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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.

#### Engagement costs political capital

Farnsworth and Werz 12

Eric, vice president of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society, and Michael, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward, 11/30/12, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/

On the economic front, the success of the new Mexican administration’s economic reform and growth agenda is a core interest of the United States. A number of policy fields will be crucial to create a successful North American growth model and will elevate the transactional partnership with Mexico to a strategic relationship much like the United States enjoys with Canada. To achieve this goal, both countries must address a number of issues simultaneously.¶ The creation of jobs will play a central role in domestic politics in both countries. U.S-Mexican trade needs to be encouraged in the border region and beyond. To achieve this, the U.S.-Mexican border needs to be more permeable and allow more crossings at lower cost.¶ To secure energy independence, both countries need to prioritize research and development investments to ensure that technologies that facilitate access to shale gas—such as horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracking—do not adversely affect the environment. This is a necessary step to move forward with the development of massive North American shale gas resources—a potential strategic game-changer.¶ Mexican states along the U.S. border are official observers in the Western Climate Initiative, joining California and four Canadian provinces. The federal governments in both the United States and Mexico should take aggressive steps to make it more feasible for these Mexican states to become full partners in the initiative to achieve meaningful reductions in carbon pollution and move toward greater U.S.-Mexican cooperation on future North American pollution cuts.¶ Both countries need to expand their economic relations with Asia and Europe. President-Elect Peña Nieto sees China as an important future partner for economic growth. Both Mexico and Canada were invited in June to join the negotiations toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership—an important if belated step. Both should also be included at the very beginning of discussions with Europe—should they occur as has been rumored—toward the creation of a free trade zone in the Atlantic. Such trade negotiations would provide an added means for the three North American economies to build cooperation.¶ The war against cartels and gangs involved in the illegal drugs trade continues to rage on both sides of the border, although indications of progress include a reduction in violence, cleaned-up cities, and increasing professionalization of the Mexican security forces. Achieving a reduction of violence will be a key challenge for President-Elect Peña Nieto, with street protests demanding as much. Judicial reform is moving forward, albeit slowly, but Mexican authorities still rely too greatly on confession by apprehended suspects and have deficits in the acquisition and use of intelligence. This fight needs to be framed as a joint challenge, emphasizing the co-responsibility of the United States, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has expressed several times.¶ The re-launch of a U.S.-Mexican bilateral commission would be an important vehicle to institutionalize cabinet-level discussions across the broad range of issues that affect our countries and maybe trilateralize along with Canada from time to time. Tone and perception count a lot in the bilateral relationship. In addition, both sides should establish permanent working groups to help change the image and perception of Mexico in the United States and vice versa. Such an engagement in public diplomacy could include messaging and outreach to counter the often-distorted perception of Mexican society in the United States.¶ The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### Capital is key – allows Obama to thread the needle – there’s momentum 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.”

**Comprehensive reform is key to food security**

**ACIR ‘7** (December 4, 2007 THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Dear Member of Congress: The Agriculture Coalition for Immigration Reform (ACIR) is deeply concerned with pending immigration enforcement legislation known as the ‘Secure America Through Verification and Enforcement Act of 2007' or ‘SAVE Act’ (H.R.4088 and S.2368). While these bills seek to address the worthy goal of stricter immigration law enforcement, they fail to take a comprehensive approach to solving the immigration problem. History shows that a one dimensional approach to the nation’s immigration problem is doomed to fail. Enforcement alone, without providing a viable means to obtain a legal workforce to sustain economic growth is a formula for disaster. Agriculture best illustrates this point. Agricultural industries that need considerable labor in order to function include the fruit and vegetable, dairy and livestock, nursery, greenhouse, and Christmas tree sectors. Localized labor shortages have resulted in actual crop loss in various parts of the country. More broadly, producers are making decisions to scale back production, limit expansion, and leave many critical tasks unfulfilled. Continued labor shortages could force more producers to shift production out of the U.S., thus stressing already taxed food and import safety systems. Farm lenders are becoming increasingly concerned about the stability of affected industries. This problem is aggravated by the nearly universal acknowledgement that the current H-2A agricultural guest worker program does not work. Based on government statistics and other evidence, roughly 80 percent of the farm labor force in the United States is foreign born, and a significant majority of that labor force is believed to be improperly authorized. The bills’ imposition of mandatory electronic employment eligibility verification will screen out the farm labor force without providing access to legal workers. Careful study of farm labor force demographics and trends indicates that there is not a replacement domestic workforce available to fill these jobs. This feature alone will result in chaos unless combined with labor-stabilizing reforms. Continued failure by Congress to act to address this situation in a comprehensive fashion is placing in jeopardy U.S. food security and global competitiveness. Furthermore, congressional inaction threatens the livelihoods of millions of Americans whose jobs exist because laborintensive agricultural production is occurring in America. If production is forced to move, most of the upstream and downstream jobs will disappear as well. The Coalition cannot defend of the broken status quo. We support well-managed borders and a rational legal system. We have worked for years to develop popular bipartisan legislation that would stabilize the existing experienced farm workforce and provide an orderly transition to wider reliance on a legal agricultural worker program that provides a fair balance of employer and employee rights and protections. We respectfully urge you to oppose S.2368, H.R.4088, or any other bills that would impose employment-based immigration enforcement in isolation from equally important reforms that would provide for a stable and legal farm labor force.

**Food insecurity sparks World War 3**

**Calvin ’98** (William, Theoretical Neurophysiologist – U Washington, Atlantic Monthly, January, Vol 281, No. 1, p. 47-64)

The population-crash scenario is surely the most appalling. Plummeting crop yields would cause some powerful countries to try to take over their neighbors or distant lands -- if only because their armies, unpaid and lacking food, would go marauding, both at home and across the borders. The better-organized countries would attempt to use their armies, before they fell apart entirely, to take over countries with significant remaining resources, driving out or starving their inhabitants if not using modern weapons to accomplish the same end: eliminating competitors for the remaining food. This would be a worldwide problem -- and could lead to a Third World War -- but Europe's vulnerability is particularly easy to analyze. The last abrupt cooling, the Younger Dryas, drastically altered Europe's climate as far east as Ukraine. Present-day Europe has more than 650 million people. It has excellent soils, and largely grows its own food. It could no longer do so if it lost the extra warming from the North Atlantic.
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**A. Interpretation - Economic engagement is long-term strategy for promoting structural linkage between two economies**

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” [http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http%3A//polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf)

The basic causal logic of economic engagement, and the emphasis on domestic politics, can be traced to Hirschman. He viewed economic engagement as a long-term, transformative strategy. As one state gradually expands economic interaction with its target, the resulting (asymmetrical) interdependence creates vested interests within the target society and government. The beneficiaries of interdependence become addicted to it, and they protect their interests by pressuring the government to accommodate the source of interdependence. Economic engagement is a form of structural linkage; it is a means to get other states to *want* what you want, rather than to *do* what you want. The causal chain runs from economic interdependence through domestic political change to foreign policy accommodation.

