which those integrated into the market economy live, as fish swim in water, they are the “social gravity” we might naturally feel is right, but don’t necessarily see, as much a part of our lives as the air we breathe (York and Clark 2006). In contrast to the modernization thesis, environmental justice scholars, among other critical theorists and activists have sought to expose the mythological basis of neoliberalism and transcend the system. The work of environmental justice scholars, feminist ecologists, and ecological rift theorists, marshaling the empirical evidence, represent powerful critiques of the modernization thesis. Taken together with the insights in existing critical work on energy, they provide an alternative approach to energy that belies the notion that “there is no alternative.” They share a common commitment, as social scientists and activists, to reality. Part of this reality is that “actual class and racial inequalities around the global and between North and South have only worsened in the past half-century—the same period during which the late modern state of capitalism took hold” (Pellow 2007, 41). Despite views that we live in a post-racial society, (or one where “men are finished and women are taking over” [Sohn 2011]), in fact economic globalization has “seriously undermined the gains of the civil rights and labor movement and the general antiracist struggle in the United States and undercut the global benefits of the anticolonial struggles occurring throughout the global South” (Pellow 2007, 43). Moreover, economic globalization and the intensified spread of ecological destruction “are intimately linked because the TNCs [transnational corporations] themselves were the ones creating and pushing both globalization and toxins on the world markets, facilitating greater control over nations, communities, human bodies, and the natural world itself”(43). Today, neoliberal mythology has severely hindered the development of a wider environmental justice consciousness in the broader public, and amongst activists and academics. In energy studies this view is especially pronounced in the focus on technology, carbon markets, voluntary certification schemes, and alternative energies that basically allow business to continue as usual (Foster 2002, 9-25; Rogers 2010; Holleman 2012). The critical literature emerging from what I call an energy justice perspective in ecological rift theory, systems ecology, feminist and critical human ecology, and environmental justice scholarship has drawn out the social and ecological crises of the current energy regime. This is in contrast to too many well-intentioned scholars and activists who buy into the main tenets of the modernization thesis, and thus are reluctant to break with capitalism as a system, or worse, they promote it, ignoring or ignorant of the enormous costs. This has led to the view that our task as environmentalists is getting economics to “internalize the externalities,” to bring under the pricing system the work of natural systems and human services (labor). For energy this means carbon markets and trade in other forms of pollution and raising energy prices. While it is clear that as long as we have this system, goals should include wealth redistribution and businesses shouldering the costs of their polluting practices, long-term, internalizing more of the world in the market system is a total death strategy. The logic of the market is clear. An energy justice movement, with the intention of healing the ecological rift and transcending social injustice, on the other hand has as its base the goal of “externalizing the internalities.” This is an ecological and social imperative. Understanding the nature of the current system, Daniel Yergin’s worse-thannothing approach to energy is the logical response of capital. Carbon markets and the new biotech boom also make sense. If the point is accumulation, sources of profit must be found at every turn and crises represent especially ripe opportunities (Klein 2007). The problem today is not capitalism’s lack of response to the climate crisis, capital was never developed as a system geared toward ecological reproduction or meeting human needs. It is a system geared toward profit at all cost and can have no rational response. The problem is that capitalism organizes so many of our productive activities in the first place. The sooner this is recognized, the sooner we can start thinking of real alternatives, and understand ourselves as subjects, not merely objects of the system, as protagonists of our own future. We can move beyond playing the passive consumers of the next product capitalism has on offer, green or otherwise, packaged as a solution to energy crises. Examples like the carbon market schemes, or Daniel Yergin’s view of what constitutes energy revolution, make clear “that there’s no way we can just subcontract our environmental conscience to the new breed of green marketers” (McKibben 2010).

