## Contention 1 –The status quo

#### Currently, untold numbers of Mexican men, women, and children are being unfairly imprisoned by human traffickers along the border—a bilateral partnership is critical

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

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

#### Mexico is the key—they’re a global hotspot for sex trafficking

Department of State, 13 (U.S. Department of State, 2013, “Trafficking in Persons Report 2013” http://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/2013/index.htm)//EM

Mexico is a large source, transit, and destination country for men, women, and children subjected to sex trafficking and forced labor. Groups considered most vulnerable to human trafficking in Mexico include women, children, indigenous persons, persons with mental and physical disabilities, as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth, and undocumented migrants. Mexican women and children are exploited in sex trafficking within Mexico and the United States, lured by fraudulent employment opportunities, deceptive offers of romantic relationships, or extortion, including through the retention of identification documents or threats to notify immigration officials. Mexican men, women, and children also are exploited in forced labor in agriculture, domestic service, manufacturing, construction, in the informal economy, and in forced street begging in both the United States and Mexico. Staff at some substance addiction rehabilitation centers and women’s shelters have subjected residents to forced labor and forced prostitution. The vast majority of foreign victims in forced labor and sexual servitude in Mexico are from Central and South America, particularly Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador; many of these victims are exploited along Mexico’s southern border. Trafficking victims from the Caribbean, eastern Europe, Asia, and Africa have also been identified in Mexico, some en route to the United States. Organized criminal groups coerced children and migrants into prostitution and work as hit men, lookouts, and in the production, transportation, and sale of drugs. There were also reports during the year of criminal groups using forced labor in coal mines and kidnapping professionals, including architects and engineers, for forced labor. Child sex tourism persisted in Mexico, especially in tourist areas such as Acapulco, Puerto Vallarta, and Cancun and in northern border cities like Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez. Many child sex tourists are from the United States, Canada, and western Europe, though some are Mexican citizens. In some parts of the country, threats of violence from criminal organizations impede the ability of the government and civil society to combat trafficking effectively. The Government of Mexico does not fully comply with the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; however, it is making significant efforts to do so. During the year, authorities approved a new national anti-trafficking law and increased convictions of trafficking offenders at the state level. Some states strengthened their anti-trafficking law enforcement capacity, and the government maintained varied training efforts at the national and local level. Specialized victim services and shelters remained inadequate, however, and victim identification and interagency coordination remained uneven. There was no centralized data on victim identification or law enforcement efforts, efforts against forced labor continued to be relatively weak, and official complicity continued to be a serious problem.

#### Sex trafficking embodies a patriarchal form of domination that perpetuates the belief that women should be silent while they suffer

**Ditmore, Maternick, and Zapert ’12** (Melissa, Anna, and Katherine, all are research consultants to the Sex Workers Project of the Urban Justice Center, “The Road North: The role of gender, poverty and violence in trafficking from Mexico to the US”, August 2012, pg. 22-25 http://www.ccasa.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/The-Road-North-The-role-of-gender-poverty-and-violence-in-trafficking-from-Mexico-to-the-US.pdf , [SG])