**B. Violation – the plan is technical assistance – engagement requires trade promotion**

**Celik, 11 –** master’s student at Uppsala University (Department of Peace and Conflict Research) (Arda, Economic Sanctions and Engagement Policies <http://www.grin.com/en/e-book/175204/economic-sanctions-and-engagement-policies>)

Literature of liberal school points out that economic engagement policies are significantly effective tools for sender and target countries. The effectiveness leans on mutual economic and political benefits for both parties.(Garzke et al,2001).Ecenomic engagement operates with trade mechanisms where sender and target country establish intensified trade thus increase the economic interaction over time. This strategy decreases the potential hostilities and provides mutual gains. Paulson Jr (2008) states that this mechanism is highly different from carrots (inducements). Carrots work quid pro quo in short terms and for narrow goals. Economic engagement intends to develop the target country and wants her to be aware of the long term benefits of shared economic goals. Sender does not want to contain nor prevent the target country with different policies. Conversely; sender works deliberately to improve the target countries’ Gdp, trade potential, export-import ratios and national income. Sender acts in purpose to reach important goals. First it establishes strong economic ties because economic integration has the capacity to change the political choices and behaviour of target country. Sender state believes in that economic linkages have political transformation potential.(Kroll,1993)

**C. Voting issue –**

**1. limits – broad interpretations of engagement include anything that effects the economy, which means everything**

**2. negative ground – trade promotion is vital for a** stable mechanism **for disad links and counterplan ground**
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#### International property rights are neoliberal tools that increase the rich-poor gap and block knowledge production between the North and South – we must question the epistemological assumptions made by the 1ac to instill discussion of economic integration within policy structures – only the alternative solves – its approach to knowledge production is an interdisciplinary strategy that opens up a space of contestation that IPR regimes preclude

**Grinspun and Cameron, 96** – Latin American Studies Association; Y’s ork University and Carleton University (Ricardo and Maxwell A., “NAFTA And The Political Economy Of Mexico's External Relations”, Latin American Research Review, Volume 31, Number 3, Pages 161-188, http://lasa-2.univ.pitt.edu/LARR/prot/search/retrieve/?Vol=31&Num=3&Start=161)//VP

Alternative Scholarship¶ Any review of the literature on Mexico's external relations that ignored the role of scholarship outside traditional channels would be incomplete. A burgeoning electronic network is now transmitting information about the latest events in Mexico to an increasingly attentive and "wired" audience throughout North America and beyond, opening new arenas of unregulated and vibrant discussion and intellectual exchange. More and more, North American researchers are depending on the Internet as a basic research tool. The development of grassroots scholarship--affiliated with nongovernmental organizations, secondary academic institutions, small alternative "think tanks" and making extensive use of communications technology--supports an increasingly transnational civil society. These sources of information have not been given sufficient attention and may in fact generate some of the most interesting new contributions to the NAFTA debate. In fact, the diminished relevance of conventional texts makes book reviews less salient because the real debate may be going on in cyberspace.24¶ A key contribution of grassroots scholarship has been the development of critical analysis of economic integration outside university and policy networks. A useful compendium of these ideas by prominent expositors is the compact volume entitled The Case against Free Trade: GATT, NAFTA and the Globalization of Corporate Power, edited by Ralph Nader and his team. The quality of scholarship in this volume is uneven, footnoting is sporadic to preserve its popular reach, and the arguments raised by these skeptics are by now well known. Nevertheless, the work's relevance has been accentuated by the economic and social developments unfolding in Mexico since early 1994. Three intriguing and strong contributions are those by Vandana Shiva, by Herman Daly, and by Jorge Castañeda and Carlos Heredia.¶ Shiva's "Diversity and Intellectual Property Rights" shows how the Dunkel Draft Text of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) will lead to the harmonization of intellectual property rights (IPR) regimes in less developed countries and thus stifle creativity and knowledge development related to biodiversity. Shiva's experience is drawn from agricultural practices in India. But her criticisms of IPR regimes and the social forces that benefit from their promotion in the new economy are equally relevant for Mexico in the aftermath of both the newly created World Trade Organization (WTO) and NAFTA, given that both entail changes in IPR protection and agricultural liberalization.¶ Shiva advances three general propositions that merit serious research regarding Mexico. First, she asserts that patent protection "displaces the farmer as a competitor [with TNCs], transforms him into a supplier of free raw material, and makes him totally dependent on industrial supplies for vital inputs like seed" (p. 115). Second, both the formal and informal sectors are negatively affected by the "intellectual enclosures engendered by patents" (p. 116), the informal sector most seriously given that local cooperatives, traditional agricultural practitioners (such as herbalists), and peasant farmers generally lack a conception of private property and freely share their knowledge without compensation to those who patent it for exploitation of profit. Shiva's third proposition is that patents "block a free flow of knowledge from the formal sector of the North to the formal sector of the South while maintaining a free flow from the informal sector of the South to the formal sector of the North" (p. 116). To the extent that this phenomenon is global, the implications for Mexico and other less-developed countries are enormous. If research and development combined with innovation remain the cornerstone of the new economy, Shiva's research forecasts that the new IPR regimes of GATT and (by extension) NAFTA will only worsen existing disparities between North and South.¶ At the minimum, Shiva's research demonstrates the need for an interdisciplinary approach to IPR regimes and biodiversity. Such an approach must question who has the power to define what is "knowledge" or "innovation" and appropriate the benefits of that definition; what types of "properties" are being protected and by whom; what alternatives are being foreclosed by existing IPR regimes and at what costs to local communities; what role government can play to mediate between the TNC and the local community; and how these communities with no conception of "profit" or "private appropriation" can be protected from exploitation in the new economy.¶ Herman Daly's strength in "From Adjustment to Sustainable Development: The Obstacle of Free Trade" lies in blending the disciplines of economics and environmental studies uniquely to demystify issues of adjustment and sustainable development. He argues persuasively that adjustment is generally defined in neoclassical terms that downplay ecological considerations as "externalities" (likely correctable by substitution or technology). Daly creatively links economy and ecology through the concept of scale, which "refers to the physical size of the economy relative to the ecosystem" (p. 123). The main point here is recasting the economy via this concept as a subsystem of a broader and more important entity--the environment. Scale measures the total resource use by which the ecosystem sustains the economic subsystem on the basis of population multiplied by per capita use of resources.¶ The second half of Daly's analysis shows how international free trade conflicts with keeping scale within ecological limits, generally because neoliberal ideology assumes "that the whole world and all future generations can consume resources at the levels current in today's high-wage countries without inducing ecological collapse" (p. 129). One may wish to quarrel with the extent of ecological collapse that Daly implicitly forecasts, but the interdisciplinary scope of his research and his ability to view the economy in a broader ecological context is powerful in its logic and simplicity. Daly's insights are most relevant for Mexico, whose largest urban centers, export-processing zones, and arable lands present formidable ecological challenges.¶ Castañeda and Heredia's "Another NAFTA: What a Good Trade Agreement Should Offer" sketches an alternative vision of integration for North America. Such attempts are infrequently made in the critical literature and should be encouraged. Many of the authors' elements of a "good trade agreement" are intriguing but need further development. For example, Casteñeda and Heredia propose renegotiating Mexico's external debt (an idea on which most critics would agree), with one option being debt-for- investment swap to finance social development funds (pp. 84-85). Such swaps raise complex issues, however, one of which could be more direct foreign control of Mexican social policy. To take another example, Casteñeda and Heredia propose that all three countries create an "economic commission to plan which industries should be developed and where, how each stage will be reached, where the money will come from . . . and what regulations will be established" (p. 85). This solution implies a "greater transfer of sovereignty" than NAFTA currently entails, as the authors recognize (p. 89). Given the existing asymmetries of power in North America, one may question whether this proposal is feasible, progressive, or simply naive.¶ In the same vein, Castañeda and Heredia believe strongly in a dispute-resolution process that is "autonomous" and "open to all," "with citizen participation . . . a key element" (p. 89). Prima facie, this concept seems progressive, but one must always bear in mind that the extent of citizen participation depends on the prior degree of democratization of civil society. This issue is a much more complex question than the institutional framework of dispute resolution in NAFTA.