### 1

**CIR is a priority issue -- Obama’s investing his capital and pushing passage – a deal is on the horizon**

**Clift 10/25** [Eleanor, Daily Beast, “ Obama, Congress Get Back to the Immigration Fight”, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/10/25/obama-congress-get-back-to-the-immigration-fight.html>]

 **After months of** relative **quiet on** the subject of **immigration** reform, President **Obama reclaimed center stage** in an event in the East Room of the White House Thursday, **urging the** Republican-controlled **House to take up** bipartisan **legislation** passed in June by a big margin (68-32) in the Senate. 131024-immigration-rally-tease “It doesn’t get easier to put off,” he said, a pointed reminder to Republicans that the politics are stacked against them if they punt on an issue of central importance to the fastest growing bloc of voters in the country. Neutralizing the Democrats’ advantage among Hispanics is crucial to the GOP’s presidential prospects, and could improve Congress’ image in the wake of the government shutdown. “Rather than create problems, let’s prove to the American people that Washington can actually solve some problems,” Obama implored. Among those assembled in the East Room for the president’s remarks was Frank Sharry, founder and director of America’s Voice and a longtime activist for immigration reform. Asked what he was thinking as he listened to Obama’s 12-minute speech, he termed it “a modest push,” noting that **Obama has been** “remarkably **restrained**” on the issue when you consider that overhauling the nation’s broken immigration system is his top second-term priority. Obama sidelined himself in deference to Republicans who needed room to build support without being aligned with a president so many in the GOP caucus reflexively dislike. But **now with the shutdown behind them and Republicans on the defensive, Obama saw an opening to get back in the game**. His message, says Sharry: “‘Hey, I’m flexible,’ which after the shutdown politics was important, and he implied ‘if you don’t do it, I’m coming after you.’” For Obama and the Democrats, immigration reform is a win-win issue. They want an overhaul for the country and their constituents. If they don’t get it, they will hammer Republicans in demographically changing districts in California, Nevada, and Florida, where they could likely pick up seats—not enough to win control of the House, but, paired with what Sharry calls “the shutdown narrative,” Democratic operatives are salivating at the prospect of waging that campaign. Some Republicans understand the stakes, and former vice-presidential candidate and budget maven Paul Ryan is at the center of a newly energized backroom effort to craft legislation that would deal with the thorniest aspect of immigration reform for Republicans: the disposition of 11 million people in the country illegally. Rep. Raul Labrador (R-ID), an early advocate of reform who abandoned the effort some months ago, argues that Obama’s tough bargaining during the shutdown means Republicans can’t trust him on immigration. “When have they ever trusted him?” asks Sharry. “Nobody is asking them to do this for Obama. They should do this for the country and for themselves.... We’re not talking about tax increases or gun violence. This is something **the pillars of the Republican coalition** are strongly in favor of.” The details matter hugely, but what a handful of Republicans, led by Ryan, appear to be crafting is legalization for most of the 11 million but without any mention of citizenship. Among those pillars is Chamber of Commerce President Tom Donahue, who on Monday noted the generally good feelings about immigration reform among disparate groups, among them business and labor. He **expressed optimism** that **the House could pass something, go to conference and resolve differences with the Senate, get a bill** and have the president sign it “and guess what, government works! Everybody is looking for something positive to take home.” The Wall Street Journal reported Thursday that GOP donors are withholding contributions to lawmakers blocking reform, and that Republicans for Immigration Reform, headed by former Bush Cabinet official, Carlos Gutierrez, is running an Internet ad urging action. Next week, evangelical Christians affiliated with the Evangelical Immigration Table will be in Washington to press Congress to act with charity toward people in the country without documentation, treating them as they would Jesus. The law-enforcement community has also stepped forward repeatedly to embrace an overhaul. House Speaker John Boehner says he wants legislation, but not the “massive” bill that the Senate passed and that Obama supports. The House seems inclined to act—if it acts at all—on a series of smaller bills starting with “Kids Out,” a form of the Dream Act that grants a path to citizenship for young people brought to the U.S. as children; then agriculture-worker and high-tech visas, accompanied by tougher border security. The sticking point is the 11 million people in the country illegally, and finding a compromise between Democrats’ insistence that reform include a path to citizenship, and Republicans’ belief that offering any kind of relief constitutes amnesty and would reward people for breaking the law. The details matter hugely, but what a handful of Republicans, led by Ryan, appear to be crafting is legalization for most of the 11 million but without any mention of citizenship. It wouldn’t create a new or direct or special path for people who came to the U.S. illegally or overstayed their visa. It would allow them to earn legal status through some yet-to-be-determined steps, and once they get it, they go to the end of a very long line that could have people waiting for decades. The Senate bill contains a 13-year wait. However daunting that sounds, **the potential for** meaningful **reform is tantalizingly close with Republicans actively engaged in preparing their proposal, pressure building** from the business community and religious leaders, **and a short window before the end of the year** to redeem the reputation of Congress and the Republican Party after a bruising takedown**. The pieces are all there for long-sought immigration reform**. We could be a few weeks away from an historic House vote, or headed for a midterm election where Republicans once again are on the wrong side of history and demography.

