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**Immigration reform will pass --- pc is key and Obama is pushing – focus is key**

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.”

**Economic engagement is unpopular – costs PC**

NYT 13

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

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

**Key to the economy**

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

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

**Nuclear war**

**Harris and Burrows 9**

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

Increased Potential for Global Conflict

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

**Hall, 11** - Senior Fellow in International Relations, Australian National University (Ian “The engagement of India”, Paper submitted at workshop for the Australia India Institute,

<http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30197993/1_Hall.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIR6FSIMDFXPEERSA&Expires=1371520591&Signature=%2FQOoAjmvG%2BCjEcrw3Ys8FyKydp8%3D&response-content-disposition=inline>

This book explores the various modes of engagement employed in the Indian case, their uses, and their limits. It follows the growing consensus in the literature that defines “engagement” as any strategy that employs “positive inducements” to influence the behavior of states.8 It acknowledges that various different engagement strategies can be utilized. In particular, as Miroslav Nincic argues, we can distinguish between “exchange” strategies and “catalytic” ones. In the first, positive inducements are offered to try to “leverage” particular quid pro quos from the target state.9 In the second, inducements are offered merely to catalyze something bigger, perhaps even involving the wholesale transformation of a target society.10 In this kind of engagement, many different incentives might be laid out for many different constituencies, from educational opportunities for emerging leaders, to trade concessions for the economic elite.

The objects of engagement can include changing specific policies of the target state or transforming the wider political, economic, or social order of a target society. Both of these objectives could be pursued with coercive strategies employing either compellence or deterrence—or indeed with a mixture of both engagement and coercion.11 But much recent research has argued that the evidence for the efficacy of both compellence and deterrence in changing target state policies is inconclusive.12 Both military and economic sanctions have been shown to have mixed results and many scholars argue that coercion rarely works.13 By contrast, there is some considerable evidence that engagement strategies can elicit both discrete quid pro quos from states and wider political and social change within them.14 Moreover, it is clear that engagement is both more commonly utilized than often recognized by scholars of international relations, and more politically acceptable to politicians and publics in engaging and target states than coercion, except perhaps in cases where the target state of engagement is especially controversial.15 Engagement strategies take different forms depending on their objectives. They can emphasize diplomacy, aiming at the improvement of formal, state-to-state contacts, and be led by professional diplomats, special envoys, or politicians. Alternatively, they can emphasize military ties, utilizing military-to-military dialogues, exchanges, and training to build trust, convey strategic intentions, or simply to foster greater openness in the target state’s defense establishment.16 They can be primarily economic in approach, using trade, investment, and technology transfer to engender change in the target society, and perhaps to generate greater economic interdependence, constraining a target state’s foreign policy choices.17 Finally, they can seek to create channels for people-to-people contact through state-driven public diplomacy, business forums and research networks, aid and development assistance, and so on.

**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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**CP Text: The People’s Republic of China should provide technical assistance to the government of Mexico for implementation of commercial domestic intellectual property protections.**

Mexico wants trade with China – US intellectual property rights come with too many conditions – China is seen as more effective

Mallén, 6/28 (Patricia covers Latin America for the International Business Times. Patricia holds two BAs from Universidad Complutense de Madrid and an MA in International Reporting from CUNY Graduate School of Journalism. “Latin America Increases Relations With China: What Does That Mean For The US?” June 28 2013, [http://www.ibtimes.com/latin-america-increases-relations-china-what-does-mean-us-1317981#](http://www.ibtimes.com/latin-america-increases-relations-china-what-does-mean-us-1317981))//VP

Though a recent trip to the region by Vice President Joe Biden seems to run counter to the Pacific Alliance snub, China’s President Xi Jinping has also visited recently, and likewise met with Latin American leaders, illustrating how the two global powers are going after the same prize. Biden traveled to Colombia, Trinidad and Tobago and Brazil in May, with the last leg of his trip coinciding with the beginning of Xi’s in Trinidad, before jumping to Costa Rica and Mexico. Both leaders met with several Latin American presidents and discussed trade and cooperation. The outcomes of their trips were very different, however. Xi’s trip was the first visit from a Chinese official to the region in almost a decade. Trinidad and Tobago’s main newspaper, Newsday, called the visit a “historic occasion” and a “visit from China to a good friend.” Prime Minister Kamla Persad-Bissessar said she was committed to boosting relations with China and accepted an invitation to Beijing for November of this year. In Costa Rica, Xi signed a $400 million loan to build a cross-country road and reaffirmed relations with its main ally in the region. Costa Rica is the only country in Latin America that sides with China in the mainland-Taiwanese dispute and does not recognize the island as a nation. Even more significant was Xi’s visit to Mexico. President Enrique Peña Nieto welcomed his Chinese counterpart, whom he had visited in Beijing in April, and made his intentions clear: Mexico wants closer trade relations with China, with whom it has a gap of $45 billion in export and import -- an important development considering that Mexico is, for now, America's biggest trade partner in the world. Biden’s visit was not as successful. His meeting in Trinidad and Tobago was called “brutal and tense” by Persad-Bissessar, and Colombian journalist Andrés Oppenheimer deemed the trip a sympathy visit after Secretary John Kerry called Latin America “Washington’s backyard” in a much-berated slip last April. While Biden had pleasant meetings in Rio and Bogotá, no agreements were signed during his trip. Perhaps the biggest development in China’s investment in the area is the recent decision by the Nicaraguan congress to allow a Chinese company to build a canal through the country. Although still in the proposal stages, the project would bring profound change to the geopolitics of the region -- and even the world. If built, the canal could significantly affect commerce through the Panama Canal, which, though it is now part of Panama's domain, was built by the U.S. and remains a symbol of the nation's historical dominance in the region. That dominance is in decline. After decades of uncontested U.S. influence in the region, some Latin American leaders have started making decidedly anti-American policies. The most notable was the late Venezuelan Comandante Hugo Chávez, who was very vocal about his disdain for the U.S., but he is far from the only one. Bolivia's President Evo Morales, for instance, kicked out USAID after Kerry's verbal slip, and has gone so far as to ban Coca-Cola from the country. But now it's Ecuador bumping heads with its northern neighbor, mostly in regard to Ecuador granting entry to NSA-secrets leaker Edward Snowden. President Rafael Correa openly said that they would welcome the whistle-blower because he was a "free man," no matter what the U.S. said. Disagreements between the governments have led to the cancellation of a special trade agreement, which Ecuador has called "an instrument of blackmail." Beyond the lack of understanding with its former main trade partner, why is Latin America so smitten with China? Kevin Gallagher, a professor of international relations at Boston University, says China speaks to the region’s newfound confidence. “China is offering attractive deals to Latin American economies while the United States continues to lecture and dictate,” Gallagher wrote for The Globalist. “For too long, the United States has relied on a rather imperial mechanism, just telling Latin America what it needs,” he added. “Compare that to China’s approach: It offers Latin America what it wants.” Gallagher argued that the U.S.’ biggest offer to Latin America is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which offers access to the U.S. market on three conditions: deregulate financial markets, adopt intellectual property provisions that give preferences to U.S. firms, and allow U.S. firms to sue governments for violating any of its conditions. China, on the other hand, has been providing more financing to Latin America than the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the U.S. Export-Import Bank combined since 2003, with no previous conditions and very few strings attached. “Latin America is very sensitive to any notions of conditionality due to painful past experiences with the IMF and the World Bank,” Gallagher said. “China makes sure that its policy is not based on conditionalities.” Gallagher said the U.S. should awake from its past slumber and stop taking Latin America for granted. Shlomo Ben-Ami, vice president of the Toledo International Center for Peace and former Israeli foreign minister, takes a different stance. He argues that China's advancement in the region does not automatically equate with American loss of preeminence. U.S. exports to Latin America continue to rise (by 94 percent over the past six years), as do imports (87 percent in the same period), and America continues to be the biggest foreign investor in the area.