¶ Another example of alternative scholarship arising out of research nongovernmental organizations not associated with traditional academic outfits is Mexico: A Country Guide, edited by Tom Barry, which includes contributions by ten other authors. Neither a typical tourist guide nor a dry academic tract, the book is oriented toward well-informed individuals with an interest in the Mexican social landscape. For such readers, the book is readable and succinct in comprehensively examining sociopolitical issues in contemporary Mexico. The detailed coverage is impressive, including issues such as government and politics, the economy, social forces, social sectors and institutions, and foreign influence along with less common issues such as feminism, the environment, and indigenous organizing. The book's overall purpose is to understand the nature of the crises and challenges facing Mexicans and their society on the eve of NAFTA, as Mexican policy makers deepen their commitment to a neoliberal strategy of growth while attempting to respond to multiple social, economic, and environmental problems. Mexico: A Country Guide represents the growth of a new kind of "international relations" between the civil societies in Mexico and the United States, one that is neither governmental nor business-oriented. One danger is that a work of this type may quickly become outdated. Major developments such as the Chiapas conflict, economic and financial crisis, and political assassinations are already altering the 1992 social space captured so adeptly in this book.¶ The growing difficulties of neoliberal experiments and the crisis that has engulfed Mexico since 1994 indicate the need for scholarship on equity, external conditionality, vulnerability to external shocks, and marginalization. La integración comercial de México a Estados Unidos y Canadá: ¿Alternativa o destino? represents one effort to come to grips with the new face of Mexico while maintaining an eclectic intellectual perspective. This work by Víctor Bernal Sahagún and his colleagues appeared in 1990 and is already in its third edition in Mexico. UNAM researchers captured at an early stage many dimensions of the process of "integración salvaje" that Mexico underwent with the countries to the north. These essays emphasize the deep asymmetry characterizing the U.S.-Mexican relationship and its implications for bilateral trade and investment and the NAFTA negotiations. Although the essays vary in quality, they represent a significant effort to bring up the political-economy implications of this integration--aspects missing from much of the mainstream literature.¶ An especially meritorious essay focuses on how the proposed free trade agreement responds to U.S. geostrategic interests. John Saxe-Fernández argues that economic decision-making in the United States is closely interlinked with political and strategic considerations. He insists that "partial" and "atomistic" economic analysis of trade issues in isolation from political and military considerations or those surrounding national sovereignty or human rights is not only wrong but deliberately promoted by those who want to obscure these links. For Saxe-Fernández, the current drive for North American integration is deeply rooted in the U.S. strategic need to secure reliable energy resources. The energy crisis in the early 1970s, which revealed the extent of U.S. vulnerability, catalyzed this strategic agenda. Saxe-Fernández quotes a striking 1979 report from a Wall Street firm arguing that the United States should rely on Canada and Mexico, not the Middle East, and calling for a "sort of Common Market that will integrate the vast energetic resources in North America, through an efficient system of distribution, at the same time that it allows for the will of these countries to engage in free trade amongst themselves."25 Saxe-Fernández also delineates a consistent pattern of International Monetary Fund and World Bank predominance over Mexican economic and social policies and industrial restructuring during the debt crisis in the early 1980s, which heightened Mexico's vulnerability to external actors. This path began with Mexico signing a letter of intent with the IMF in 1982 and the privatization and growing foreign control over Mexican mineral reserves, banks, and large chunks of the petrochemical and petroleum industry. It concluded with NAFTA.¶ Conclusion¶ The portrait of Mexico presented in many of the books reviewed here is radically at odds with the conventional understanding of the Latin American political economy. Mexico is commonly viewed as poised to join the so-called First World after implementing policies that embraced markets and embodied the "Washington consensus." According to this perspective, underlying social cleavages were either deemed irrelevant or destined to diminish in the rapid modernization of the country, and U.S.-Mexico relations were finally on a more "mature" (meaning cooperative) footing. In contrast, the real face of Mexico (especially since January 1994) remains a depressingly familiar one. Still ahead loom the tasks of addressing social and economic inequality, building democratic institutions, securing human rights, configuring a stable and sustainable economic model, and forging fair and thus more enduring hemispheric relations.¶ Rural poverty and indebtedness, the Chiapas insurrection, and a major financial crisis created major hurdles in U.S.-Mexican relations following the ratification and implementation of NAFTA.26 These hurdles are calling attention to serious deficiencies in the literature on U.S.-Mexico relations, which has been framed within a narrow neoclassical approach to economic integration. Given the extent to which events and decisions in one country affect the security and prosperity of the other, and often in unexpected ways, it is no longer possible to ignore the social, political, economic, and environmental costs and uncertainties of economic integration. Many neoclassical analysts understated these costs and missed a key lesson: how these costs as well as the benefits of integration are managed and distributed will contribute decisively to the sustainability of the process (Pastor and Wise 1994).¶ It is now clear that sound and sustainable management of bilateral integration requires a sophisticated body of knowledge on the political economy of U.S.-Mexican relations. This knowledge cannot be exclusively economic, nor can it be monopolized by elites and their intellectual representatives. The debate on North American economic integration must involve a broader spectrum of opinions, one that transcends the consensus supporting neoliberal policy in a tightly knit network of academic researchers, policy makers, think tanks, and the private sector. If the current crisis forebodes the weakening of Mexican (and perhaps Latin American) neoliberalism, which alternative policy perspective is likely to become more influential? A return to full-fledged national populism is neither likely nor desirable. We need alternatives that transcend the dichotomy between these ideologies. One such alternative should be an interdisciplinary political-economy approach that can encompass an array of elements: the global forces of capitalism as they affect local forms of linkages to international markets; the enhanced role of transnational actors in the new economy, particularly transnational corporations; the regulatory and institutional framework of both markets and governments; the transformation of relations between the state and civil society; the asymmetric nature of power relations within and between societies, including divisions across ethnic, gender, and class lines; the nature of production regimes and "social contracts" that sustain societies; the location and sustainability of human society within the earth's ecosystem; rural-urban relations and migration; and debt and its impact on social infrastructure.¶ Although eclectic seeds of alternative thinking exist, a major challenge for future scholarship on Mexican and Latin American society is to flesh out and synthesize an integrated alternative approach. Our previous work has been motivated by the belief that intellectuals can provide the theoretical background for the development of policy alternatives that will contribute to more just, open, and sustainable societies in the Americas (see Grinspun and Cameron 1993).¶ Future research should take an integrative and interdisciplinary approach to the political economy of Mexico and its external relations. Narrow scholarship that maintains a single disciplinary focus, even with the technical rigor of neoclassical economic analysis, has been of little use in predicting and explaining recent transformations. Thus we need a sober assessment of the risks and uncertainties of a strategy of development hinged on attracting massive inflows of capital. The redistributive (and the associated social and political) impacts of economic integration urgently require analysis, particularly in view of accelerating integrationist efforts in the hemisphere. These research directions will require more attention to the institutional setting of markets and the power relations among participants in them.27 Computable economic models must be radically redesigned to become relevant policy tools based on realistic assumptions, such as allowing for the existence of unemployment and other "imperfections" in labor markets, transnational corporations, speculative financial markets, external disequilibrium, and macroeconomic instability (Cypher 1993; Stanford 1993).¶ Regional and hemispheric integration will remain a focus of scholarly attention in the years to come. But so-called free trade agreements should be analyzed for what they are--broad institutional mechanisms that reshape the relationship between state and civil society, and not just experiments in commodity trade liberalization. Difficulties in U.S.-Mexico relations have arisen recently in nontrade areas like finance and the environment, where the weak regulatory framework of NAFTA could affect its sustainability. More and more, attention will shift to the institutional settings that shape market activity, both national and international. For example, the potential impact of new provisions on intellectual property rights (such as those implemented in Mexico in recent years) on areas as diverse as technological innovation, education, and health remains almost completely unexplored. The NAFTA side agreements on labor and the environment are only feeble forms of new institutional arrangements required at the transnational level to avoid social dumping. Recognizing the risks of extreme deregulation of capital flows suggests the need for controls of some type. Ultimately, the impact of economic integration on Mexican, Canadian, and U.S. citizens depends on such institutional and societal arrangements and the power relations underlying them.