**The plan is politically divisive – causes backlash and lobby intervention**

Shear 13 (Michael, NYT White house correspondent, 5/5, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all>)

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 politic.comal risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington. “Realistically, the border is as tight as could be and there have been few spillovers of the violence from Mexico into the U.S.,” she added, but perceptions count in Washington “and can be easily distorted.” “Drugs today are not very important to the U.S. public over all,” she added, “but they are important to committed drug warriors who are politically powerful.” Representative Michael T. McCaul, a Texas Republican who is chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, has warned against the danger of drug cartels forming alliances with terrorist groups. “While these threats exist, you would be surprised to find that the administration thinks its work here is done,” he wrote in an opinion article for Roll Call last month, pressing for more border controls in the bill. The Obama administration has said any evidence of such cooperation is very thin, but even without terrorist connections, drug gangs pose threats to peace and security. Human rights advocates said they feared the United States would ease pressure on Mexico to investigate disappearances and other abuses at the hands of the police and military, who have received substantial American support. The shift in approach “suggests that the Obama administration either doesn’t object to these abusive practices or is only willing to raise such concerns when it’s politically convenient,” said José Miguel Vivanco, director of Human Rights Watch’s Americas division. Still, administration officials have said there may have been an overemphasis on the bellicose language and high-profile hunts for cartel leaders while the real problem of lawlessness worsens. American antidrug aid is shifting more toward training police and shoring up judicial systems that have allowed criminals to kill with impunity in Mexico and Central America. United States officials said Mr. Obama remains well aware of the region’s problems with security, even as he is determined that they not overshadow the economic opportunities. It is clear Mr. Obama, whatever his words four years ago, now believes there has been too much security talk. In a speech to Mexican students on Friday, Mr. Obama urged people in the two countries to look beyond a one-dimensional focus on what he called real security concerns, saying it is “time for us to put the old mind-sets aside.” And he repeated the theme later in the day in Costa Rica, lamenting that when it comes to the United States and Central America, “so much of the focus ends up being on security.” “We also have to recognize that problems like narco-trafficking arise in part when a country is vulnerable because of poverty, because of institutions that are not working for the people, because young people don’t see a brighter future ahead,” Mr. Obama said in a news conference with Laura Chinchilla, the president of Costa Rica.

**PC is key and Obama is pushing – continued 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.”

**<<<INSERT LINK>>>**

**Expansion of worker visas is key to build US science diplomacy and relationships between countries**

Pickering and Agre 10 [Thomas R., undersecretary of state from 1997-2000 and chairs the advisory council of the Civilian Research and Development Foundation Peter, a Nobel laureate, is a physician and director of the Malaria Research Institute at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. He is president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2-20, [“Science diplomacy aids conflict reduction,” <http://www.utsandiego.com/news/2010/feb/20/science-diplomacy-aids-conflict-reduction/?page=2#article-copy>]