Violence against women and cultural beliefs and state systems that support it exist in greater or lesser degree all over the world. In Mexico, patriarchal cultural values take the form of machismo, which values strong and dominant men, and justifies identifying women as property and violence against women in various forms (Bucardo 2004; Newdick 2005; Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002). Evidence displays various cultural ideals that support machismo’s influence on Mexican society. For example, young women are often mandated to work by their families or must get permission, and intimate partner violence is not given serious consideration as a public health issue (Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002; Villareal 2007). Machismo also manifests in pervasive discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in Mexico. Some organizations estimate that there are as many as 1,000 murders of gays, lesbians, transgender or transsexual individuals occurring every year (Norandi 2007), or up to 15 homophobic or transphobic murders each month, according to The Citizens Commission Against Homophobic Hate Crimes (Fortino Torrentero 2009). Murders, assaults and other violent crimes against LGBT persons are hugely under reported due to a general distrust of law enforcement based on the violence, exploitation and indifference exhibited by law enforcement toward LGBT persons (Villamil 2010). The presence of machismo in Mexican society creates a culture that tolerates the existence of an involuntary sexual labor force. Latino culture has many concepts that define beliefs about gender and family in addition to machismo, which are present in Mexico (Bucardo 2004; Newdick 2005; Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002). Familismo calls upon a strong obligation to one’s family. In the traditional gender roles in Latino culture, marianismo, creates the expectation that women present as wholesome and must comply with the needs of their family, particularly the male members (Bucardo 2004; Newdick 2005; Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002). Simpatia emphasizes non-confrontational relationships. These social and cultural beliefs not only create an atmosphere tolerant of abuse, but also one where acknowledgement of abuse is unlikely (Bucardo 2004; Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002). These cultural values can also act as deterrents to speaking out negatively against family, friends, elders, and particularly males. In addition, respeto—a fundamental value concerning respect—further complicates abuse because a woman would likely fear the consequences of speaking out against an elder, relative, or man because it could be deemed disrespectful due to respeto (Bucardo 2004; Newdick 2005; Peek-Asa, Garcia, McArthur & Castro 2002). Physical and social retribution may be the consequences of violating respeto. Revictimization is a stark reality because Latino culture dictates that when an unmarried woman is no longer a virgin, she is automatically considered promiscuous and/or a fair target of sexual aggression by male family and non-family members (Comas-Diaz 1995). Although these cultural understandings are from a study of Puerto Rican family dynamics, these characteristics are prevalent in Mexico. The specific cultural examples in the next section clearly display this. These deeply instilled cultural beliefs further perpetuate a culture where women are often silent sufferers of violence. State actions in Mexico perpetuate structural violence against women through policies that are socially constraining, such as lack of access to abortion and reproductive health rights, the ability to marry as young as 14 with parental consent, and lack of prosecutions against those who abuse or murder women (Hague Domestic Violence Project 2012; United Nations Population Fund 2009). Lack of attention to violence against women may be an unintended consequence of the state’s focus on tackling drug-related violence through a military response to the cartel-led drug trafficking industry (Martinez 2012). However, violence against women in Central America is not isolated to Mexico. The Guatemalan government recently launched a “femicide” unit to address the unprecedented levels of violence against women, particularly indigenous women, and the rising murder rate (Bevan 2012). Due to these cultural, societal and economic conditions, the trafficking of persons into commercial sex has become a lucrative business in some southern Mexican states. Not only are young women seeking alternative employment opportunities, but many in these regions have been left economically vulnerable due to the forces of globalization, and most notably the North American