#### 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.

## 1NC

**Text: Congress should delegate the authority to provide technical assistance to the government of Mexico for implementation of commercial domestic intellectual property protections to the Department of State. The Department of State should pursue and enact the congressional delegation.**

**CP is competitive – they don’t spec their agent which is a reason to vote neg because it kills agent CPs and branch specific DA’s AND hurts knowledge about implementation.**

**Counterplan solves the aff and doesn’t link to politics.**

Epstein and O’Hallaron 99 (David Epstein- Department of Political Science and Stanford Graduate School of Business, Columbia and Stanford University, and Sharyn O’Hallaron- Department of Political Science and the School of International and Public Affairs and Hoover Institution, Columbia and Stanford University, January 1999 (“The Nondelegation Doctrine and the Separation of Powers” – Cardozo Law Review) p. lexis

Our institutional analysis begins with the observation that there are two alternative modes for specifying the details of public policy. Policy can be made through the typical legislative process, in which a committee considers a bill and reports it to the floor of the chamber, and then a majority of the floor members must agree on a policy to enact. Alternatively, Congress can pass a law that delegates authority to regulatory agencies, allowing them to fill in some or all of the details of policy. The key is that, given a fixed amount of policy details to be specified, these two modes of poli [\*962] cymaking are substitutes for each other. To the degree that one is used more, the other will perforce be used less. Note also that it is Congress who chooses where policy is made. Legislators can either write detailed, exacting laws, in which case the executive branch will have little or no substantive input into policy, they can delegate the details to agencies, thereby giving the executive branch a substantial role in the policymaking process, or they can pick any point in between. Since legislators' primary goal is reelection, it follows that policy will be made so as to maximize legislators' reelection chances. Thus, delegation will follow the natural fault lines of legislators' political advantage. In making this institutional choice, legislators face costs either way. Making explicit laws requires legislative time and energy that might be profitably spent on more electorally productive activities. After all, one of the reasons bureaucracies are created is for agencies to implement policies in areas where Congress has neither the time nor expertise to micro-manage policy decisions, and by restricting flexibility, Congress would be limiting agencies' ability to adjust to changing circumstances. This tradeoff is captured well by Terry Moe in his discussion of regulatory structure: The most direct way [to control agencies] is for today's authorities to specify, in excruciating detail, precisely what the agency is to do and how it is to do it, leaving as little as possible to the discretionary judgment of bureaucrats - and thus as little as possible for future authorities to exercise control over, short of passing new legislation... Obviously, this is not a formula for creating effective organizations. In the interests of public protection, agencies are knowingly burdened with cumbersome, complicated, technically inappropriate structures that undermine their capacity to perform their jobs well. n40 Where oversight and monitoring problems do not exist, legislators would readily delegate authority to the executive branch, taking advantage of agency expertise, conserving scarce resources of time, staff, and energy, and **avoiding the logrolls, delays, and informational inefficiencies** associated with the committee system. Consider, for example, the issue of airline safety, which is characterized on the one hand by the need for technical expertise, and on the other hand by an almost complete absence of potential political benefits. That is, policymakers will receive little credit if airlines run well and no disasters occur, but they will have to with [\*963] stand intense scrutiny if something goes wrong. n41 Furthermore, legislative and executive preferences on this issue would tend to be almost perfectly aligned - have fewer accidents as long as the costs to airlines are not prohibitive. The set of individuals receiving benefits, the public who use the airlines, is diffused and ill organized, while those paying the costs of regulation, the airline companies, are well-organized and politically active. Furthermore, keeping in mind that deficiencies in the system are easily detectable, delegated power is relatively simple to monitor. For all these reasons, even if legislators had unlimited time and resources of their own (which they do not), delegation to the executive branch would be the preferred mode of policymaking.

**Counterplan key to maintain separation of powers**

**Bryner, ’87** [Gary, Ph. D in Govt, Poli Sci @ BYU, “Bureaucratic Discretion: Law and Policy in Federal Regulatory Agencies,” p.5-6]

Bureaucratic discretion is also defended as a practical response to the inability of traditionally separated governmental powers to deal effectively with the policy challenges confronting them. James Landis defended the broad grants of discretionary authority to administrative agencies not as "simply an extension of executive power" but a "full audit of authority nec­essary for |them| in order to plan, to promote, and to police," thus represent­ing "an assemblage of rights normally exercisable by government as a whole." "The administrative process." he argued, is an "answer to the inadequacy of the judicial and the legislative processes.'"\* Discretion is especially important in regulatory agencies, as it permits administrative officials to be flexible and adaptable in tailoring their efforts to specific situations. Laws cannot be written to anticipate and address all of the possible situations within an agency's jurisdiction. They must permit a consideration of economic, regional, cultural, personal and other differences among those who fall within (he agency's regulatory reach. Discretion per­mits the regulators to tailor their efforts to particular circumstances and con­cerns, produce regulatory actions that arc reasonable and fair, and effectively accomplish policy objectives.” Discretion Is a fundamental clement of modern administrative theory and is consistent with important norms of pluralism and democracy. It is also consistent with political incentives and serves as an attractive way for legisla­tors to delegate responsibility for difficult decisions to bureaucrats. Credit can be claimed for legislative action, blame can be deflected when specific efforts clash with politically powerful interests, and constituents can be culti­vated by intervening in unpopular agency actions.

Separation of powers is key to effectively respond to global crises

**Tushnet**, June **2005**: [Mark V. Tushnet – response to Curtis Bradley and Jock Goldsmith Harvard Review. Academic OneFile, “Controlling Executive power in the war on terrorism.” ]

Imagine this scenario: after a series of bombings in New York, the President directs U.S. armed forces to round up Arab American males over the age of fifteen in the New York metropolitan area and confine them in a sports stadium; those who military officers determine pose no continuing threat to domestic security are released back to their communities, a process that predictably will lead to some detentions lasting a month and more. (1) The discussion by Professors Bradley and Goldsmith of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (2) (AUMF) adopted on September 18, 2001, (3) raises the intriguing question: would such action be authorized by the AUMF already in place? (4) This Reply addresses only a few aspects of the problems Professors Bradley and Goldsmith consider, in an attempt to draw out some of the more general implications of their analysis for constitutional law. How does--or should--the U.S. Constitution regulate the exercise of power in response to threats to national security, to ensure that power is used wisely? (5) Broadly speaking, two mechanisms of control are available: a separation-of-powers mechanism and a judicial-review mechanism. (6) Both mechanisms aim to ensure that the national government exercises its power responsibly--with sufficient vigor to meet the nation's challenges, but without intruding on protected liberties. (7) Under the separation-of-powers mechanism, nearly all of the work of regulating power is done by the principle that the President can do only what Congress authorizes. (8) Its primary concern is what Professors Bradley and Goldsmith call Executive Branch unilateralism, a fear that Presidents acting on their own might make unsound decisions, engaging in too much (or too little) military action, intruding on liberties too much (or too little). Under the judicial-review mechanism, courts enforce two sets of principles: principles allocating power between the President and Congress, and principles protecting individual liberties, such as those embodied in the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. Its primary concern is that the government as a whole will act improvidently. To avoid unilateral executive (or congressional) action, the judicial-review mechanism makes the concerns that underlie the separation-of-powers mechanism enforceable by the courts. I believe that neither the separation-of-powers nor the judicial-review mechanism of control is adequate to the task of structuring the exercise of national power under modern conditions, and that we would benefit from creative thinking about good constitutional design. Defenders of the separation-of-powers mechanism make both a positive and a negative case. (9) The positive case rests on the classic "ambition counteracting ambition" theory articulated in The Federalist Papers. (10) Congress and the President stand in structural opposition to each other, with each side alert to possible "power grabs" by the other that would threaten--simultaneously--the people's liberties and the prerogatives and power of the opposing branch. (11) In addition, the people influence the President and Congress differently, with members of the House of Representatives concerned that their constituents might turn them out of office if they fail to challenge presidential initiatives that the people believe threaten their liberties, the President having a nationwide constituency more sensitive than smaller and more parochial constituencies to national security concerns, and the Senate free to deliberate about what good policy would be without concern for short-run political disadvantage. (12) The separation-of-powers mechanism rejects executive unilateralism, but identifies no enduring substantive limitations on what the President and Congress may do; the only limitations are those worked out in the interactions between the President and Congress.