The talks were emblematic of a promising global trend that features researchers, diplomats and others collaborating on science and, in the process, building closer ties between nations. Even countries with tense government-to-government relations share common challenges in infectious diseases, earthquake engineering, energy production and environmental protection. The White House and Congress have made welcome moves to embrace the potential of science diplomacy, but in the months and years ahead, they will need to exert still more leadership and make sure the effort has the resources needed to succeed. Science diplomacy is hardly a new idea. A 1979 agreement between the United States and China paved the way for bilateral scientific cooperation that has generated vast benefits for both nations, including reduced tensions and billions of dollars in economic activity. U.S. and Soviet nongovernmental organizations contributed to a Cold War thaw through scientific exchanges, with little government support other than travel visas. Now, science diplomacy may help America open a door toward improved relations with Pyongyang, too. Last December, six Americans representing leading scientific organizations sat down with their North Korean counterparts. High-level science delegations from the United States in recent months also have visited Syria, Cuba and Rwanda, not to mention Asian and European nations. America’s scientific and technological accomplishments are admired worldwide, suggesting a valuable way to promote dialogue. A June 2004 Zogby International poll commissioned by the Arab American Institute found that a deeply unfavorable view of the U.S. in many Muslim nations, but a profoundly favorable view of U.S. science and technology. Similarly, Pew polling data from 43 countries shows that favorable views of U.S. science and technology exceed overall views of the United States by an average of 23 points. Within the scientific community, journals routinely publish articles cowritten by scientists from different nations, and scholars convene frequent conferences to extend those ties. Science demands an intellectually honest atmosphere, peer review and a common language for the professional exchange of ideas. Basic values of transparency, vigorous inquiry and respectful debate are all essential. The North Korea visit, organized by the U.S.-Democratic People’s Republic of Korea Science Engagement Consortium, exemplifies the vast potential of science for diplomacy. The U.S. government already has 43 bilateral umbrella science and technology agreements with nations worldwide, and the administration of President Barack Obama is elevating the profile of science engagement. In June, in Cairo, he promised a range of joint science and technology initiatives with Muslim-majority countries. In November, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton appointed three science envoys to foster new partnerships and address common challenges, especially within Muslim-majority countries. In addition to providing resources, the government should quickly and significantly increase the number of H1-B visas being approved for foreign doctors, scientists and engineers. Foreign scientists working or studying in U.S. universities make critical contributions to human welfare and to our economy, and they often become informal goodwill ambassadors for America overseas. Science is a wide-ranging effort that naturally crosses borders, and so scientist-to-scientist collaboration can promote goodwill at the grass roots. Such efforts advance science while supporting peace and the health of the planet. In an era of complex global challenges, science diplomacy can be crucial to finding solutions both to global problems and to global conflict.

**Science diplomacy solves a laundry list of impacts -- spills over and strengthens research**

Nina Fedoroff, Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID, 4-2-08, [Testimony Before the House Science Subcommittee on Research and Science Education]
Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. The global scientific community embraces principles Americans cherish: transparency, meritocracy, accountability, the objective evaluation of evidence, and broad and frequently democratic participation. Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all. Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides. Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, members of ideologically divergent societies can use the common language of science to cooperatively address both doahaha

mestic and the increasingly trans- national and global problems confronting humanity in the 21st century. There is a growing recognition that science and technology will increasingly drive the successful economies of the 21st century. Science and technology provide an immeasurable benefit to the U.S. by bringing scientists and students here, especially from developing countries, where they see democracy in action, make friends in the international scientific community, become familiar with American technology, and contribute to the U.S. and global economy. For example, in 2005, over 50% of physical science and engineering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers trained in the U.S. have been foreign nationals. Moreover, many foreign-born scientists who were educated and have worked in the U.S. eventually progress in their careers to hold influential positions in ministries and institutions both in this country and in their home countries. They also contribute to U.S. scientific and technologic development: According to the National Science Board’s 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators, 47% of full-time doctoral science and engineering faculty in U.S. research institutions were foreign-born. Finally, some types of science – particularly those that address the grand challenges in science and technology – are inherently international in scope and collaborative by necessity. The ITER Project, an international fusion research and development collaboration, is a product of the thaw in superpower relations between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This reactor will harness the power of nuclear fusion as a possible new and viable energy source by bringing a star to earth. ITER serves as a symbol of international scientific cooperation among key scientific leaders in the developed and developing world – Japan, Korea, China, E.U., India, Russia, and United States – representing 70% of the world’s current population.. The recent elimination of funding for FY08 U.S. contributions to the ITER project comes at an inopportune time as the Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project had entered into force only on October 2007. The elimination of the promised U.S. contribution drew our allies to question our commitment and credibility in international cooperative ventures. More problematically, it jeopardizes a platform for reaffirming U.S. relations with key states. It should be noted that even at the height of the cold war, the United States used science diplomacy as a means to maintain communications and avoid misunderstanding between the world’s two nuclear powers – the Soviet Union and the United States. In a complex multi-polar world, relations are more challenging, the threats perhaps greater, and the need for engagement more paramount. Using Science Diplomacy to Achieve National Security Objectives The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the developed world to address the causal factors that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, the world faces common threats, among them climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, food insecurity, and religious extremism. These threats can undermine the national security of the United States, both directly and indirectly. Many are blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous. Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy. There are also important challenges to the ability of states to supply their populations with sufficient food. The still-growing human population, rising affluence in emerging economies, and other factors have combined to create unprecedented pressures on global prices of staples such as edible oils and grains. Encouraging and promoting the use of contemporary molecular techniques in crop improvement is an essential goal for US science diplomacy. An essential part of the war on terrorism is a war of ideas. The creation of economic opportunity can do much more to combat the rise of fanaticism than can any weapon. The war of ideas is a war about rationalism as opposed to irrationalism. Science and technology put us firmly on the side of rationalism by providing ideas and opportunities that improve people’s lives. We may use the recognition and the goodwill that science still generates for the United States to achieve our diplomatic and developmental goals. Additionally, the Department continues to use science as a means to reduce the proliferation of the weapons’ of mass destruction and prevent what has been dubbed ‘brain drain’. Through cooperative threat reduction activities, former weapons scientists redirect their skills to participate in peaceful, collaborative international research in a large variety of scientific fields. In addition, new global efforts focus on improving biological, chemical, and nuclear security by promoting and implementing best scientific practices as a means to enhance security, increase global partnerships, and create sustainability.