Free Trade Agreement’s (NAFTA) impact on certain socio-economic sectors in these states (Newdick 2005). Human trafficking within and originating in Mexico is a diverse and widespread phenomena, affecting many kinds of labor and industry. However, in regards to trafficking into commercial sex in Mexico, historical and cultural factors have led the city of Tenancingo in the state of Tlaxcala to be a geographic nucleus (Torres 2009; Brumback & Stevenson 2010; HSTC Bulletins #9, #11 2011). Here, adult men, often with the support of their multi-generational families, have come to distort customary marriage traditions of local indigenous populations in order to deceptively coerce young women into prostitution (HSTC Bulletin #9 2011; Torres 2009; Castro Soto et al. 2004). The lack of economic opportunities for men in Tlaxcala and the surrounding regions is one important factor contributing to the rise of trafficking. Anthropologist Oscar Montiel Torres carefully tracks how changes in the economy in Tlaxcala left few employment options for men of the region (Torres 2009). Torres cites the industrialization process, cycles of factory booms and busts in the early and late 20th century, corresponding political changes, and labor policy as the reasons why so many men in and around Tenancingo, once dependent on factory work, now turn to trafficking (Torres 2009: Ch. 3). Two of the most common recruitment methods used by traffickers in Tlaxcala, Mexico are the “asking of the hand” and the “theft of the bride.” Long-standing cultural practices are the basis for both methods, which are still commonplace when seeking a wife (HSTC Bulletin #9 2011; Castro Soto et al. 2004). The “asking of the hand” method entails adult men—the traffickers, or as they are known locally, padrotes—wooing and courting adolescent women for a culturally acceptable amount of time before asking permission of the bride’s family for her hand in marriage. The trafficker appears to follow the traditional procedures. However, the trafficker subverts the traditional practice after living together as a married couple, and eventually coerces his young bride into prostitution under the guise of their mutual financial interest (HSTC Bulletin #9 2011; Castro Soto et al. 2004). The “theft of the bride” method is more complex. Kidnapping the bride and rendering her “unreturnable” either through rape or consensual sex are the key components to this practice (Montes and Iñiguez 2010; Kaltman et al. 2011; D’Aubeterre 2003). Then the prospective groom and bride, together with the groom’s family, go to the bride’s family to ask forgiveness for the kidnapping and to get their blessing for marriage. Sometimes the kidnapping is a ruse used by a consenting couple to get married, and sometimes the kidnapping is more sinister where a man would forcibly kidnap and often rape a woman who did not want to become his bride. In these regions of Mexico the practice is often perceived as akin to elopement as opposed to taking young women against their will (D’Aubeterre 2003; Kaltman et al. 2011; Montes and Iñiguez 2010; Castro Soto et al. 2004). Traffickers manipulate this ritual by initially appearing to follow traditional cultural procedures, and then using them as a way to trap women into a marriage or a relationship in order to later force her into prostitution. This method is far more stigmatizing for both gender roles: young women are victimized multiple times, while young men have several opportunities to display superiority through force and physical violence (HSTC Bulletin #9 2011; Kaltman et al. 2011; Castro Soto et al. 2004). Generally, the “asking of the hand” method is more culturally acceptable than the “theft of the bride” method, yet both traditions make it difficult for the young women involved to find a socially respectable way out of the relationship, even after they realize that they are in danger (HSTC Bulletin #9 2011; Torres 2009). Many young women in Mexican society are subject to chastisement if they leave a relationship or have sex with a man without getting married. These women often do not feel that they can return home out of fear that they will bring shame and dishonor to their families. These cultural pressures sometimes result in women agreeing to a marriage or staying in a relationship in order to appeal to social expectations (Kaltman et al. 2011; Castro Soto et al. 2004). Because these techniques do not always lead to legal marriage, the trafficker can use them over and over, securing multiple women. The trafficking situation exacerbates these cultural vulnerabilities because traffickers often utilize physical violence and psychological manipulation in order to maintain a hold over the victim (Castro Soto et al. 2004).