## 1NC

**US economic engagement with Mexico is a vehicle for neoliberal exploitation for the entire region – the plan becomes a tool for military intervention and US security interests while strengthening its economic grip over Latin America**

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

The advance of neoliberalism suffers no shortage of critics, both from its supporters who seek a greater balance in the interests of North and South, and from its opponents who see it as lacking any real choice for developing states. The spread of neoliberalism is viewed by its strongest critics as part of the continuing expression of Western power through the mechanisms of globalization, often directly linked to the hegemonic power of the United States. Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos have assembled a collection of articles that pushes this debate in a somewhat new direction. This compilation addresses the question from a different perspective, focusing not on the neoliberal process as globalization but on neoliberalism as the new guise of panamericanism, which emphasizes a distinctly political overtone in the discussion. The edited volume argues that neoliberalism reanimates a system of relations in the hemisphere that reinforces the most negative aspects of the last century's U.S.-dominated panamericanism. The assembled authors offer a critical view that places neoliberalism squarely in the realm of U.S. hegemonic exploitation of interamerican relations. This volume, furthermore, articulates a detailed vision of the potential failures of this approach in terms of culture, politics, security, and economics for both North and South. Oliva and Prevost present a view from Latin America that differs from that of other works that emphasize globalization as a general or global process. This volume focuses on the implementation of free market capitalism in the Americas as a continuation of the U.S. history of hegemonic control of the hemisphere. While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as old wine in new bottles. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and intervention in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny in the past, the prospect of hemispheric economic integration will be marked by a dominant view privileging U.S. security, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to undermine the stable governance that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for instability could also generate a new period of U.S. interventionism in Latin America. Treto also analyzes how the "liberal peace" could be undermined by the "right of humanitarian intervention" in the Americas if the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia served as a model for U.S. involvement in the hemisphere. Hector Luis Saint-Pierre raises the issue of "democratic neoauthoritarianism," responsible for "restricting citizenship to the exercise of voting, limiting its voice to electoral polls of public opinion, restraining human rights to consumer's rights, [and] shutting down spaces to the citizens' participation" (116). While these critiques are leveled from a structuralist viewpoint, they often highlight concerns expressed from other theoretical perspectives and subfields (such as the literature on citizenship and participation in the context of economic integration). These chapters also emphasize the way inattention to economic, social, and political crisis could damage attempts at integration and the overall success of the neoliberal paradigm in the Americas. In general, the section on hemispheric issues offers a suspicious view of the U.S. role in promoting integration, arguing that in reality, integration offers a deepening of historical asymmetries of power, the potential to create new justifications for hegemonic intervention, and the further weakening of state sovereignty in the South. [End Page 150] If the first section of the book is joined with skepticism of integration as panamericanism and chooses to focus broadly on the negative effects of the implementation of these policies, part 2 links these regional issues with the politics of specific countries. This section offers articles that speak to country-specific issues in a regional context and to ways that bilateral relations with the United States shape the overall context of regional and hemispheric integration. The regional issues range from CARICOM's evolution to the different approaches to balancing human security and globalization in Central America, the special relationship of Mexico and the United States, and the disincentives for political parties to embrace the Mercosur process. Again, the authors offer continued pessimism about the process of integration unless Latin American states can exercise more control over its evolution. Key to this idea of alternative integration are Brazil and Mexico, the former more successful in asserting its independence than the latter, in the authors' view. Jaime Preciado Coronado singles out the geopolitics of U.S.-Mexican relations and their magnified effect in the region, where the United States has collaborated in Mexico's insertion into the world networks of interdependence and, in return, Mexico promotes the idea of the Washington Consensus intensely and its model of the promotion of free trade with the United States for the rest of Latin America, in order to achieve the consolidation of the continental bloc that maintains American hegemony through the use of the advantages of the international division of labor.