### 2

**Interpretation: Economic engagement must include conditional carrots and sticks.**

Helweg, Professor of Public Policy @ SMU, 2000 (Diana, Economic Strategy and National Security, p. 145)

Secretary of State Madeline K. Albright has argued that a U.S. policy of economic engagement with a country does not mean endorsement of its regime. In fact, the U.S. version of engagement is different from countries, such as France and Japan, which often practice a policy of unlimited economic engagement based on the rationale that unfettered trade and investment best promotes democratic values for the targeted nation, and financial success for themselves. By contrast, U.S.-"style" engagement must be coupled with a range of policy tools that includes the targeted use of economic restrictions. In other words, it is a variation of the traditional carrot and stick approach rather than one or the other.

Violation: the affirmative is unconditional.

**Predictable limits: forcing the plan to be conditional ensures a stable mechanism for negative ground.**

**Resolutional Consistency: US engagement implies the use of carrots and sticks.**

### 3

Economic engagement is inextricably linked to liberal thinking through its use of liberalization and integration as a means for creating peace making a critical analysis necessary to subvert the liberal orthodoxy’s security agenda.

Hurrell, professor of international relations, 98

[Andrew, July, International Affairs, Volume 74, Issue 3, “Security in Latin America”, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2624967, page 529-530, accessed 7/10/13, VJ]

The second assumption, which also reflects a deep-rooted strand of liberal thinking on international relations, is that economic liberalization and regional integration feed naturally and positively into the creation of a stable and secure regional order. In contrast to the strong claims of democratic peace theory, the links between economic interdependence and peace have always been more elusive and difficult either to demonstrate or to refute with any precision. The argument here is that, while there are certainly cases, most notably within Mercosur and the Southern Cone, where economic integration appears to have reinforced rapprochement between erstwhile rivals and assisted the creation of a more stable regional environment, at the same time successful economic regionalization can also be a significant potential problem for regional order and a source of negative security externalities which, if unmanaged, are likely to become more serious. The third assumption is that the agenda of regional security should be broadened to include issues such as drug trafficking, drug-related violence and criminality, migration and refugees, environmental degradation, and worsening public order in the face of different forms of internal violence. It is certainly the case that the most serious security problems and threats to regional order are domestic and transnational in nature. And yet the increasingly pervasive rhetoric of the new security agenda disguises or even obscures many complex and contested issues. Divergent understandings of the meaning, nature and implications of the new security agenda have important policy implications and are likely to impede effective regional responses. Since the end of the Cold War regional order and security have increasingly come to be defined in terms of the collective defence of democracy and the promotion of liberal economic reform and regional integration. These processes will, it is hoped, provide the foundations for the creation of a stronger sense of regional community and the establishment of a set of political structures within which specific security threats, both traditional (e.g. old-style border conflicts) and non-traditional (e.g. the privatization of violence, drugs, migration) can be tackled.2 I do not argue here that this liberal orthodoxy is wholly wrong. But I do suggest that it needs to be subjected to a much more critical analysis than has been common hitherto.

A refusal to problematize liberalism results in the subordination of everything deemed ‘non-liberal’ making war inevitable under the guise of the West’s ‘civilizing’ mission which in reality is a justification for imperialism.