#### A bilateral partnership increases prevention initiatives in addition to number of prosecutions - allows for information sharing and expedited investigations

**Garza 11** Candidate for Juris Doctor, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, AB from Harvard (Rocio, 11/1/11, "Addressing Human Trafficking Along the United States-Mexico Border: The Need for a Bilateral Partnership," <http://www.cjicl.com/uploads/2/9/5/9/2959791/cjicl_19.2_garza_note.pdf>)//AM

Victims on both sides of the United States-Mexico border ¶ would greatly benefit from improvements to both countries’ laws ¶ and their implementation. Regardless, the United States and ¶ Mexico can accomplish much more if they join efforts and ¶ collaborate in a formal bilateral partnership that takes into ¶ account the internal and external factors243¶ that make human ¶ trafficking possible. A bilateral partnership would ensure that ¶ both countries’ interests are represented in any solution to ¶ eradicate human trafficking. It could be beneficial in prosecuting ¶ traffickers, protecting victims, and putting preventative measures ¶ in place.¶ 1. Prosecution of Traffickers¶ A formal bilateral partnership could allow the United States ¶ and Mexico to share information about traffickers, which could ¶ lead to more prosecutions. Currently, if in the course of an ¶ investigation, a U.S. prosecutor believes that a trafficker returned ¶ to Mexico, the prosecutor may either petition for extradition or ¶ submit a request for the Mexican government to prosecute the ¶ accused in Mexico.244 Generally, Mexican President Calderon ¶ cooperates with the United States in extraditing criminals.245¶ Several traffickers have been extradited to the United States ¶ in connection to high profile cases, such as the Carreto-Valencia ¶ brothers who were charged with human trafficking for running a ¶ forced prostitution ring in New York.246 After several family ¶ members were charged in 2004, another participant was extradited ¶ in 2007 and sentenced in 2008.247 Another case involved ¶ defendants who illegally transported Mexican individuals to ¶ Florida and forced them to work in fruit harvesting fields by ¶ threatening them with violence.248¶ If the strategies used to ¶ prosecute these traffickers were maintained by a bilateral ¶ partnership, both the United States and Mexico could expedite ¶ their investigatory processes instead of acting unilaterally and only ¶ responding to each other’s requests for extradition and ¶ punishment. More efficient prosecutions would leave more ¶ resources and time to address the needs of victims.¶ 2. Protection of Victims¶ A bilateral partnership could be formed between U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and Mexican customs ¶ officials in order to create better strategies to identify human ¶ trafficking victims at the shared border. Although most ¶ immigrants agree to be smuggled, others are abducted and taken ¶ against their will.249 When these immigrants are intercepted at the ¶ border, they are often confused with smugglers and the people ¶ they are smuggling and not recognized as victims.250 Having a ¶ bilateral partnership could ensure that these issues come to light ¶ and that proper training is provided to U.S. Customs and Border ¶ Protection agents in order to prevent them from simply deporting ¶ victims or sending them back to their traffickers. Even if ¶ immigrants have consented to being smuggled, U.S. agents may be ¶ able to identify the signs of human trafficking if information is ¶ shared across the border. Suspected victims of human trafficking ¶ could be turned over to Mexican customs officials for further ¶ investigation and possible legal aid and protection.¶ In a bilateral partnership with representatives from both ¶ countries, the United States and Mexico would be able to come up ¶ with strategies that keep traffickers and smugglers out of the ¶ United States while protecting the victims. For example, if a ¶ partnership were in place, the members of the partnership could ¶ designate specific steps for U.S. Customs and Border Protection ¶ agents to take when they suspect the people they have detained ¶ are victims of human trafficking. These steps could include, for ¶ example, sending victims directly to predetermined and stateapproved Mexican shelters equipped to handle their needs as victims of human trafficking. Another specific step that a ¶ partnership may be able to put in place is that U.S. Customs and ¶ Border Protection agents could separate people they intercept at ¶ the border and ask them specific questions to determine if they are ¶ victims. Some victims of human trafficking report that if they had ¶ not been near their traffickers at the time they were stopped at the ¶ border and if they had been asked more direct questions, they ¶ would have revealed that they were being taken against their will ¶ and been rescued despite their fear of retaliation from traffickers.¶ 3. Prevention of Human Trafficking¶ Prevention tends to be a goal that is cast aside in favor of ¶ prosecution of traffickers and protection of victims because it is ¶ intangible. One can count the number of prosecutions and victims ¶ helped but cannot ascertain how many are saved with preventative ¶ measures. In the 2009 TIP Report, Secretary of State Hillary ¶ Clinton acknowledged that much remains to be done in identifying ¶ and tackling the root causes of human trafficking.253 Clinton urged ¶ all governments to leverage their resources and offered U.S. ¶ partnership to strengthen anti-trafficking efforts.254¶ One of the ways in which the United States can leverage its ¶ resources is by partnering with Mexico in order to continue raising ¶ awareness about the dangers of human trafficking and how ¶ smuggling can easily lead to trafficking. In addition, a partnership ¶ would send a message to both countries about the seriousness of ¶ the crime and the urgent need to address it together. In a ¶ partnership between U.S. and Mexican representatives, they ¶ would be able to strategize to develop viable alternatives to ¶ prevent illegal immigration, given that most victims are vulnerable ¶ due to a lack of economic alternatives. Furthermore, through a ¶ partnership, the United States and Mexico could develop joint and ¶ more informed awareness campaigns to warn their citizens about ¶ the dangers and criminal consequences of engaging in human ¶ trafficking.