**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.

## Cooperation

**Multiple alt causes to brain drain that the aff cant solve**

**Nebraska Mosaic 12** (Gabriel Medina Arenas, Nebraska Mosaic, “Flip side of Mexican immigration: brain drain”, 4-20-12, <http://cojmc.unl.edu/mosaic/2012/04/20/1642/>) MaxL

Two reasons exist for this brain drain, according to Juan Ramón de la Fuente, former chancellor of the Mexican National Autonomous University: the lack of job opportunities in Mexico and Mexico’s high level of insecurity. Marcelo Suarez-Orozco, an Argentinean professor and Hispanic immigration expert at New York University, spoke recently at UNL and offered additional reasons for this brain drain. Suarez-Orozco, who holds a doctorate in anthropology, said highly educated Mexicans want better working conditions. They want jobs in which they have better research opportunities and labs, as well as better salaries and opportunities to get specialized scholarships and fellowships. The number of Mexican-born professionals who live in the U.S. doubled between 1997 and 2007, from 259,000 to 552,000, an annual average growth rate of 11 percent. During that same period, the number of people in Mexico who earned a bachelor’s degree grew only 6 percent. “Never before in the history of the United States have so many highly educated immigrants arrived into our country in such high numbers,” Suarez Orozco said. “Today a quarter of all physicians in our country are immigrant-born, 40 percent of all the engineers in the United States are foreign, a third of all the folk with doctorates in the United States are foreign-born.” Mexico’s supply of educated people is growing five times faster than the population, but job opportunities for professionals are not expanding as fast, according to the Migration Policy Institute. One reason this is happening is because Mexico’s government and the private sector are not creating enough high skilled jobs. To stop this brain drain the Mexican government and the private sector need to create more high-skilled jobs; they have to hire people based on their credentials and not on friendship or nepotism; they have to raise the salaries of highly educated people and they have to keep on fighting against organized crime. Roughly 73,000 Mexicans hold a doctorate. Of those, about 20,000—or 27 percent—live in the United States, according to the U.S. Current Population Survey, published by the Census Bureau. Nearly half of these people—46 percent—came between 1990 and 2009. Thirty-four percent came between 1970 and 1980, and 19. 8 percent came before 1970. About 60 percent of the Mexicans who earn master’s degrees or doctorates are living in the U.S., according to the Institute of the Mexicans Living Abroad, an agency operated by the Mexican government. Arrieta, Calzada and Moguel are among them. Their immigration stories, which might surprise some Americans, have put them at odds with some of their fellow Mexicans. “I don’t feel I’m better than them,” Moguel said of the lower-skilled, undocumented immigrants, some of whom he and his wife count among their friends. “I feel very fortunate because I had the opportunity to study for a Ph.D.,” he said. Moguel said he encourages his undocumented friends to try to send their children to an American college. “I want more Mexicans to become whatever they want, regardless of the legal status of their parents.” Before Arrieta taught at UNL, she did her doctoral work and was a research assistant at Indiana’s Purdue University. She took biochemistry and genetics classes in the mornings and cleaned houses in the afternoons. Her husband’s $900-a-month stipend as a Fulbright scholar at Purdue wasn’t enough to pay the bills for them and their three children. “It was a very difficult time,” Arrieta said. But it was also exciting. “I was learning many interesting things at school, so I didn’t mind doing that job for about a year,” she said. “Besides we really needed the money, and we had children to take care of.” In Mexico, she said, such jobs would be seen as degrading. “But that’s not the case in the U.S.” Calzada worked for almost 15 years as a professor at the Autonomous National University of Mexico, the largest and most prestigious in the country. But regardless of her experience, she didn’t get tenure because, she said, she lacked good connections. “I felt very disappointed,” Calzada said. “The way things work in Mexico is not fair. I knew people with less experience than me who got tenure in the same university. The difference is they had more influential friends than me.” An MPI study projects that Mexico’s domestic supply of professionals will exceed demand until about 2025. After that demand will exceed supply. That means that Mexico will educate more professionals than the job market needs until 2025, but after that year the country will lack enough high-skilled people to fill in the required job positions. “The problem is very serious,” said Alejandro Diaz-Bautista, an economics professor at Colegio de la Frontera Norte in Tijuana, Mexico, and an expert in immigration and economics integration between Mexico and the United States. “This brain drain in developing countries like Mexico is an obstacle for economic growth, modernization and the improvement of quality of life.” Diaz-Bautista said the brain drain is one reason the Mexican economy can’t compete with those of the U.S., Europe or Japan. Salvador Moguel says: “There are no equal opportunities in Mexico, like there is in the U.S. Your credentials are not enough for you to get a good job.” / Photo by Gabriel Medina In Mexico, between 1990 and 2000, the number of people who graduated from college increased 6.7 percent, but the economy grew only 3.5 percent, suggesting too few jobs were created. Forty-five percent of Mexicans who graduated from college that decade did not find a job appropriate to their education level. Even though Salvador Moguel earned his master’s degree at the State University of New York and his doctorate at New Mexico State University, he wanted to go back to Mexico to work and live. The problem: He didn’t get a good offer. Moguel started living in the U.S. in the 1990s when he was working on his master’s degree. He returned to Mexico and worked for a few years. When he decided to enroll in a doctoral program, he planned to do it at Mexico’s UNAM. But they didn’t accept him. And he was surprised at the reason. “They told me they didn’t think I could be a good researcher because I was almost 30,” he said. So he earned his doctorate in the U.S., then returned to Mexico to look for a job. When he didn’t get one, he once again returned to the U.S. to teach and conduct research. “There are no equal opportunities in Mexico, like there is in the U.S.,” he said. “Your credentials are not enough for you to get a good job.” Between 1997 and 2007, the presence of Mexican professionals working in foreign countries grew 153 percent, from 411,000 to 1.4 million people, according to the Mexican Public Education Ministry. About 5 million Mexicans with more education than the average Mexican—8.6 years in school—decided to come to live in the U.S. in those years. UNL economics Professor Hendrik Van den Berg said this trend, which is worldwide, is likely to continue or even increase: Educated people from undeveloped countries will keep on migrating to developed countries to get a better life. “The only way to stop this brain drain is to have a booming Mexican economy,” he said. “That’s what Brazil has been able to do. Their economy is going well, and I know quite a number of Brazilians that were highly educated and were here illegally. But now they are back in Brazil.” According to the MPI, the Department of Homeland Security issued 300,000 temporary working visas to highly skilled Mexicans in 2009 alone. This brain drain may worry the Mexican government, but it invests only about $3,400 toward the education of each Mexican student enrolled in public institutions of higher learning, an amount insufficient to fully educate and train the next generation. Government officials respond that Mexico is a developing country, that it lacks the necessary funds. This migration of qualified people has cost Mexico approximately $7 billion according to the country’s Public Education Ministry. “The Mexican government and the universities don’t pay good salaries to professors with doctorates,” Calzada said. “The problem is that their budget is not big enough to do good scientific research.”