## Cooperation

#### No solvency – their evidence assumes a Mexico-California biotechnology partnership –the aff doesn’t increase this relationship

#### Status quo solves the aff – strong Mexican growth now and US encouraging patents now – their evidence

Surpin et al, 07 – CEO, Biocom, Master of Public Health from the University of Pittsburgh a bachelor of science degree in biology from LeMoyne College Panetta has been actively involved in biotechnology product development and commercialization for more than 20 years, joined Mycogen Corporation, a pioneering San Diego based biotechnology firm where he played a principal role in commercialization of the first recombinant DNA microbes and crops (Beni Surpin, Bram Hanono and Joseph Panetta, “Moving Technology Across the Border: The Future of Biotech for the U.S. and Mexico,” pg online @ http://www.latinolawblog.com/2007/10/articles/crossborder-insolvency/moving-technology-across-the-border-the-future-of-biotech-for-the-us-and-mexico/ //ghs-ef)//VP

With so many research institutions, universities, and biotechnology companies located in the U.S., it would be opportune for Mexico to become a potential destination for these companies to collaborate in the development and manufacturing of their goods. While U.S. companies may benefit from the increased and less expensive labor force, Mexico would benefit through the production of jobs for, and development of, skilled labor. Currently, biotechnology collaboration between the two countries simply mirror the maquiladoras of the later half of the 20th century. In 2006, trade between the U.S. and Mexico in biotechnology and life sciences goods, as reported by the U.S. Department of Commerce, had reached nearly $3 billion dollars and has experienced an average annual growth of 15% between 2003 and 2006. While the advent of the maquiladoras benefited both the U.S. and Mexico substantially in the past and continue to serve both countries today, they have been doing so to a lesser capacity as international competition has stiffened. With maquiladoras operating under a wide range of industries spanning from chemical products, garment assembly, food production, and electronic assembly, U.S. companies capitalize, of course, on Mexico's skilled but less expensive labor force, while creating millions of jobs in Mexico, and assisting in some flow of technology across the border. In reviewing the data, in 2003 there were more than 3,500 maquiladoras in Mexico, 90% of which were located along the U.S.-Mexico border. Although the number of maquiladoras is still strong, and Mexico has a long future in the manufacturing arena, as competition from China and other countries increases, Mexico will need to find other niches to fill, so as to continue growth and expansion of its increasing skilled labor force. With some luck, Mexico has already rooted itself in the biotechnology and life science industry by promoting growth in its medical devices production. In 2003, Baja California biomedical device firms employed over 23,700 individuals. In Baja California alone there are about 60 biomedical product companies, of which 40 have U.S. parent companies. The Cluster de Productos Médicos de Las Californias (Medical Products Cluster of the Californias), which is made up of many of Baja California's largest medical products manufacturers, actively encourages suppliers to expand into Mexico. U.S. companies have followed and as a result new employment has spurred on both sides of the border. Currently, there are about 170 manufacturing plants operating in Mexico, including most of the industry's big names: Pfizer, Bristol-Myers, and Eli Lilly among them. And while there are a number of Mexican pharmaceutical companies operating and performing research, such as Probiomed (Mexico City), Biciclo (San Luis de Potosi) and Laboratorios Silanes (Mexico City), the potential for additional activity is exponential. To the extent Mexico adopts policies similar to those of the Bayh-Dole Act, both countries would move beyond the blueprint of the maquiladoras in which most of the R&D occurs in the in U.S. while only the manufacturing portion of the collaboration occurs in Mexico. By Mexico giving incentives to its skilled researchers, it can become a partner with the U.S. in biotech R&D and no longer only focus on manufacturing of medical products. In doing so, and considering that Mexico has the largest pharmaceutical market in Latin America with industry sales expected to reach $14 billion in 2008, Mexico will be able to fully exploit its technological capabilities and accelerate the launch of new discoveries and medications south of the border. This in turn, coupled with full collaborations between researchers in Mexico and the U.S., would greatly benefit the biotech industry in each of the two countries, as well as the region as a whole.

#### They don’t solve brain drain or Mexican science –

#### 1) Multiple alt causes – their March evidence cites cultural shifts, increase in scientific growth, and a full focus on cancer and diabetes to solve genomic medicine

#### 2) No solvency – their evidence says registering and innovating IPR’s are difficult for Mexico – their impacts are inevitable

#### No risk of TB Spread – even drug resistant strains

**Collins and Fidel, ‘7** (Lois M. and Steve, June 3, 2007, Desert Morning News, L-N)

The frenzy over tuberculosis spawned by a single "extensively drug-resistant" case is capturing headlines. But most people exposed to the airborne bacteria will never develop active disease. The Atlanta attorney's case has health officials concerned because his TB falls into a class of infections that resists two first-line TB drugs and some second-line drugs -- one of only 49 other extensively drug-resistant cases reported in the United States between 1993 and 2006. There's also a class called multidrug-resistant TB, which is easier to treat than cases like this one but more difficult than typical TB. Although it's harder to kill, it's no easier to spread than any other tubercolosis, according to Carrie Taylor, an infection control practice nurse at LDS Hospital. "You have to breathe in air that's coughed." Doctors treat an average of 38 active TB cases each year in Utah, according to the Utah Department of Health. The disease usually settles in the lungs, although it can affect the kidneys, spine, brain and other organs. The disease is caused by Mycobacterium tuberculosis, which spreads person-to-person but only through close contact. Taylor and her colleague Vickie Anderson, also an infection-control practice nurse at LDS Hospital, describe it as passing from one person's lungs directly into another's. It's not like a cold that is easily spread and fairly hardy. In fact, sunlight kills it. Unless the individual has a drug-resistant TB strain -- "not common in Utah," said Taylor -- it's very treatable, although it takes a long time and several medications. Left untreated, it can kill. At least initially, patients are isolated to avoid spread of the disease. Both chicken pox and measles are more contagious, said infectious disease specialist Dr. John Kriesel of University Hospital. As an example, when a Provo High School student was recently diagnosed with tuberculosis and health officials asked 250 of the student's school contacts to be tested for it, Kriesel predicted "not one of them will test positive for TB." People in casual contact are extremely unlikely to get the disease. Just being exposed doesn't mean you could pass it on, Taylor said. Without symptoms, you can't spread it, even if you have a positive skin test. People who live with a patient are at higher risk, but most won't get it, either.

#### Alt cause - TB growing in India and China

**Sampaio, ‘7** (Jeorge former President of Portugal, UN Secretary-General Special Envoy to Stop Tuberculosis, CHINA DAILY, March 1, 2007, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-03/28/content\_5906284.htm)

MDR-TB is growing worldwide, with the highest rates in countries of the former Soviet Union around the European Union, in India and China. MDR-TB does not respond to standard TB drugs and predictably, if not properly treated, it can become extensively drug-resistant (XDR-TB). XDR-TB strains have now been found in all regions of the world.

**Biotech won’t be implemented – environmental drawbacks**

**Altieri ’1** – Ph.D., teaches agroecology in the Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management at University of California at Berkeley, and is a technical advisor to the Latin American Consortium on Agroecology and Development in Santiago (Miguel, “The Ecological Impacts of Agricultural Biotechnology,” Actionbiosence, February 2001, <http://www.actionbioscience.org/biotechnology/altieri.html#fullbio>)//SS

Transnational corporations (TNCs) such as Monsanto, DuPont, and Novartis, the main proponents of biotechnology, argue that carefully planned introduction of these crops should reduce or even eliminate the enormous crop losses due to weeds, insect pests, and pathogens. In fact, they argue that the use of such crops will have added beneficial effects on the environment by significantly reducing the use of agrochemicals.13 However, ecological theory predicts that as long as transgenic crops follow closely the pesticide paradigm prevalent in modern agriculture, such biotechnological products will do nothing but reinforce the pesticide treadmill in agroecosystems, thus legitimizing the concerns that many environmentalists and some scientists have expressed regarding the possible environmental risks of genetically engineered organisms. In fact, there are several widely accepted environmental drawbacks associated with the rapid deployment and widespread commercialization of such crops in large monocultures, including:3,21,25¶ the spread of transgenes to related weeds or conspecifics via crop-weed hybridization¶ reduction of the fitness of non-target organisms through the acquisition of transgenic traits via hybridization¶ the rapid evolution of resistance of insect pests such as Lepidoptera to Bt¶ accumulation of the insecticidal Bt toxin, which remains active in the soil after the crop is ploughed under and binds tightly to clays and humic acids;¶ disruption of natural control of insect pests through intertrophic-level effects of the Bt toxin on predators¶ unanticipated effects on non-target herbivorous insects (i.e., monarch butterflies) through deposition of transgenic pollen on foliage of surrounding wild vegetation14¶ vector-mediated horizontal gene transfer and recombination to create new pathogenic organisms

**No environment extinction**

**Easterbrook, 03** – senior fellow at the New Republic, 03 [“We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=]

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, **it wouldn't be the final curtain**. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

## IP

#### Non-unique – US has put many countries on USTR 301 list before – no reason why that kills trade

#### Alt cause to US trade policy – subsidized steal and LNG export restriction

**Palmer, 1/31** – Reuters Reporter (Doug, “US ban on LNG exports would violate WTO rules – experts”, 2013, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/31/usa-trade-lng-idUSL1N0AZMTU20130131)//VP

WASHINGTON, Jan 31 (Reuters) - A U.S. government decision to subsidize steel, chemical and other manufacturers by restricting exports of liquefied natural gas would violate global trade rules and damage U.S. credibility after years of pressing other countries like China to drop restrictions on natural resource exports, experts said.¶ "It would be hypocritical and contrary to WTO rules for the United States to impose restraints on the export of LNG while permitting unfettered domestic consumption of natural gas," said Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who recently wrote about the issue for the think tank.