**Their risk calculus is born out of neoliberal logic---uncertainty is a trick used to either promote or reject policy based on ideological predispositions**

Pellizzoni 11, Associate Professor of Environmental Sociology at the University of Trieste, Italy, April 2011, “Governing through disorder: Neoliberal environmental governance and social theory,” Global Environmental Change, Vol. 21, p. 795-803//VP

This article started out with two aims: ﬁrst, to identify at the deepest, ontological, level the underpinnings of widespread environmental policy approaches often associated with neoliberalism. Second, to show that different socio-environmental theoretical perspectives have had difﬁculty confronting these underpinnings, which affects their capacity to interpret the latter’s implications for the governance of the biophysical world. Neoliberalism draws on established traditions in political liberalism and market capitalism, yet is characterized by a novel understanding of the ontological quality of nature. ‘Nature’ is no longer conceived as an objectively given, though cognitively mediated, reality, but as a constitutively ﬂuid entity, a contingency purposefully produced and controlled for instrumental ends. Governance through uncertainty, instability or ‘disorder’ thus seems to be the distinguishing feature of the ‘neoliberalisation of nature’. This ideational core may be considered the ﬁrst reason for the sense of unity often felt when contemplating the array of sectors, approaches and cases characterizing current market-oriented environmental governance, and at the same time for the sense of uneasiness towards neoliberalism that environmental social theory conveys. Whatever the judgment, it is important to grasp what is at stake with neoliberal governance of nature. Browsing social science books and journals, one realizes that much critical energy has been focused on questioning the objectivist account of nature that allegedly dominates current policy narratives and practices. Only a discerning scholarship has begun to realize that objectivism and antiobjectivism are losing relevance as categories capable of distinguishing intellectual and stakeholder positions, and that they increasingly become claims usable in power games over the biophysical world. Attention, for example, has been recently paid to the instrumental use of uncertainty (Freudenburg et al., 2008; Jacques et al., 2008), which, depending on the circumstances, is used either to ask for policy-making (as with GMOs) or to call for policy-avoiding (as with ‘unwarranted’ restrictive measures related to climate change). The very possibility of appealing to ‘sound science’ either for evidence of no problems, or no evidence of problems indicates the fundamentally anti-objectivist attitude that characterizes present political and cultural frameworks. Policy promoters share this attitude with their opponents. Those who ask for ‘precaution’ use the same arguments in reverse, requiring action when and where there is no evidence of no problems. 11 This commonality entails that appeals to uncertainty are devoid of any strategic relevance in current controversies; rather, they play a tactical role. This is likely to represent a problem above all for counter-forces to neoliberalism, to the extent that in a tactical struggle the most advantaged are those provided with greater organizational, economic, cognitive and legal resources (to say nothing of military ones). In short, we are today in front of a refashioning of the symbolic order of society vis-a` -vis its biophysical underpinnings. In this change, neoliberal discourses, policies and practices are at the same time a powerful driver and a result. Disorder becomes order to the extent that uncertainty, contingency and instability are regarded not as disabling by-products of governance but as enabling ways of governing. In the public realm, this ends up constituting a sort of shared horizon of meaning: not only is no new ‘order’ (in the traditional sense) in sight, but anti-essentialism overﬂows from intellectual avant-gardes to become a widespread, albeit often implicit or negotiable, worldview.

#### 2) Neoliberalism is the root cause of maquiladoras expansion

MSN, 11 – Mexican Solidarity Network (Mexican Solidarity Network/Red de Solidaridad con Mexico. 22 December 2011. “Neoliberalism: Mexico- a Neoliberal Experiment” http://www.mexicosolidarity.org/programs/alternativeeconomy/neoliberalism)//VP

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.

#### Expanding visas serves to smooth the excesses of neoliberalism via labor flexibility

**Wise et al., 10** – Penn social sciences PhD (Raul, “Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements”, October, http://rimd.reduaz.mx/secciones\_documentos/959ReframingtheDebate.pdf)//VP

The official discourse of neoliberal globalization rests on the ideology of the free market, the end of history, representative democracy and, more recently, the war on terrorism. In practice, however, it promotes the interests of large corporations and a single, exclusive mode of thought, nullifying all alternatives. While the prevalent discourse exalts the notion of citizenship and citizen rights and opportunities in a democracy with an open economy and full political participation, the latter is constrained to a limited electoral offer and often curtailed by an exclusionary political system. At the same time, fundamental human rights are systematically undermined and subverted by the doctrine of national security and the demands of a market economy at the service of multinational corporate interests, which turns the vast majority of the population into cheap means of production and objects of consumption. In addition, the so-called welfare state has been dismantled under the sway of mercantilism, and the satisfaction of most basic needs is conditioned by the market, where communal goods and public services are offered as new spaces for privatization. Labor flexibility, sustained by a massive workforce surplus and the systematic deprivation of labor rights, becomes a mechanism through which to increase business competitiveness and extraordinary profits. All of this, in turn, seriously undermines the social, economic, political and environmental fabric, leading to considerable damage. The advancement of structural reform in peripheral countries has led to increasing social debt, a fact that remains unacknowledged by governments and the entrenched powers.