**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.

**No risk of TB Spread**

**Collins and Fidel, 07** (Lois M. Collins and Steve Fidel Deseret Morning News 6/3/07, Lexis)

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.

## IP Leadership

**No risk of Chinese aggression – Taiwan has substantial geographic and military advantages**

**Gholz, Press, and Sapolsky, 97** (Eugene Gholz and Daryl Press, doctoral candidates in political science at MIT. Harvey Sapolsky, professor of public policy at MIT. International Security, Vol. 21, No. 4. Spring 1997, KONTOPOULOS)

Current US strategy implicitly assumes that America must remain engaged because of the Asian countries' failure to balance against Chinese strength. But Japan and Taiwan, the two plausible targets for Chinese aggression, are more than capable of defending themselves from conventional attack. Both enjoy the geographic advantage of being islands. The surrounding oceans ensure a defense dominance that could only be overcome with enormous material or technological advantages. The amphibious operations required for a Chinese invasion of Taiwan or Japan would be extremely difficult and at a minimum would require substantial investment in amphibious warfare capability. Taiwan could extract a withering toll on invading forces. Its air force is large, sophisticated, and growing; its navy has deadly missile boats; and it produces anti-ship cruise missiles. The same Taiwanese forces would make a Chinese blockade of Taiwan even harder. China would find it difficult to harass Taiwanese ports on the eastern side of the island with ground-launched anti-ship cruise missiles.41 Chinese attacks on shipping would be blocked by Taiwan's air superiority and sea control, and Chinese blockading forces would find it difficult to cover the wide swath of ocean around Taiwan, China could use its ballistic missile force to conduct terror attacks against Taiwanese targets, but terror attacks have negligible military or long-run political effects-witness the failures of the German Blitz and of the sustained IRA bombing campaign against the United Kingdom. As long as Taiwan has access to advanced Western weapons, it will be able to defend itself.

**Status quo solves- US won’t allow it, Non-Proliferation Treaty and NATO taking action now**

**Birsel and Nebehay 4/23** (2013. Robert. Stephanie. Writers for Reuters. “US Rejects North Korean Demand for Nuclear Status” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/23/us-korea-north-idUSBRE93M03R20130423> Pismarov)

The United States swiftly rejected Pyongyang's claim of nuclear status, while NATO foreign ministers condemned its pursuit of ballistic missile and nuclear weapons programs and called for "credible" talks to be held on denuclearization. "North Korea's demand to be recognized as a nuclear weapons state is neither realistic nor acceptable," Thomas Countryman, U.S. Assistant Secretary for International Security and Non-Proliferation, told Reuters in Geneva. Countryman, who is heading the U.S. delegation to two-week talks on the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), told reporters on Monday: "It is important that the world respond calmly but deliberately without changing our emphasis that the goal of the world to which North Korea is committed is a denuclearized Korean peninsula. "And the more states that make that clear, the greater the chance we have of arriving at exactly that goal," he said. A White House spokesman said this month North Korea would need to show it was serious about abandoning its nuclear ambitions for talks to be meaningful. In Brussels, NATO foreign ministers issued a statement saying that North Korea's "provocative actions" violated U.N. Security Council resolutions, undermined regional stability and jeopardized prospects for lasting peace. "We urge the DPRK to refrain from further provocative acts," the NATO ministers said, calling for North Korea to comply with Security Council resolutions and return to the NPT from which the reclusive country announced its withdrawal in 2003.

**China improving IP now – economic prosperity**

**Harris and Zheng, ‘13** - writes and speaks extensively on Chinese law, with a focus on protecting foreign businesses in their China operations AND interviewer (Chinese Law Blog, 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.