#### A masculine ideology is the root cause of all proliferation, environmental destruction, domestic violence, and war

Warren and Cady 94 (Karen J, Duane L, feminists and authors, Hypatia, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing connections,” pg 16-17)

Much of the current "unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors -- the symptoms of dysfunctionality -- that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is -- as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy. 11The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989 , 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "a militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" ( Spretnak 1989 , 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility ties in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

#### Trade with Latin America is a structure of gendered exploitation – the aff offers a model to restructure history – Gender is a key question of Latin American literature

**Strasser and Tinsman 10** (Ulrike Strasser and Heidi Tinsman - Associate Professors of History @ UC Irvine, Journal of World History, “It’s a Man’s World? World History Meets the History of Masculinity, in Latin American Studies, for Instance”, Vol. 21, Num. 1, March 2010, pg. 75-78, Project Muse) //MaxL

But while historians as a group are only beginning to enter the fray, individual historians and various subfields of course are anything but new to discussions of inequality between peoples and uneven developments on a transregional or even global scale. This article concerns itself primarily with two particularly vibrant approaches: world history and historical studies of masculinity. Both have been profoundly committed to exploring issues of domination and difference, and they each have developed vital critical vocabulary for narrating their complex histories. At fi rst glance, that would make the two fi elds seem like natural allies, or at least easy interlocutors, at this moment in time and in the profession’s history. But to the contrary and somewhat paradoxically, there has been a vexed relationship between world historians and historians of masculinity (and of gender and sexuality more broadly). They have largely remained segregated in their own institutional and intellectual spaces, conferences and journals included. From there they have eyed one another with some degree of skepticism and occasionally outright suspicion. Even when their thematics do overlap, historians of gender and sexuality rarely see themselves writing world history, and vice versa.2 What’s the problem? How can it be solved? And what’s to be gained? This article builds on conversations generated by a double-session roundtable we organized at the 2007 meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington, D.C., titled “Narratives of Difference and Domination: World Histories and Studies of Masculinity.” Featured as a Presidential Session and including scholars working on various world “areas,” the panels drew a large audience and lively debate.3 The session also generated interest in Europe, where conversations about world history are beginning to gather steam. We were invited by the German-language journal Historische Anthropologie to publish an article on our refl ections under the title “Männerdomänen? World History trifft Männergeschichte—das Beispiel der Lateinamerikastudien” in November 2008.4 Because the relationship between gender, sexual- ity, and world history is of more longstanding concern within the U.S. academy, we were eager to have our essay made available in English. We thank both Historische Anthropologie and the Journal of World History for permitting us to reproduce it here. We contend that the oft vexed issues separating world historians and historians of gender and sexuality are not only ones of perceptions and labels (although mistaken attributions do matter 5), but also foremost a matter of diverging intellectual trajectories and partially incommensurate categories. Other trends in each fi eld notwithstanding, at this juncture, it is a heavily materialist world history that faces off with a predominantly culturalist history of gender and sexuality. Diagnosing such disciplinary unevenness, however, is different from asserting that “never the twain shall meet.” In trying to establish intersections between the two fi elds, we use this article to bring a third fi eld into the mix: United States–based Latin American studies, an area of study that has long combined these traditions and hence offers particular insights on the challenges of bringing them together. Most promising from our point of view is the recent scholarship from Latin American studies that illuminates how world history and histories of gender and sexuality converge naturally, as it were, around the theme of masculinity. World history commonly centers its analyses on domains of life in which men are primary actors, be it patterns of trade and labor exploitation, or empire building and state formation. Histories of gender and sexuality, on the other hand, regularly examine why certain domains or individuals are coded as “masculine,” what such codings mean, and how they matter to larger processes. The Latin Americanist literature offers important models for combining these two topics and is suggestive of how world history can usefully be narrated as the story of masculinities. This article is not intended as a literature review of Latin Americanist histories of gender and sexuality, or even masculinity.6 Rather, we invoke Latin American studies as a research area that often has fl uidly blended culturalist and materialist traditions and focused on masculinity in ways that are highly relevant to debates within world history today.