#### The idea of securing desire and mobilizing sexuality is a tactic of security that turns case as security privileges heteronorm.

**Neocleous** 20**08** (Mark is a Professor of the Critique of Political Economy; Head of Department of Politics & History, he joined Brunel University in the Department of Government in 1994. Since then he has published numerous books and articles. His most recent work has been towards the development of a critique of security. “CRITIQUE OF SECURITY” 2008. Pg. 134-135, MT)

Moral surveillance has long been entwined with political surveillance; police power entwined with bourgeois morality; statecraft with soulcraft. What we have here is the conduct of conduct as a technology of power, manifested in the cult of domesticity; that is, in domesticity as a police power. As **security is linked to a ‘proper’ morality and ‘normal’ sexuality, so the desire for security becomes a political technology for the securing of desire**. Not a repressive strategy, but the mobilisation of sexuality for security, constantly reasserting a view on who might have sex with whom as a means of interpellating certain human pleasures as a security threat. Containment, the key to security, could function as a ‘micro-physics of power’ resonating through the personal lives of citizens, making the citizenry as much an active subject of raison d’état as its passive object.96 National security was thus dependent not only on political loyalty, but also on a certain tactics of morality that, in turn, were taken to be indicative of one’s loyalty. The outcome was a reassertion of the importance to **national security of that privileged** object of bourgeois subjectivity, **the married heterosexual couple**. In constructing certain forms of sexuality as ‘security risks’, the loyalty oath could help shape subjectivity and identity. Thus while loyalty oaths have long been associated with sovereignty – a sign and symbol of one’s subjection and obedience – they are also very much disciplinary.97 Loyalty oaths instil discipline by fabricating a self- regulating subject, a loyal self-regulating subject who identifies with the state as the purported agent of security. (One might better say: is faithful to the state, as ‘loyalty’ oscillates here between conjugal and political fidelity.) At the same time, loyalty oaths come to constitute the collective identity of the group(s) in question, a form of mediated reciprocity in which swearing allegiance makes a claim on all members of the group that they will never become ‘Other’, constituting the unity and identity of the group and reaffirming these against the foreign and outside.98 **The mass of heterogeneous interests, desires and identities that makes up a society has to be condensed into a single national entity, a ‘nationality’, the order and security of which has to be constantly reiterated against the dangerous Other.** The crudeness and simplicity of the images of ideological purity in defining the identity of the imagined communities in question only helps in driving home the central message: that it is to this identity that loyalty would be expected. This is loyalty as a search for conformity, an adherence to the status quo, an essentially conservative political discourse.99 Outside of the obvious practices of, say, reading Marx or defending the Soviet Union in debates, the questions asked at the Loyalty Hearings were aimed at picking up on those views thought to be the central indicia of communism (that is, of a security threat): being committed to women’s equality; pointing to the diversity of possible pleasures in the nature of human desire; suggesting a better deal for blacks; voicing dissatisfaction with any aspect of the social order; reading and thinking a little too much and in all the wrong ways.

#### Alt solves – empirics prove

**Munck, 03** - professor of Globalization and Social Exclusion (Ronaldo, Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work Studies and Globalisation and Social Exclusion Unit, University of Liverpool, “Neoliberalism, necessitarianism and alternatives in Latin America: there is no alternative (TINA)?”, Third World Quarterly, Vol 24, No 3, pp 495–511, 2003, http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism,%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf)//VP