**No Korean war**

**Taylor 4/6** (2013. Robert Taylor has been writing for PolicyMic since January 2011. He spends his time writing, ranting, studying, protesting stupid wars, and advocating the virtues of economic and political freedom. He has written for multiple websites and dedicates himself to undermining the state's ability to initiate aggression against peaceful people. “War with North Korea: Kim Jong-Un is Not a Threat Despite Hawkish US Rhetoric” <http://www.policymic.com/articles/32465/war-with-north-korea-kim-jong-un-is-not-a-threat-despite-hawkish-u-s-rhetoric> Pismarov)

Tensions in the Korean peninsula are dangerously high. North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un has made multiple threats, the U.S. is [responding](http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/04/02/296235/us-sends-another-warship-to-korean-coast/) by beefing up its military presence, and even China is [mobilizing](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/04/01/china-mobilizing-troops-jets-near-n-korean-border/) troops near the North Korea border. With war, and the possibility of an accident or mistake, a serious possibility, this reiterates the case that the U.S. should stop meddling and intervening in Korea and use diplomacy instead. The hawkish response by the Pentagon in Korea is only adding to the tension and decreasing the chances of peace. Over the past few weeks, the U.S. has ran multiple war games near the Korean peninsula with nuclear-capable B-52 strategic heavy bombers and B-2 stealth bombers and has [even sent](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/9296587/US-special-forces-parachuted-into-North-Korea.html) Special Forces into North Korea. Flexing this type of muscle in a region riddled with tripwires for war is a dangerous gamble. As Xu Ke [argues](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/indepth/2013-03/30/c_132273419.htm) in *Xinhua Weekly*, hostilities between North Korea and Washington are the result of what Ke calls "fragile relationship" between the two governments, based on "mistrust, misunderstanding and animosity." America's "punishment-heavy approach" in dealing with Pyongyang has helped fuel this crisis. Pyongyang issued its "state of war" against South Korea in direct response to the aforementioned U.S.-South Korea war games. Rounds after rounds of economic sanctions by the U.S. have further isolated North Korea. This has backed North Korea into a corner and forced it to resort to desperation in attempting to defend itself, including the pursuance of long-range missile capabilities. While Washington is surrounding North Korea, running military exercises, and imposing sanctions, North Korea really has absolutely no means of carrying out the hawkish rhetoric Jong-Un is currently employing. North Korea [lacks the technology](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/03/29/north-korea-almost-certainly-lacks-basic-technical-capability-to-carry-out-its-big-war-plan/?print=1) to strike Guam or Hawaii, let alone the mainland U.S. Even the neighboring South Korean capital residents of Seoul are [remaining calm](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/mar/31/north-korea-sabre-rattling-seoul), seeing North Korea's threats for what they are: empty threats aimed at getting food and aid packages and ultimately a peace treaty with the U.S. If bordering South Korea isn't worried, why is the U.S.? As [I argued](http://www.policymic.com/articles/31083/war-with-north-korea-u-s-and-south-korea-are-preparing-for-the-worst) last week for *PolicyMic*, part of it likely has to do with President Obama has been implementing his "Asia pivot" and militarizing the Pacific. Also, whenever the war drums are beating, one will never go broke betting on our military-industrial-complex. The past two U.S. administrations have been warning about the supposed threat North Korea poses, which has coincided with [increased spending](http://www.policymic.com/articles/31083/war-with-north-korea-u-s-and-south-korea-are-preparing-for-the-worst) for missile defense systems along the western U.S. Thankfully, these missile defense systems are government programs, so they are laughably inefficient and [simply don't work](http://reason.com/archives/2013/03/21/our-fruitless-quest-for-missile-defense). And since the North Korean threat isn't real, they pretty much cancel each other out. The only practical way to avoid a disastrous war and increase the chances of long-term peace is to build trust, for the U.S. to the stop the saber-rattling, sit down with China and other countries in the regions, and use some diplomacy for a change. Besides, what's the alternative? Nuclear war? America's political leaders may be well-dressed criminals, but they aren't foolish; just like the North Korean regime, they are nuclear-armed and interested in self-preservation. This may ironically be the reason that war and military confrontation will be avoided and cooler heads will prevail.
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## DA

**Immigration key to biotech**

**Dahms 3**, (executive director of the California State University System Biotechnology Program (CSUPERB); chair of the Workforce Committee, Biotechnology Industry Organization; and a member of the ASBMB Education and Professional Development Committee, (A. Stephen, “ Foreign Scientists Seen Essential to U.S. Biotechnology,” in Pan-Organizational Summit on the U.S. Science and Engineering Workforce: Meeting Summary, National Academy of Sciences, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bookshelf/picrender.fcgi?book=nap10727&blobtype=pdf>)

The **scarcity of skill**ed technicians **is** seen by **the biotech**nology **industry** in the U.S. and Canada as one of it**s** **most serious challenges**. The success of this industry is dependent on the quality of its workforce, and the skills and talents of highly trained people are recognized as one of the most vital and dynamic sources of competitive advantage. The U.S. biotechnology industry workforce has been growing 14 to 17 percent annually over the last six years and is now over 190,000 and conservatively estimated to reach 500,000 by **2012**. Despite efforts by the industry to encourage U.S. institutions to increase the production of needed specialists, a continual shortfall in the needed expertise requires access to foreign workers. Foreign workers with unique skills that are scarce in the U.S. can get permission to stay in the U.S. for up to six years under the H1B classification, after which they can apply for permanent resident status. There are currently over 600,000 foreign workers in this category across all industries, and they are critical to the success and global competitiveness of this nation. Of these H-1B visa holders, 46 percent are from India and 10 percent are from China, followed in descending order by Canada, Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, U.K., Pakistan, and the Russian Federation. Our annual national surveys have demonstrated that between 6 and 10 percent of the biotechnology workforce have H-1B visas. The constant shortfall in specialized technical workers that has been experienced by the biotechnology industry over the past six years has been partially alleviated by access to talented individuals from other nations. However, the industry’s need is sufficient to justify a 25 percent increase in H-1Bs in 2004. Biotechnology industry H-1B visa holders are mainly in highly sought after areas such as analytical chemistry, instrumentation specialization, organic synthesis, product safety and surveillance, clinical research/biostatistics, bio/pharm quality, medicinal chemistry, product scale-up, bioinformatics and applied genomics, computer science, cheminformatics, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics. Forty percent of H-1B foreign workers are at the Ph.D. level, 35 percent M.S., 20 percent B.S., and 5 percent M.D. In comparison, the U.S. biotechnology industry technical workforce is estimated to be 19 percent Ph.D., 17 percent M.S., 50 percent B.S., and 14 percent combined voc-ed/ community college trained. These and other survey data by industry human resource groups clearly show that the **H-1B** worker skill**s match** the **most pressing** employment **needs** of the biotechnology industry. The data demonstrate that maintaining a reasonably-sized H-1B cap is critical to the industry. Although the national annual H-1B visa cap was raised from 115,000 to 195,000 in the 106th Congress via S. 2045, the cap has already been exceeded. The increased cap remains in effect until 2003 and efforts are under way to ensure that it remains high. The Third Annual National Survey of H-1Bs in the biotechnology industry found that 80 percent are from U.S. universities, and 85 percent of those eventually get green cards. Companies now spend, on average, $10,200 in processing fees and legal expenses to obtain each green card, an estimated cost to the industry of more than $150 million over the past 5 years. In the wake of the 9/11 World Trade Center attacks, debate has been focused on more restrictions on foreign students, a development that would have a **severe impact** upon the competitiveness of the U.S. biotechnology industry. Clearly, the H-1B route provides a temporary solution to shortages in the national and domestic biotechnology labor pools, shortages mirroring the inadequate production of appropriately trained U.S. nationals by U.S. institutions of higher learning. The reality is that universities have inadequate resources for expanding the training pipeline, particularly in the specialized areas of the research phase of company product development. Efforts should be directed toward influencing greater congressional and federal agency attention to these important topics.