Grayson, PhD in Political Science, 03

[Kyle, March, YCISS, “Democratic Peace Theory as Practice: (Re)Reading the Significance of Liberal Representations of War and Peace”, <http://yciss.info.yorku.ca/files/2012/06/WP22-Grayson.pdf>, accessed 7/1/13, VJ]

Given the representation practices embodied within the democratic peace theory discourse, it is best to view the interactions that it fosters as ‘imperial encounters’. According to Doty, ‘the term imperial encounters is meant to convey the idea of asymmetrical encounters in which one entity has been able to construct ‘realities’ that were taken seriously and acted upon and the other entity has been denied equal degrees of kinds of agency’.39 The ‘reality’ of democratic peace theory has been defined by Western representational practices outlined above. These representations have shaped the production of knowledge and identities as well as making particular courses of action appear possible/impossible/inevitable.40 Furthermore, to borrow a term from David Campbell, democratic peace theory has constructed a new ‘geography of evil’ that (re)produces national identity while dictating what courses of action are apt (i.e., conversion/force) when confronting the supposedly non-liberal/democratic ‘other’.41 To reiterate this point in a slightly different fashion, “the context of the democratic peace, then, includes not only the advent of a zone of peace among core states, but also international relations of domination and subordination in the periphery…”.42 As a result of this analysis, the answers to the questions of ‘for whom and for what purpose’ is democratic peace theory designed are now evident but not surprising. Democratic peace theory and its associated discourse is for the people of the US/West. Its purpose is to fix the American/Western national identity as civilized, peacefully inclined, and democratic with the non-West by definition being considered uncivilized, war-mongering, and authoritarian. Democratic peace theory also aids in the justification of the American/Western world-view which perceives both democracy and war in a particular fashion. In turn, these conceptions of democracy and war help to hide much of the sordid past and present of the international relations of western liberal democratic states. They help to justify the unjustifiable and to legitimate the illegitimate. Of utmost importance is the ontological basis of these international relations practices sanctioned by democratic peace theory and its associated discourse within the popular political realm. This is the focus of the following section which examines the existence of one of the empirical silences within democratic peace theory research and the consequences of ignoring these important events. Democratic Peace Theory and the Ontology of War and Peace In Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War, Michael Shapiro tries to examine “the ways that enmity-related global geographies and ethnoscapes emerge as collectivities, and how they try to achieve, stabilize, and reproduce their unity and coherence”.43 Historically, the practice of war has emerged as one the most enduring methods to attempt to fix national identities and ontological foundations. Victory in war confirms all the positive subjective views of the ‘self’ while at the same time providing ‘proof’ of the subjectively perceived inferior nature of the ‘other’. Conversely, defeat not only leads to (geo)strategic losses, but also to a reappraisal of the national identity and deep questioning of the foundations that helped define national identity. The American defeat in the Vietnam War provides an excellent example of these identity/foundation casualties. Therefore, Shapiro argues that war is not just (geo)strategic, but is also about the confrontation between competing ontologies. As mentioned earlier, democratic peace theory and its surrounding discourse views war as an activity waged by state actors in pursuit of (geo)strategic spoils (e.g., territory, resources, wealth), as well as an activity arising over disputes of ‘ownership’ of spoils and/or perceived violations of sovereignty. As John Vasquez has argued, “the situation that states in the modern global system are most likely to deal with by the use of force and violence is one in which their territory is threatened....territorial disputes provide the willingness to go to war”.44 Democratic peace theorists believe that liberal democracies can peacefully manage these kinds of disputes amongst themselves; however, in circumstances of dispute between a liberal democracy and a non-liberal/democracy, war is seen as almost inevitable. Conventionally, this has been attributed to the inherently aggressive nature of the ‘authoritarian’ state, which prevents liberal democracies from trusting these states to adhere to peacefully negotiated settlements. Yet, when democratic peace theory is viewed as a representational practice, war becomes inevitable between disputing liberal democratic states and non-liberal/democratic states not because of the aggressive nature of authoritarian regimes but because these situations are viewed as an opportunity for liberal democratic states to engage in a ‘civilizing’ mission and reaffirm their national identity and ontology by demonstrating their superiority in battle. This imperative becomes especially clear if we abandon the traditional view of wa

r contained within democratic peace theory and look at democratic non-state/liberal democratic state disputes and the underlying ontological contestations that fuelled them.45 Barkawi and Laffey have argued that currently “force is used in the service of defending and expanding economic and to a lesser extent political liberalism (in the guise of democracy) beyond the liberal capitalist core”.46 From a historical perspective, the dispute between the Iroquois Six Nations and the Canadian government over the Grand River territory during the first decades of the twentieth century, provides an excellent example of the ontological impetus behind international relations practices and how warfare can also be directed towards the annihilation of culture.