#### No solvency – aff doesn’t resolve US focus on 301 reports – impacts are inevitable

#### USTR credibility high now

**Talley, 8/2** – Reporter for the Wall Street Journal (Ian, “USTR: U.S. Wins 'Major' WTO Trade Case Against China”, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20130802-710195.html)//VP

WASHINGTON--The World Trade Organization ruled China unfairly imposed trade duties on U.S. chicken exports in a case the Obama administration says sets a legal precedent and sends a message to other countries wrongfully leveling tariffs.¶ U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman called the ruling by the WTO's dispute panel a major win that shouldn't only restore exports of U.S. chicken parts to China--a market worth roughly $600 million a year--but also stop other countries from using similar trade tactics against U.S. products.¶ Washington wants to tap the export potential of the world's second largest economy. But Beijing, fearing its own economic development is at stake, has resisted meeting some of trade standards required of it as a member of the WTO. Taking China to the WTO court is one front in a broader effort by President Barack Obama's administration to press China to allow freer trade with the U.S.¶ In 2010, China imposed duties on chicken feet, wing tips and other parts in retaliation for President Obama's decision the previous year to invoke a rare safeguard against imports of Chinese tires.¶ The Office of the United States Trade Representative successfully argued the duties were unjustified, using opaque and bad accounting standards. USTR lawyers said the ruling sends a strong message to China and other countries, such as Mexico, that are "arbitrarily inflating" export costs on a raft of other products.¶ This is the second of three WTO disputes the U.S. successfully has challenged China with on trade duties.¶ China has 60 days to appeal the WTO decision.

#### Carrots are inevitable – USPTO requires carrot use – plan isn’t key

#### No China war – Chinese democratization will facilitate cooperation

**Friedberg, 05** (Aaron L. Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University. International Security, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Fall 2005) http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/is3002\_pp007-045\_friedberg.pdf)//VP

Liberal optimists believe that, although it is still far from finished, the process of democratization is already well under way in China.20 This process is being driven largely by economic development, which, in turn, is being accelerated by China’s increasing openness to trade. Rising per capita incomes are creating a growing Chinese middle class. In Europe and North America, and more recently in Asia, those whose rising incomes allow them to do more than attend to the struggle for daily existence have been the prime movers behind progress toward democracy, and there is every reason to hope that they will play a similar role in China.21 Liberals also believe that, in addition to stirring the desire for political rights, economic development creates an objective, functional need for political liberalization. Without courts, contracts, and a reliable rule of law, economic progress will surely falter. Moreover, in an era in which sustained growth depends increasingly on free flows of information, regimes that seek to restrict speech and control communications will be at a fatal disadvantage. Over time, if it wishes even to approach the levels of well-being already attained by its advanced industrial counterparts (all of which are democracies), China too must become democratic.22 As it does, the liberal optimists expect that its relations with the United States will stabilize and that, ultimately, it will enter into the democratic “zone of peace.” Although the process may take time fully to unfold, before too long open conflict between the United States and a democratic China will be as improbable as war among the members of the European Union appears to be today.

**Cant solve disease –TB adapted because of an increase in drugs – creating more pharma makes the impact worse**

#### No Korean war

**Kang & Cha, 03** – \*associate professor of Business at Dartmouth, AND \*\*associate professor of government Georgetown’s school of Foreign Service (May/June 2003, David C. Kang, Victor D. Cha, Foreign Policy, “Think Again: The Korea Crisis,” <http://www.ituassu.com.br/asia_fp1.pdf>, JMP)

“The DMZ Is the Scariest Place in the World” Yes, if looks could kill. When former U.S. President Bill Clinton called the border between the two Koreas the world’s scariest place, he was referring to the massive forward deployment of North Korean forces around the DMZ and the shaky foundations of the 50-year-old armistice—not peace treaty—that still keeps the peace between the two former combatants. Since the end of the Korean War in 1953, there have been more than 1,400 incidents across the DMZ, resulting in the deaths of 899 North Koreans, 394 South Koreans, and 90 U.S. soldiers. Tensions have been so high tha tin 1976 the United States mobilized bombers and an aircraft carrier battle group to trim one tree in the DMZ. The deployments and operational battle plans on both sides suggest that if a major outbreak of violence were to start, a rapid escalation of hostilities would likely ensue. In practice, however, no such outbreak has occurred. North Korea has faced both a determined South Korean military, and more important, U.S. military deployments that at their height comprised 100,000 troops and nuclear-tipped Lance missiles and even today include 37,000 troops, nuclear-capable airbases, and naval facilities that guarantee U.S. involvement in any Korean conflict. The balance of power has held because any war would have disastrous consequences for both sides. Seoul and Pyongyang are less than 150 miles apart—closer than New York is to Washington, D.C. Seoul is 30 miles from the DMZ and easily within reach of North Korea’s artillery tubes. Former Commander of U.S. Forces Korea Gen. Gary Luck estimated that a war on the Korean peninsula would cost $1 trillion in economic damage and result in 1 million casualties, including 52,000 U.S. military casualties. As one war gamer described, the death toll on the North Korean side would be akin to a “holocaust,” and Kim Jong Il and his 1,000 closest generals would surely face death or imprisonment. As a result, **both sides have moved cautiously and avoided major military mobilizations that could spiral out of control.** Ironically enough, as for the DMZ itself, although bristling with barbed wire and sown with land mines, it has also become a remarkable nature preserve stretching across the peninsula that is home to wild birds and a trove of other rare species.

#### China improving IP now – economic prosperity

**Harris and Zheng, ‘13** – attorney writes and speaks extensively on Chinese law, with a focus on protecting foreign businesses in their China operations AND interviewer (Dan and Chenguang, 4/27/13, “China Intellectual Property Law. A Radio Interview For World Intellectual Property Rights Day,” http://www.chinalawblog.com/2013/04/china-intellectual-property-law-a-radio-interview-or-intellectual-property-rights-day.html)//CT

ZC: Chinese Intellectual Property laws, there are origins in Deng Xiaoping’s 1978 reform and opening up policy. During the past decade or so, especially after China’s accession into the World Trade Organization, IP protection has been brought to the fore, since China wants to dock with international standard and adopt international practices. How did China’s accession into the World Trade Organization influence intellectual property rights in China? And how better are we compared to with, say, ten years ago?

DH: China is a lot better compared to ten years ago. I think very little of that has to do with the WTO. I think that China is better because China is getting wealthier, and because Chinese companies are starting to care more about IP. I am of the view that countries start doing well with IP when its own powerful companies really start caring about it. And I’ve seen this progression happen in Japan, I’ve seen this progression happen in Korea, I’ve read about how this progression happened in the United States. The reality is nobody is going to be able to force China to improve its IP from the outside, but big companies within China like Haier, like Huawei, like Lenovo — companies that care about their own IP — are going to be able to force China to improve. That’s what’s happening. And as more big companies come to the fore in China, China’s IP is going to continue to improve. And there’s not much that can be done to rush it. In fact, if anything China’s IP is improving nicely. Meaning, it’s improving at least as fast as Korea’s did, at least as fast as Japan’s did, and probably as fast as the US’s did, but the US was a long time ago.