Reform’s key to all aspects of US hegemony

**Nye 12**. [Joseph S., a former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, is University Professor at Harvard University. “Immigration and American Power,” December 10, Project Syndicate, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye]

CAMBRIDGE – The United States is a nation of immigrants. Except for a small number of Native Americans, everyone is originally from somewhere else, and even recent immigrants can rise to top economic and political roles. President Franklin Roosevelt once famously addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution – a group that prided itself on the early arrival of its ancestors – as “fellow immigrants.”¶ In recent years, however, US politics has had a strong anti-immigration slant, and the issue played an important role in the Republican Party’s presidential nomination battle in 2012. But Barack Obama’s re-election demonstrated the electoral power of Latino voters, who rejected Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney by a 3-1 majority, as did Asian-Americans.¶ As a result, several prominent Republican politicians are now urging their party to reconsider its anti-immigration policies, and plans for immigration reform will be on the agenda at the beginning of Obama’s second term. Successful reform will be an important step in preventing the decline of American power.¶ Fears about the impact of immigration on national values and on a coherent sense of American identity are not new. The nineteenth-century “Know Nothing” movement was built on opposition to immigrants, particularly the Irish. Chinese were singled out for exclusion from 1882 onward, and, with the more restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, immigration in general slowed for the next four decades.¶ During the twentieth century, the US recorded its highest percentage of foreign-born residents, 14.7%, in 1910. A century later, according to the 2010 census, 13% of the American population is foreign born. But, despite being a nation of immigrants, more Americans are skeptical about immigration than are sympathetic to it. Various opinion polls show either a plurality or a majority favoring less immigration. The recession exacerbated such views: in 2009, one-half of the US public favored allowing fewer immigrants, up from 39% in 2008.¶ Both the number of immigrants and their origin have caused concerns about immigration’s effects on American culture. Demographers portray a country in 2050 in which non-Hispanic whites will be only a slim majority. Hispanics will comprise 25% of the population, with African- and Asian-Americans making up 14% and 8%, respectively.¶ But mass communications and market forces produce powerful incentives to master the English language and accept a degree of assimilation. Modern media help new immigrants to learn more about their new country beforehand than immigrants did a century ago. Indeed, most of the evidence suggests that the latest immigrants are assimilating at least as quickly as their predecessors.¶ While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population.¶ For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades.¶ Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US.¶ In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition**,** skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies.¶ Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US.¶ Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both.¶ Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightestfrom the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.¶ That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to maintain the strength of the US.

**Growth is necessary for environmental transition—resource access.**

Ben-Ami 11 — Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist and author, regular contributor to *spiked*, has been published in the *American*, the *Australian*, Economist.com, *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent*, *Novo* (Germany), *Ode* (American and Dutch editions), *Prospect*, *Shanghai Daily*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Sunday Times*, and *Voltaire* (Sweden), 2011 (“Growth is good,” *Ode*, June, Available Online at http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/print/75/growth-is-good, Accessed 08-16-2011)//VP

But is this notion of environmental limits really true? It is certainly the case that, say, building a factory can lead to pollution. However, it is also true that economic growth can generate the resources to clean up the environment and mold it to benefit human beings. That is why, as a general rule, developed countries are less polluted and cleaner than developing ones. Typically, countries experience an environmental transition as they develop. In the early stages, cities may be grossly unsanitary and factories might billow filthy smoke. But as they become richer, these cities clean things up. In London, my hometown, cholera was widespread in the mid-19th century as raw human waste flowed into the Thames River. Then the authorities built an extensive sewage system, a pioneering civil engineering project at the time, and the problem was solved. If anything, today’s developing countries potentially have it easier. They do not need to reinvent sewage systems or modern medicine. Instead, they just need to generate the resources to be able to afford the type of infrastructure already available in the West.