**The alternative is to reject the affirmative.**

A rejection is critical to reforming the securitized institutional apparatus through which the liberal peace operates to negate the non-liberal other into a localized form of democracy that engages the illiberal instead of obliterating it.

Richmond, Professor of International Relations, 09

[Oliver, July, Review of International Studies, Volume 35, Issue 03, “A Post Liberal Peace: Eirenism and the Everyday”, page 563-565, accessed 7/10/13, VJ]

Such a search, via critical research agendas for peace77 termed here eirenism. indicates the need for an ethical re-evaluation of the liberal peace.71 'Eirenism\* was used by Erasmus as a call against religious chauvinism after the Reformation.74 In a modem context it provides a lens through which one can evaluate the claims, apparent or hidden of a particular epistemology, concept, theory, method, or ideology. The failure to apply such a tool has led liberal peacebuilding approaches into a paradoxical situation. They have reinstated social and economic class systems, undermined democracy, and caused downward social mobility (as explained in the examples of East Timor and Afghanistan below). Yet. liberal peace's Renaissance and Enlightenment underpinnings make clear that the states-system of territorial sovereignty, the approximation of democracy, of human rights and free trade, also carries a humanist concern with social justice and wide-ranging pluralism (often to be guaranteed by an international organisation).75 Ironically, this is where its failings are most obvious. Its focus has remained on security and institutions, rather than developing an engagement with the everyday life of citizens. It has sometimes been built on force rather than consent, and more often conditionally, and it has failed to recognise local cultural norms and traditions. It has created a 'virtual peace' in its many theatres.76 This is not to say that narrow security issues have not been somewhat assuaged and that this has not been without benefit, of course. Experience and data from a range of UN and UNDP thematic or country focused reports has shown liberal peacebuilding to have less impact on everyday life than is often claimed by its institutional proponents, the donor and development communities, and particularly the International Financial Institutions. One example among many can be found in the context of East Timor after the crisis of 2006. A UN report conceded that despite a lengthy and costly UN involvement there since 1999: |.. | poverty and its associated deprivations including high urban unemployment and the absence of any prospect of meaningful involvement and employment opportunities in the foreseeable future, especially for young people have also contributed to the crisis.'' Vet there is little sense of a need to reflect on the underlying liberal peace paradigm that allowed a 'peace' to be built in East Timor which ignored these issues. In a more recent example, a report on Afghanistan by the UN Secretary General ignored any direct engagement with such issues in favour of traditional political and security concerns, with the exception of one telling reference: The failure of development actors to ensure that quieter provinces in the north and west receive a tangible peace dividend has played into the latent north-south fault line within Afghanistan [...f\* This report's later sections on development, human rights, and humanitarian issues or human security, focus on orthodox issues relating to institution-building or 'emergency' issues.79 In the conclusion to the report the full litany of liberal peacebuilding discourse is repeated in seeming ignorance of the lessons of East Timor, or indeed of Afghanistan itself. Accordingly, the transition in Afghanistan is under \*[.. .| increasing strain owing to insurgency, weak governance and the narco-economy'. The government needs to \*|...] restore confidence to the popu- lation in tangible ways\* but this is conceptualised as being derived from: |.. .| stronger leadership from the Government, greater donor coherence - including improved coordination between the military and civilian international engagement in Afghanistan - and a strong commitment from neighbouring countries, (without which) many of the security, institution-building and development gains made since the Bonn Conference may yet stall or even be reversed.10 This list of priorities, focusing on security, terrorism, narcotics, and then the orthodoxy of the liberal peace as a subsequent priority (governance, development, reconciliation, and human rights abuses in this order) effectively places a local peace dividend for communities and individuals as a distant and lesser priority, and disconnects its importance from the conduct of democratic politics and the legitimacy of the state.11 This is because the liberal peace's primary goal in its intervention into the local or domestic is actually on an international order between sovereign states. This is to be achieved ideally through the construction of a liberal social contract to produce domestic and international order. In practice, what has been achieved in post-conflict environments are the shells of liberal states, reproducing international order, but achieving a virtual peace in a domestic context - at least in the short to medium term, as the examples above, and of Cambodia and Bosnia aptly illustrate. The ethical and policy metanarratives about liberal peace derive from the founding myths of Westphalia, its state-centric elitism, its focus on territorial boundaries and sovereignty, and its disciplinary nature. Walker has described this as a 'moment of exclusion" The concept of peace has generally been subject to Utopian or dystopian assumptions, and the notion of the liberal peace has emerged as an 'auto-ambivalent' compromise." It has been imbued with a specific set of interests, partly through the decontextualisation of classical political theory to support inherency arguments about conflict, or confirm liberal norms of market- democracy, and propensity to reshape rather than engage with non-liberal others. This also validates territorial state sovereignty and a social contract skewed in favour of the slate, free markets, and the eradication of the indigenous or locally more authentic (often through property rights).34 among other tendencies.33 This has been used to promote a culture of governmental and securitised institutionalism rather than a broad peace (often by rejecting Kant's peace federation or by confirming territorial sovereignty).i6rather than promoting an everyday peace.37 It has supported the classical liberal view that liberal stales and peoples are effectively superior in rights and status to others, and extended these arguments to allow for the justification of direct or subtle forms of colonialism, interventionism. and local depoliticization to occur.38 A civil and emancipatory peace might arise through liberalism, as Foucault argued, but more often it leads to violence of a structural or direct nature in non-liberal contexts.39 In practice it also may have negative effects on self-determination and agency.40 In this context an ethical evaluation of the liberal peace underlines its tendency to be flimsy, denying self-determination and self-government, and depoliticising. This is as opposed to the potential of peace being empathetic. emancipatory, and resting upon an ontological agreement and hybridity (meaning the development of an ontology that is not exclusive but is open to difference).41 These latter qualities imply that the agents and recipients of the liberal peace are able to relate to each other on an everyday, human level, rather merely through problem-solving institutional frameworks that dictate or negate lived experience. They indicate the need for a deep negotiation of peace even by the agents of the liberal model, and for a willingness to see the Western liberal model itself modified by its engagement with its own 'others' - meaning conflict and post-conflict, especially non-Western, non-liberal, and 'developmental', polities.