# 2NC

## Coop

#### **Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case**

Buell 3 (Frederick Buell, cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books; “From Apocalypse To Way of Life,” pg. 185-186)//VP

Looked at critically, then, **crisis discourse** thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a **political liability** almost as much as an asset. It calls up a **fierce and effective opposition** with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too **vulnerable to refutation by events**. It also **exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters** and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “**total solution**” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “**final solution**.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into **inhumanist authoritarianism**; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit **depoliticizes people**, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, **people need to delink from nature** and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to **further indifference** to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “**total solution**.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode; eco-authoritarianism** was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

## Leadership

#### Carrots are inevitable – rule 56 proves

**Rush, 12** – patent attorney at PCT Law Group (Andrew, “Rule 56: There’s No Such Thing as TMI at the Patent Office”, June 27, http://ipinspace.com/2012/06/27/rule-56-theres-no-such-thing-as-tmi-at-the-patent-office/)//VP

Rule 56 is part of the USPTO’s broader carrot-and-stick approach to producing better patent: on one hand, if you fail to disclose key information during the patent application process, your patent may end up being an invalid, worthless piece of paper. On the other hand, anything you disclose to the Patent Office will be considered during the application process. Any resulting patent will be granted with a presumption that the patent is valid in light of the information considered during the application process. This presumption can lead to a significantly stronger, more valuable patent.¶ Rule 56 requires that the Patent Office be informed of any and all documents, images, videos, devices on the market, and other sources of information that are material to the patentability of the invention involved in the patent application process. Rule 56 doesn’t apply to just the inventor; any patent agent or patent attorney that assists with the application must share their knowledge. Even assistants who were substantively involved in the patent application process must disclose!¶ What is material to patentability?¶ Information is material to the patentability of the invention in question if the patent would not issue “but-for” the information being withheld from the Patent Office. In other words, if the information relates to the novelty, usefulness, or obviousness of the invention, it should be disclosed because it might be a bar to patentability of the invention.¶ Carrot and Stick approach¶ The Stick: Lying to the Patent Office about even a portion of a patent can result in harsh punishment. Currently, if even one claim in a patent is secured by violating Rule 56, the entire patent may be invalidated. Where an “applicant knew of [prior art], knew that it was material, and made a deliberate decision to withhold it” a court may invalidate the patent.¶ The Carrot: As mentioned earlier, there is a huge up side to disclosing potentially relevant sources of prior art to the Patent Office: anything you disclose will be considered by the patent office when determining whether your application should be granted! Issued patents are presumed valid with respect to any information or prior art considered by the Patent Office during examination of the patent application.

#### That means No Korean war

**Kang & Cha, 03** – \*associate professor of Business at Dartmouth, AND \*\*associate professor of government Georgetown’s school of Foreign Service (May/June 2003, David C. Kang, Victor D. Cha, Foreign Policy, “Think Again: The Korea Crisis,” <http://www.ituassu.com.br/asia_fp1.pdf>, JMP)

“The DMZ Is the Scariest Place in the World” Yes, if looks could kill. When former U.S. President Bill Clinton called the border between the two Koreas the world’s scariest place, he was referring to the massive forward deployment of North Korean forces around the DMZ and the shaky foundations of the 50-year-old armistice—not peace treaty—that still keeps the peace between the two former combatants. Since the end of the Korean War in 1953, there have been more than 1,400 incidents across the DMZ, resulting in the deaths of 899 North Koreans, 394 South Koreans, and 90 U.S. soldiers. Tensions have been so high tha tin 1976 the United States mobilized bombers and an aircraft carrier battle group to trim one tree in the DMZ. The deployments and operational battle plans on both sides suggest that if a major outbreak of violence were to start, a rapid escalation of hostilities would likely ensue. In practice, however, no such outbreak has occurred. North Korea has faced both a determined South Korean military, and more important, U.S. military deployments that at their height comprised 100,000 troops and nuclear-tipped Lance missiles and even today include 37,000 troops, nuclear-capable airbases, and naval facilities that guarantee U.S. involvement in any Korean conflict. The balance of power has held because any war would have disastrous consequences for both sides. Seoul and Pyongyang are less than 150 miles apart—closer than New York is to Washington, D.C. Seoul is 30 miles from the DMZ and easily within reach of North Korea’s artillery tubes. Former Commander of U.S. Forces Korea Gen. Gary Luck estimated that a war on the Korean peninsula would cost $1 trillion in economic damage and result in 1 million casualties, including 52,000 U.S. military casualties. As one war gamer described, the death toll on the North Korean side would be akin to a “holocaust,” and Kim Jong Il and his 1,000 closest generals would surely face death or imprisonment. As a result, **both sides have moved cautiously and avoided major military mobilizations that could spiral out of control.** Ironically enough, as for the DMZ itself, although bristling with barbed wire and sown with land mines, it has also become a remarkable nature preserve stretching across the peninsula that is home to wild birds and a trove of other rare species.

## K

#### 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.

#### 5) Fictitious Commodities – intellectual property rights are not an inevitable phenomenon, but rather the result of a concerted effort to engrain a narrative of “knowledge scarcity” in all of us. This myth is at the heart of the 1AC, and serves to elevate idea ownership to an absolute right status

**May, 04** – Professor of Political Economy at Lancaster University (Christopher, “Cosmopolitan Legalism Meets Thin Community, July, Government and Opposition, Volume 39 Issue 3)//VP

The most important aspect of IPRs is their formal construction of scarcity where none necessarily exists. Knowledge and information, unlike material things, are not necessarily rivalous, coincident usage does not detract from utility. In this sense, most of the time, knowledge (before it is made property) does not exhibit the characteristics of material things. Take the example of a hammer (as material property); if I own a hammer and we would both like to use it, our utility is compromised by sharing use. I cannot use the hammer while you are, you cannot while I am, our intended use is rival. Thus, for you to also use my hammer, either you have to accept a compromised utility (relying on my goodwill to allow you to use it when I am not) or you must also buy a hammer. The hammer is scarce. However, the idea of building something with hammer and nails is not scarce. If I instruct you in the art of simple construction, once that knowledge has been imparted, your use of that information has no effect on my own ability to use the knowledge at the same time, there is no compromise to my utility. We may be fighting over whose turn it is to use the hammer, but we do not have to argue over whose turn it is to use the idea of hammering a nail into a joint, our use of the idea of cabinet construction is non-rival. Ideas, knowledge and information are generally non-rivalous. Certainly, if you and I were both cabinet-makers, then instructing you in cabinet construction might lead you to compete for my customers, possibly reducing my income. We might say that any secrecy regarding my skills was anti-competitive. There are also other cases where knowledge may produce advantages for the holder (often called information asymmetries), by enabling a better price to be extracted, or by allowing a market advantage to be gained. In both cases information and knowledge is rivalous, and wider availability of this knowledge would cause market advantage to be compromised. However, rivalousness is not necessarily of any wider social benefit: competition is often beneficial to customers, while information asymmetries produce market choices that are not fully informed and which therefore can be inefficient, or even harmful. Thus, when information is 'naturally' rivalous, the social good may be best served by ensuring that it is shared, not hoarded. For instance, many problems for buyers in the second-hand car market could be ameliorated if all car dealers were required to reveal all they knew about the cars they were selling. This would likely reduce the price they could obtain for much of their stock, but would enhance the general satisfaction (and even safety) of second-hand car buyers. Leaving aside special cases like this, generally speaking it is difficult to extract a price for the use of non-rival (knowledge) goods, so a legal form of scarcity (IPRs) is introduced to ensure a price can be obtained for use. Material property is 'naturally' scarce and therefore is rival in potential use, whereas knowledge in most cases is non-rival prior to becoming intellectual property. However, Karl Polanyi suggested the idea that labour, land and money themselves might be commodities required that a 'commodity fiction' be developed during the transformation from feudalism to capitalism.23 The rendering of things not originally produced for sale as commodities required a story to be told about these resources which was not necessarily linked to their real existence or production but rather narrated a propensity to be organized through markets. This reliance on the narrative of the advantages of market organization is central to the norms on which IPRs are founded. As Arnold Plant stressed 70 years ago, unlike 'real' property rights, patents (and other IPRs) are not a consequence of scarcity. They are the deliberate creation of statute law; and, whereas in general the institution of private property makes for the preservation of scarce goods, tending (as we might somewhat loosely say) to lead us 'to make the most of them', property rights in patents and copyright make possible the creation of scarcity of the products appropriated which could not otherwise be maintained. Whereas we might expect the public action concerning private property would normally be directed at the prevention of the raising of prices, in these cases the object of the legislation is to confer the power of raising prices by enabling the creation of scarcity.24 This protection of rights for the express purpose of raising prices is, of course, the central issue that we will return to below. The 'knowledge commons', from which intellectual property has temporarily rendered certain 'items' as scarce property, have been recognized in law since early forms of intellectual property were codified in the Renaissance. Limits on the period of protection (making IPRs temporary) are used to put socially useful knowledge back into these commons. This also recognizes that many aspects of 'new' knowledge are actually drawn from the extant pool of information and knowledge represented by these commons, and thus the continued vitality of the commons is also crucial for continuing innovation and creativity. Such extraction from these commons was originally (in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) regarded as a privilege accorded only in certain circumstances; duties such as training in the practices covered, or the use of the technologies towards specific ends were part of the grant of temporary monopoly. However, the subsequent history of intellectual property has seen these monopoly grants gain the status of rights.25 These rights construct a scarcity of legitimate use which is far from natural nor of self-evident benefit to all, and therefore significant time and effort is spent telling stories about intellectual property that are meant to justify its existence as a set of legal rights. While not entirely absent, the public good is only recognized under TRIPs as a residual after all other possible rights have been exercised. Any public-regarding aspect of IPRs is subsumed beneath the normative narratives of individual rights that are central to the justification of intellectual property.26 Not only commentators, but also legal documents, judgments and, most importantly, the TRIPs agreement itself and its subsequent arbitration at the WTO, sometimes explicitly, but always implicitly, draw on material property-related narratives to justify the recognition of property in knowledge.