If Argentina shows the downside of neoliberal globalisation at its starkest, we need to consider whether in neighbouring Brazil a more hopeful scenario is not now opening up with the historic victory of the Workers's Party candidate Luis Inacio 'Lula' de Silva in the 2002 presidential elections. In a bold political statement calling for an alternative to neoliberalism, Ciro Gomes and Roberto Unger declared in the mid 1990s that 'Todo o Brasil reclama a falta de proposta e de alternativa' (the whole of Brazil is complaining about the lack of proposals or alternatives) (Gomes & Unger, 1996: 17). But they admitted that, while the people want and need opposition, they have no faith in the opposition that exists. This is, as we shall argue, probably the main issue facing those seeking to articulate a progressive alternative to neoliberalism. Even as advocates and beneficiaries of this perspective/ideology/discourse begin to perceive the seams in this once seamless garment, the people still have confidence in it ('better the devil we know', etc). In this sense, politics is back in command and the ideologues of economic supremacy no longer hold sway over the discursive terrain. The main issues, in terms of the enduring popular credibility of the neoliberal economic project, are the heartfelt need for macroeconomic stability and the spectre of hyperinflation which caused so much devastation in the past.

Unger recognises clearly that what he calls the 'operative version' (my 'really existing') of neoliberalism enjoys a 'unity' that 'is social and political rather than narrowly economic and technical' (Unger, 1998: 58). However, this unity is seen as a negative consensus around disabling the state and disempowering govern- ment. Thus an alternative project to the dominant one of real neoliberalism would need to build a broad political alliance as well as to offer economic policies better able to carry out the productive revolution that the region needs. Raising the level of public and private savings is essential for Unger but, equally, so is the development of institutional arrangements which can channel this into productive investment, not into the global financial casino. To break with the dualism created or exacerbated by globalisation-between those integrated into the circuits of the 'new' capitalism and those who are not-is an economic issue but also, of course, a task of massive social, political and cultural dimensions. The imagination of an alternative may be possible then, but what about its practical implementation? Towards the end of 1997 an influential group of centre-left politicians and intellectuals (led by Unger and Mexico's soon to be elevated to Foreign Minister, Jorge Castanieda) issued the Consenso de Buenos Aires (CBA, 1997) intended as a full-frontal attack on the Washington Consensus. Monetary stability is therein recognised as a sine qua non ('bandera indeclinable'-unfurlable banner) and globalisation is basically taken for granted. From the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) structuralist tradition are derived the need for endogenous growth and the truism that growth and welfare are not a zero-sum equation. Much emphasis is placed on the institutional arrangements necessary to achieve social regulation of the market, but then the IDB was also saying at the time that 'Institutions matter', as we saw above. In summary the CBA could be considered a realist social democratic alternative seeking to confront the social exclusionary processes inherent in neoliberal globalisation. It would seem that a reformist alternative to the status quo is possible; whether it is a revolutionary reform in Unger's terms, promoting further transformation, has yet to be seen. In the cities of Brazil controlled by the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT- Worker's Party) we have seen the germs of a progressive alternative to neo- liberalism. The experience of Porto Alegre's 'participative budget' experiment since l998 has attracted international attention, being dubbed 'an experience of direct democracy without parallel in the world' (Cassen, 1998: 3). In its rigour and breadth this is no cosmetic exercise in 'municipal socialism' and the nearly three-and-a-half million citizens of the urban district of Porto Alegre have come to appreciate its value. There is active popular engagement with budget priorities from education to transport, health to crime, which then feeds in transparently to the actual budget implemented each year. How this experiment in direct democracy meshes (or not) with representative democracy is an open theoretical and practical issue (see Baierle, 2002, for a sceptical view). With a participation rate of 60% the participative budget has certainly engaged the population and it has also, through its transparent mechanisms, proven a strong antidote to the corruption that once permeated local government. At the local level the example of Porto Alegre shows there is a possible alternative to laissez faire economics.