**1) Time and will to pass it is there – it’s a question of PC**

Foley 10/17

Elise, Huffington Post, Obama To House On Immigration: If You Have Ideas, 'Let's Hear Them', 10/17/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/17/obama-house-immigration\_n\_4115818.html

President Barack Obama vowed Thursday to restart his push for comprehensive immigration reform this year after a bruising fight on government spending that only increased bad blood between the two parties.¶ "The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do, and it's sitting there waiting for the House to pass it," he said during remarks from the White House. "Now if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let's hear them. Let's start the negotiations. But let's not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years."¶ "This can and should get done by the end of this year," he added.¶ Obama and immigration reform advocates have insisted there's still time and the will to pass reform, even though House Republicans are showing little interest in doing so. After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, reform stalled in the house when House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) vowed not to pick it up, regardless of likely support from most Democrats and some Republicans. Instead, the House GOP vowed to pass piecemeal measures -- with no talk of a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- that have now faded from attention.

**2) House will cave**

Talev and Dorning 10/17

Margaret and Mike, Bloomberg, Obama’s Fiscal Fight Win Won’t Secure Success for Agenda, 10/17/13, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-10-17/obama-s-fiscal-fight-win-won-t-secure-success-for-agenda

David Plouffe, a former senior adviser to Obama, said the president is likely to emerge with a stronger hand in any case. The Tea Party faction in the House overplayed its hand, he said, and that probably enhances the position of the Senate, where Democrats have a majority, and of House Republicans who are willing to compromise with the administration.¶ The outcome of this standoff makes future confrontations over the debt limit less likely, Plouffe said.¶ “Hopefully, we have broken forever using the debt ceiling as a political weapon,” Plouffe said. “I’m not naïve but I think it’s unlikely the Republicans in Congress want to go through this anytime again soon.”¶ Next Round¶ The biggest victory for the president was in cutting off the Republican attempt to scuttle the health-care law, Plouffe said. By the time the next round of fiscal negotiations occurs in January, coverage will have begun for Americans who signed up through the health-insurance exchanges. That means Republicans who attack the law in the next budget fight would have to try to take away existing coverage from constituents.¶ Whether Obama gets from Congress a new immigration law or changes he’s seeking in taxes and entitlement programs depends on how Republicans read the outcome of this fight, Plouffe said.¶ He recalled that following their political loss in the 1996 shutdown, House Republicans under Gingrich reached deals with Clinton on welfare reform and the minimum wage.¶ “There was a strategic necessity for them post-shutdown to show they could govern,” Plouffe said. Immigration law “would be the natural place” for Republicans to act, he said.

**Obama spending PC**

Martosko 10/16

David, Daily Mail US Political Editor, ARMAGEDDON AVERTED: Republicans cave in as Democrats' debt ceiling bill passes Senate with only House to go before midnight default deadline can cause global chaos, 10/16/13, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2463149/Senate-passes-debt-fix-Cruz-goes-swinging-McConnell-carves-2-billion-pet-project.html

After losing such a high-stakes game of political poker, the GOP will now shoulder the burden of being blamed for the fiasco that led to serious fears of a fresh economic catastrophe and dragged America's global reputation through the mud.¶ Meanwhile, House and Senate managers are working to push a result across the finish line by midnight.¶ 'We are not putting odds on anything,' said White House press secretary Jay Carney in his afternoon briefing, but he urged both houses of Congress to 'act swiftly' and 'as soon as possible' to avoid economic disaster.¶ Carney then took questions about President Obama's plans to leverage his new-found political capital in a bid to reform America's immigration system, a move he told the Spanish-language Univision network on Tuesday that he would undertake 'the day after' Congress solved the debt crisis.

1) **trade and engagement are declining**

**Oppenheimer 5-8** (Andres Oppenheimer is a Miami Herald syndicated columnist and a member of The Miami Herald team that won the 1987 Pulitzer Prize. He is the author of Castro's Final Hour; Bordering on Chaos, Cronicas de heroes y bandidos, Ojos vendados, Cuentos Chinos and most recently, Saving the Americas. “Andres Oppenheimer: What Obama didn’t say about Latin America.” Miami Herald. http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/08/3387818/andres-oppenheimer-obama-should.html)

I’ve read with great attention President Barack Obama’s article in The Miami Herald earlier this week on how to improve U.S. relations with Latin America. It was pretty disappointing. The article, headlined “Improving our Partnership” and published after Obama’s return from a trip to Mexico and Costa Rica, says that “this is a moment of great promise for our hemisphere” and is full of feel-good talk about the future of the Americas. But, sadly, it showed the absence of any U.S. plans to drastically expand trade ties with Latin America — like the Obama administration has done with Asia and Europe — or any sign that, in his second term, Obama will pay greater attention to this hemisphere. Before we get into what Obama should do, let’s take a quick look at the facts. In his article, Obama stated that about 40 percent of U.S. exports are currently going to Latin America, and that these exports are growing at a faster pace than U.S. shipments to the rest of the world. Also, Obama celebrated that the U.S. Congress is finally close to approving comprehensive immigration reform. While that’s a U.S. domestic issue, it would have a positive economic impact on Mexico and Central America, since millions of newly legalized immigrants would be able to visit their native countries, and would most likely be sending more money to their families back home. But here are some of the facts that Obama failed to mention in his article: • U.S. total trade with Latin America has actually fallen as a percentage of total U.S. trade over the past decade. While 39 percent of overall U.S. trade was with the Western Hemisphere in 2000, that percentage fell to 38 percent in 2012, according to U.S. Department of Commerce data. • Despite Obama’s May 23, 2008, campaign promise to launch “a new alliance of the Americas,” he has not started any major hemispheric free trade initiative. By comparison, every recent U.S. president had started — or at least tried to start — a hemisphere-wide trade deal. • Obama has launched the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade talks with mostly Asian countries, and a similar Trans-Atlantic Partnership free trade negotiation with the 27-member European Union, but has not announced any plans for a Trans-American Partnership. Granted, he has helped ratify free trade deals with Colombia and Panama, which had been signed by his predecessor. And, sure, the Trans-Pacific Partnership plan includes a few Latin American countries, such as Mexico, Peru and Chile, but they are a minority within the proposed new bloc. • In his May 2 trip to Mexico, Obama failed to meet Mexico’s request to be included in the U.S.-proposed Trans-Atlantic partnership free trade talks with the European Union. The Mexican governments had asked that Mexico and Canada be included in the Trans-Atlantic Partnership plan, so that the proposed deal could become a North American-European Union deal. But the White House response was, not yet. • Despite Obama’s 2011 announcement of a plan to increase to 100,000 the number of Latin American students in U.S. colleges, and to 100,000 the number of U.S. students in Latin American universities — his most ambitious initiative for the region — progress on the project has been slow. The plan calls for significant private sector funding, but Obama has invested little time, or political capital, in it. Fund-raising has been left in charge of the State Department, whose boss — Secretary of State John Kerry — has shown scant interest in Latin America.