### 4

Mexico is a persistent violator of human rights

UN, 5/3 – (UN News Centre, “Mexico must strengthen its protection of human rights, reduce use of military – UN expert,” http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=44817&Cr=Mexico&Cr1=#.Uc9VcPm1FqW)

A United Nations independent expert today urged the Mexican Government to strengthen the national structures that protect human rights, in particular the right to life, and reduce the involvement of the military in policing to reduce the use of force in the country. “There seems to be wide agreement among various levels of Government and civil society that the long term solution to the problem of violence in Mexico lies in establishing a strong law enforcement system compliant with international standards surrounding the right to life,” the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christoph Heyns, said at the end of a visit to the country. “The need to achieve this goal as soon as possible should be the guiding star of all policy and other reforms.” Mr. Heyns welcomed the announcement of a number of initiatives aimed at moving the country from relying on the military for internal security. Some of them are already in the process of implementation. “The policies that have been announced should be fully implemented. The involvement of members of civil society in this process is crucial,” Mr. Heyns said. “There is no easy fix, but a slow and steady commitment to strengthening the role of the human rights framework in Mexico is the only long term solution.” He emphasized the importance of decreasing the military’s involvement in policing, ensuring that civil courts and not military ones try members of the military who have been accused of human rights violations, and establishing clear standards on the use of force by law enforcement officials. Mr. Heyns also drew special attention to the issue of ending impunity. “Each and every loss of life should be investigated with the same rigor. And each and every perpetrator should be apprehended and tried. Pursuing this objective will serve not only to decrease impunity, but to restore the value that society attaches to life,” he said.

Shun them – that’s a priori

Beversluis, 89 (Eric H. April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger 1 want to smash your face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict. But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions'? We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing... morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order. Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in. Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order. An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be, willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentent sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this? First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his caB for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.). . Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force." Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment than can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it.

### Solvency

**Squo solves**

Seo and Derouin, 12

Andrew Seo, Editor-in-Chief of the Harvard Political Review, AND Laura Derouin, reporter for the Harvard Independent; “Drug Cartel Financing: A Focus on Money Laundering,” September 2012, http://www.iop.harvard.edu/sites/default/files\_new/research-policy-papers/TheWarOnMexicanCartels.pdf //bghs-ms