#### 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.

#### Perm gets coopted and is a performative attempt to close off dialogue and preserve an oppressive economic foundation.

Neubauer, 12 – PhD Student at the School of Communications at Simon Fraser University (Robert J, “Dialogue, Monologue, or Something in Between? Neoliberal Think Tanks in the Americas,” http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/viewfile/1481/789)//VP

As Mato (1997, 2003, 2005, 2008) notes, transnational networks are rarely entirely unified, as elites emerge from different nations with their own institutions, histories, cultures, and political priorities. It is thereby telling that one Dialogue publication from 2009 states that “our membership is politically diverse,” including both “Republicans and Democrats from the United States,” as well as supporters of various “parties and political perspectives from elsewhere in the Americas” (IAD, 2009). This diverse ideological and regional representation may account for the fact that many of the IAD’s Latin directors do not consider themselves neoliberals, with some serving in nominally social democratic governments. As President of Chile, Lagos oversaw the establishment of national unemployment insurance and expansions in public education (ICG, n.d.), while Foxley has argued that states “must develop some kind of social protection for those who are left out of the process of globalization” (Public Broadcasting Service [PBS], 2001). Given this divergence from neoliberal orthodoxy, it is plausible that the Dialogue aims to smooth out tensions and establish a rolling consensus around a reform agenda. This may be made easier in that virtually all Dialogue directors emerge from the economic and political institutions of the transnational neoliberal bloc and state apparatus. Tellingly, there neither seems to be labor representatives nor any members of the New Left among the IAD’s Latin directorate. Therefore, it should be unsurprising that even the Dialogue’s “social democrats” seem to have embraced the overall project of regional neoliberalization. For instance, Foxley has come to “appreciate the strength and the power of the market,” even grudgingly commending Pinochet’s economic program for “deregulating the markets” and “opening up the economy” (PBS, 2001). Regardless of occasional social democratic rhetoric, directors have been intimately involved with processes of neoliberal restructuring and transnational state consolidation. Many have worked in top-level posts with neoliberal IFIs: Director David de Ferranti served as a World Bank Vice-President (Results for Development Institute, n.d.); Foxley was a Governor of the World Bank and the IADB (CGD, n.d.); and Iglesias served as President of the IADB (n.d.) for 17 years. Other directors have been involved with neoliberal privatizations. As President of Brazil, Cardoso oversaw the most sweeping privatization program in the country’s history (Epstein, 1998; View from RBC, 2012). He was instrumental in the 1997 privatization of CVRD, now the world’s second largest mining corporation (and a key holding of Dialogue funder AIG). Cardoso also oversaw the 1998 break-up of Telebras, Latin America's biggest telecommunications firm. Board members have also facilitated transnational state formation through the negotiation and implementation of regional free trade agreements. As president of Chile, Lagos signed “expansive trade agreements with the United States, the European Union and South Korea” (Armington, Lettieri, & Slim, 2005); Iglesias chaired the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations that gave birth to the WTO (IADB, 2010); and Hills served as chief U.S. trade negotiator during the negotiations for NAFTA and the Uruguay Round, at one time declaring that the United States would open up foreign markets “with a crowbar, if necessary” (Uchitelle, 1990).

#### 4) 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.
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## Politics

**No impact- econ decline doesn’t cause war**

Barnett ‘9(Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

## T

**B) literature consensus**

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” [http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http%3A//polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf)

An examination of the scholarly literature on economic engagement as an instrument of statecraft reveals a striking pattern. Albert Hirschman’s 1945 study, National Power and the Structure of Foreign Trade, is widely acknowledged today as a starting point for analysis (Hirschman, 1945/1980). Hirschman argued that the conscious cultivation of asymmetrical interdependence, if conducted strategically by the government of a powerful state, would lead weaker states to reorient not only their economies but also their foreign policies to the preferences of the stronger state. He developed a systematic framework for analysis and applied it to the trading and political relationships between Nazi Germany and its central and southeast European neighbors during the interwar period.

**Counter-Interpretation: Economic engagement is a strategy – not a specific tactic – “structural linkage” means a topical affirmative must develop a policy of continual economic benefits to foster greater interdependence between two countries back and forth**

**Mastanduno, 12** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, Foreign Policy: Theories, Actors, Cases edited by Steve Smith, p. 217)

Positive economic statecraft can be defined as the provision or promise of economic benefits to induce changes in the behaviour of a target state. It is important to distinguish between two types. The first involves the promise of a well-specified economic concession in an effort to alter specific foreign or domestic policies of the target government. I call this version tactical linkage; others refer to 'carrots' or 'specific positive linkage'. A second version, which I term structural linkage and others refer to as 'general positive linkage' or 'long-term engagement’, involves an effort to use a steady stream of economic benefits to reconfigure the balance of political interests within a target country. Structural linkage tends to be unconditional; the benefits are not turned on and off according to changes in target behaviour. The sanctioning state expects instead that sustained economic engagement will eventually produce a political transformation and desirable changes in target behaviour.

Tactical linkage and long-term engagement are each informed by a different logic. Tactical linkage operates at a more immediate level; the sanctioning state calculates that the provision of a particular type of economic reward will be sufficient to convince policy makers in the target to reconsider their existing policies. For example, immediately after the Second World War, the USA offered sizeable reconstruction loans to Britain, France, and the Soviet Union- in exchange for political concessions. The British and French were generally willing to accommodate US demands that they liberalize their domestic and foreign economic policies; the Soviets were not. In 1973, European states and japan offered economic inducements in the form of aid and trade concessions to Arab states during the OPEC crisis in a largely successful attempt to ensure that they would receive access to oil supplies at predictable prices. In 1982, the USA offered to increase sales of coal to its West European allies to discourage them from a gas pipeline deal with the Soviet Union. This influence attempt failed.

Long-term engagement, however, works at a deeper level, and its logic was most clearly articulated in the classic work of Albert Hirschman (Hirschman 1980 [1 9451). The sanctioning government provides an ongoing stream of economic benefits which gradually transform domestic political interests in the target state. Over time, ‘internationaIist' coalitions that favour interdependence with the sanctioning state will form and strengthen, and will exert influence over the policy of the weaker state in a direction preferred by the sanctioning state. Hirschman demonstrated how Nazi Germany used an array of economic inducements to inculcate economic dependence, and eventually political acquiescence, on the part of its weaker central European neighbours during the inter-war period.