**Engaging Mexico is politically divisive**

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

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

**Obama’s set his agenda to get immigration through – new fights derail it**

**Munro, 8/5** --- White House Correspondent (8/5/2013, Neil, “Obama talks economy, but focuses on immigration,” <http://dailycaller.com/2013/08/05/obama-talks-economy-but-focuses-on-immigration/>, JMP)

President Barack Obama is flying out to Phoenix on Tuesday to loudly talk up home-buying “as another cornerstone of how we strengthen the middle class.” But he’s quietly directing his Organizing for Action activists in Phoenix to spend most of their energy pushing legislators during the August recess to pass a far-reaching immigration law that could sharply increase economic pressures on the middle class.Last Tuesday’s campaign-like speech is part of a series of speeches that have taken the president out of scandal-wracked Washington and showcased him as a protector of the middle class, and as the chief salesman for a government-centered economy. The speeches are intended to shape public opinion prior to the fall fights over the budget and in the long run-up to the critical 2014 midterm elections. The speeches likely won’t shed much light on the president’s actual housing policy, which critics say is threatening to repeat the disastrous housing bubble from 1996 to 2008, in which Obama played a minor but lucrative role. But the speeches also obscure his role in the immigration debate, and minimize take the media’s attention on his wide-ranging efforts to pressure GOP leaders into passing a transformative immigration bill that could double immigration to 46 million between 2013 and 2033, and create many millions of Democratic-leaning Hispanic voters from 2018 onwards. Critics say the immigration rewrite swill increase pressure on Americans’ wages and employment opportunities, and so push more Americans toward government dependency and the Democratic Party. Polls show the contents of the pending immigration rewrites are strongly opposed by a large slice of the GOP’s base. In Phoenix, Obama’s Organizing For America “grass roots” group has scheduled 25 events during the month-long recess prior to Sept. 5. Fourteen events are just focused on immigration, one on climate issues and two on gun control, and no events are planned to act on Obama’s campaign-style talking-points about the economy or housing.The remaining eight multi-purpose events include two events that are intended to rally Obamas supports for his Aug. 5 visit, and four meetings at the offices of a local immigration attorney.

**Regardless of general capital, the plan pushes immigration off the agenda—Hirsch concedes this matters even if capital isn’t true**

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

## Cooperation

**Multiple alternate causalities**

WHO, 2K (WHO, World Health Organization, 2000, “The Big Guns of Resistance,” <http://www.who.int/infectious-disease-report/2000/ch4.htm>

The ability of HIV to accelerate the onset of acute MDR-TB has serious implications for humanity. In crowded hospitals filled with immuno-suppressed individuals, resistant TB has the potential to stalk relentlessly through a population, afflicting patients, health care workers and physicians alike. War, poverty, overcrowding, mass migration and the breakdown of existing medical infrastructures all contribute to MDR-TB's development, transmission and spread.

# 1NR

## CP

**Their cards are wrong there are different areas of intellectual property rights – China is doing well in the ones that affect your aff because they copy the US laws. They have a bad reputation because they fail in copyrights but that does not affect your impacts**

**Harris and Zheng, ‘13** - writes and speaks extensively on Chinese law, with a focus on protecting foreign businesses in their China operations AND interviewer (Chinese Law Blog, 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: In your mind, what is the key to protecting IP rights? Is it more important to make more or stronger laws, or is it more important to solve the problems related to implementation of the existing laws? DH: Well are you asking about China or are you asking about anywhere? ZC: How about the situation in China? DH: China’s laws are actually just fine. It’s not a question of the laws. It’s really a question of implementation. And a lot of times it’s a question of implementation not even so much by the Chinese government, but by companies that are doing business in China. Meaning, a lot of times foreign companies complain about IP in China, when in reality it was the foreign company that made the mistake when it went into China of not sufficiently protecting its IP. But one thing I want to clarify, and that is when I talk about IP, I always like to divide it up into three, sometimes even four areas: trademarks, copyrights, patents, and you can throw in trade secrets as the fourth item. And the reason I like to divide this up is because in some of those areas, China is actually quite good, while in other of those areas it’s quite poor, and so it’s really unfair to talk about China IP in general without breaking it up. ZC: You’ve divided IP intro three categories. In what category do you think China has done the best job, and which leaves a lot to be desired? DH: Trade secrets—China’s excellent. They borrowed the laws from the United States and they tend to enforce them. Trademarks—China’s fine. Their laws are very similar to France, to Sweden, to much of the world, and enforcement is pretty good as well. When it comes to patents, China’s patent laws are not as tough as those in the United States, but those in the United States are tougher than those in Europe, and that’s just the way China wants it … its enforcement isn’t bad. Where China does poorly is in copyrights. And that hurts China’s reputation because so many people ascribe China’s handling of IP based entirely on China’s handling of copyrights. And copyrights involve, generally speaking, content—books, movies, software. Everybody knows you can buy a DVD of just about any movie on the street in China for about two dollars. That’s a problem.

**1. War is impossible – 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)

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.