The Government of Mexico (GOM) has made fighting money laundering one of its top priorities and has made progress in combating these crimes. Mexico has adopted a national anti- money laundering strategy and increased the capacity of supervisors and law enforcement to carry it out.60 The GOM works on transnational cases very closely with U.S. law enforcement. On June 15, 2010, the Finance Ministry announced regulations limiting U.S. dollar transactions in Mexico.61 On August 26, 2010, the GOM announced the National Strategy for the Prevention and Elimination of Money Laundering and Financing for Terrorism.62 A package including nine reforms, three modifications to federal codes, and the creation of the Law to Prevent and Identify Operations with Illegal Origins and Terrorism Financing is still pending in Congress. The 2011 Money Laundering and Financial Crimes Country Database listed the following as important steps to creating a more effective AML/CFT (Anti-Money Laundering/Combating the Financing of Terrorism) regime in Mexico: “Mexico should fully implement and improve its mechanisms for asset forfeiture, control the bulk smuggling of currency across its borders, monitor remittance systems for possible exploitation, improve the regulation and supervision of money transmitters, unlicensed currency exchange centers, centros cambiarios and gambling centers, and extend AML/CFT requirements to designated non-financial businesses and professions.”63

**Automatic exchange doesn’t solve –**

**a) recipients can’t effectively parse data.**

The Economist 13 [2/16, “Automatic response”, http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21571561-way-make-exchange-tax-information-work-automatic-response]

Another problem with automatic exchange is the huge quantities of data it produces. Europe’s tax authorities have struggled to stay on top of the information swapped under the directive. An official from a British dependency taking part in the EUSD reportedly complained that some countries which receive encrypted DVDs with client information do not even get round to asking for the decryption key. And information is not necessarily helpful if the recipient still has to penetrate the web of shell companies, trusts and foundations between the account and the beneficial owner.¶ A further concern is the risk of misuse of information by corrupt administrations, or rogue government employees, such as the sale of personal financial data to would-be kidnappers. Global automatic exchange is “a developed-world solution for a global economy unsuited to it”, argues Geoff Cook of Jersey Finance. Some developing countries lack the administration to deal with it, says Gurbachan Singh, a tax lawyer in Singapore. In places like Indonesia “you may have a tax officer but not a proper tax office.”

**b) current engagement with Mexico**

CTU 12 (Curtis Tax Updates, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP, 11/29, http://curtistax.blogspot.com/2012/11/us-and-mexico-sign-intergovernmental.html]

On November 19, 2012, the U.S. and Mexico signed an intergovernmental agreement ("IGA") to improve international tax compliance including with respect to the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act ("FATCA"). FATCA generally requires a foreign financial institution ("FFI") to identify U.S. account holders and report information regarding them to the Internal Revenue Service. If an FFI fails to comply, the FFI will be subject to a 30% U.S. withholding tax on income it receives on its U.S. investments. ¶ More than 50 countries have engaged in discussions with the U.S. in response to FATCA. Mexico became the third country (the U.K. and Denmark were the first two countries) to enter into an IGA. Like the IGAs with the U.K. and Denmark, the US-Mexico IGA requires annual, automatic information exchange, on a reciprocal basis, with respect to financial accounts in 2013 and subsequent years. Under the IGA, Mexico will automatically provide to the U.S. information it collected from Mexican FFIs on financial accounts in Mexico held by U.S. residents, and the U.S. will also automatically provide Mexico with information it collects on financial accounts in the U.S. held by Mexican residents. Generally, the two governments will exchange the information within 9 months after the year-end. However, the information relating to accounts in 2013 is not required to be exchanged until September 30, 2015.

### Econ

**No chance of war from economic decline---best and most recent data**

Daniel W. **Drezner 12**, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

**The final outcome addresses** a dog that hasn’t barked: **the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict** and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple **analysts asserted** that **the financial crisis would lead states to increase** their **use of force** as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater **internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or** a ratcheting up of **great power conflict**, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder.

The **aggregate data suggests otherwise**, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “**The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is** approximately **the same as** it was in **2007**.”38 **Interstate violence** in particular **has** **declined** **since the start of the financial crisis** – **as have military expenditures** in most sampled countries. Other **studies confirm** that **the Great Recession has** **not triggered any increase in violent conflict**; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “**the crisis has not** to date **generated** the surge in **protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected**.”40

None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. **Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis**, **the proper comparison is with Great Depression**. And **by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive**. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

**Their impacts are empirically denied and there’s no risk of a collapse**

**Zakaria 9** Fareed Zakaria is editor of Newsweek International “The Secrets of Stability,” 12/12 <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2>

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization---about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology---were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis---soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The **predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all**. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy---through central banks and national treasuries---they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again---the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse** in the last year. **It is the same reason** that **we weathered the** stock-market **crash of 1987**, **the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently** more **resilient** than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.