However, many are now asking how the Workers' Party can possibly govern Brazil in the era of neoliberal globalisation and retain any radical principles at the same time. Will Lula not just say the same as Tony Blair did when he assumed office, namely that his 'hands are tied' by globalisation and that the need to maintain Brazil's 'competitiveness' on the world market must take precedence over any social reforms that might be desirable but not practicable? Certainly, the negative example of Argentina loomed large during the electoral campaign with the anti-Lula forces saying that if he was elected, the same would happen in Brazil. Now many on the left are asking whether the Workers' Party will 'live up to its name' and deliver radical policies. From both sides we see misconceptions of what is necessary and possible for a socially progressive political economy in Brazil. The left's critique of Cardoso's government (see for example Rocha, 2002) had already set the tone with unrealistic expectations being placed on progressive presidents. The fact is that Lula must govern having gained 91 (up from 58 in 1998) out of 513 deputies in the National Congress and 10 out of the 54 seats at stake in the Federal Senate. So, from the start the PT is not a hegemonic governing force. The case of Argentina shows the danger of national disintegration as the provinces of that country engage in a 'beggar thy neighbour' strategy in the midst of economic collapse. Brazil will probably display the dangers associated with inflated popular expectations of what can be achieved in terms of socioeconomic reform. As it happens the Workers Party has put forward a rational and progressive economic strategy and I believe this is not only to 'retain investors' confidence' or to 'placate Washington' (although these considerations may not be irrelevant, see Burgos, 2002). The Workers Party government plan recognises that the first challenge is to develop a 'less vulnerable economy' and to regain strong growth rates. It argues for the need to 'create a climate of stability' and to maintain control over inflation. Its first axis of development is the social and the second is 'strengthening the national economy'. Thus poverty eradication, dealing with unemployment and redressing the severe socioeconomic inequalities are placed first. Yet this is only seen as possible with a long-term strategic plan, and state planning is certainly given a key role, one that it never entirely lost in Brazil anyway. Urban regeneration and infrastructure development are seen as key in this regard. But, in explicit contrast to 1950s and 1960s developmentalism (desenvolvimentismo) this national development model is set in the context of improving national 'competi- tiveness' (Pr, Programa de Governo, 2002). Of course there will be many changes to this bold manifesto, and no doubt backtracking, but this seems very much like a 'high road' type strategy and consonant with the Chilean neo- structuralists' call for 'growth with equity' (see Sunkel, 1995). In the Argentinian context Lula's declared intention to prioritise the Mercosur is also highly significant and by no means a minor regionalist gesture.
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## Case

**Gender isn’t the root cause**

Hooper 1– (Charlotte, University of Bristol research associate in politics, Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics pp 45-46.) DF

Spike Peterson and Anne Sisson Runyan (1993), in their discussion of gendered dichotomies, appear to drop Lacanian psychoanalytic discourse as an explanation for gendered dichotomies in favor of a more straightforward- ly political account.14Gendered dichotomies, rather than uniformly con- structing gendered social relations through universal psychoanalytic mecha- nisms, are seen more ambiguously, as playing a dual role. Where gendered dichotomies are used as an organizing principle of social life (such as in the gendered division of labor) they help to construct gender differences and in- equalities and thus are constitutive of social reality, but in positing a grid of polar opposites, they also serve to obscure more complex relationships, commonalties, overlaps, and intermediate positions (Peterson and Runyan 1993, 24–25). Elaborating on this view, it can be argued that gendered dichotomies are in part ideological tools that mystify, masking more complex social realities and reinforcing stereotypes. On one level, they do help to produce real gen- der differences and inequalities, when they are used as organizing principles that have practical effects commensurate with the extent that they become embedded in institutional practices, and through these, human bodies. They constitute one dimension in the triangular nexus out of which gender identities and the gender order are produced. But at the same time, institutional practices are not always completely or unambiguously informed by such dichotomies, which may then operate to obscure more complex relationships. It is a mistake to see the language of gendered dichotomies as a uniﬁed and totalizing discourse that dictates every aspect of social practice to the extent that we are coherently produced as subjects in its dualistic image. As well as the disruptions and discontinuities engendered by the inter- sections and interjections of other discourses (race, class, sexuality, and so on) there is always room for evasion, reversal, resistance, and dissonance be- tween rhetoric, practice, and embodiment, as well as reproduction of the symbolic order, as identities are negotiated in relation to all three dimen- sions, in a variety of complex and changing circumstances. On the other hand, the symbolic gender order does inform practice, and our subjectivi- ties are produced in relation to it, so to dismiss it as performing only an ide- ological or propagandistic role is also too simplistic. ¶