#### Refusing the systemic reproduction of patriarchy demands a new methodology

Tickner professor in the School of International Relations at USC-LA 2001 J. Ann Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era page 139-140

Investigating how global structures and processes constrain women's security and economic opportunities requires asking what difference gender makes in our understanding and practices of international relations. What kind of evidence might further the claim that the practices of international politics are gendered? Through what mechanisms are the types of power necessary to keep unequal gender structures in place perpetuated? Does it make any difference to states' behavior that their foreign and security policies are so often legitimated through appeals to various types of hegemonic masculinity? These are empirical questions that can be answered only with reference to concrete historical instances, taking into account that women are differently located in terms of race, class, and nationality. Answering these questions may enable us to see that what is so often taken for granted in how the world is organized is, in fact, legitimating certain social arrangements that contribute to the subordination of women and other disadvantaged groups. Such questioning of the way we have come to understand the world, as well as the forms of power necessary to sustain dominant forms of interpretation, demands quite different methodologies from those generally used by conventional IR. Questioning the knowledge/power nexus and its normalized reproduction has been a focus of discourse analysis. Recovering the experiences of subjugated people demands methods more typical of anthropology and sociology than political science. Consequently, feminists are turning to methodologies such as ethnography and discourse analysis to answer their research questions, methodologies that have not traditionally been used in IR.

#### Thus the plan The United States federal government should establish a bilateral partnership with the government of Mexico against human trafficking.

## Contention 2- post plan

#### US human trafficking policies are modeled globally

**Srikantiah 7** Associate Professor of Law and Director, Immigrants’ Rights Clinic, Stanford Law (Jayashri, “Perfect Victims and Real Survivors: The Iconic Victim In Domestic Human Trafficking Law,” Boston University Law Review v. 187, <http://www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/bulr/volume87n1/documents/SRIKANTIAHv.2.pdf>)//AM

As the United States continues to grapple with human trafficking, other ¶ countries are doing the same and, in many cases, are using the U.S. trafficking ¶ legislation as a model. Our trafficking approach could have global ¶ consequences. Unless we allow our approach to evolve as our understanding ¶ of trafficking evolves, we erroneously exclude trafficking victims from ¶ immigration relief.

#### The Aff is a prior question and has ultimate policy relevance – deconstructing gender sets the necessary terms for effective politics.

**Shepherd 2007** [Laura J., Department of Political Science and International Studies, University of Birmingham, “Victims, Perpetrators and Actors’ Revisited:1 Exploring the Potential for a Feminist Reconceptualisation of (International) Security and (Gender) Violence,” *BJPIR*: 2007 VOL 9, 239–256]

In this article, I explore the discursive constitution of concepts of (gender) violence and (international) security in particular texts. However, this research is explicitly not ‘merely theoretical’, or ‘academic’ in the pejorative sense of the term.8 My interest in the concepts of international security and gender violence is indeed motivated by a desire to see whether these concepts could be fruitfully reconceived, but the article also considers the implications of this reconceptualisation for policy and academic work. I wish to provide for those undertaking such work alternative concepts with which to proceed. I identify myself as a feminist researcher, and recognise that this entails a curiosity about ‘the concept, nature and practice of gender’ (Zalewski 1995, 341). This curiosity questions the ways in which gender is made meaningful in social/political interactions and the practices—or performances—through which gender configures boundaries of subjectivity. I espouse a feminism that seeks to challenge conventional constructions of gendered subjectivity and political community, while acknowledging the intellectual heritage of feminisms that seek to claim rights on behalf of a stable subject and maintain fidelity to a regime of truth that constitutes the universal category of ‘women’ (Butler 2004, 8–11). While a feminist project that does not assume a stable ontology of gender may seem problematic, I argue, along with Judith Butler, that ‘[t]he deconstruction of identity is not the deconstruction of politics; rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated’ (Butler 1999, 189). A focus on articulation entails a further commitment to the analytical centrality of language—or, as I see it, discourse. Elizabeth Grosz argues that an integral part of feminist theory is the willingness to ‘tackle the question of the language available for theoretical purposes and the constraints it places on what can be said’ (Grosz 1987, 479). To me, this aspect of feminist theory is definitive of my feminist politics. If ‘men and women are the stories that have been told about “men” and “women” ’ (Sylvester 1994, 4), and the way that ‘men’ and ‘women’ both act and are acted upon, then the language used to tell those stories and describe those actions is not just worthy of analytical attention but can form the basis of an engaged critique. Furthermore, an approach that recognizes that there is more to the discursive constitution of gender—the stories that are told about ‘men’ and ‘women’—than linguistic practices can enable thinking gender differently.

#### Viewing traffic victims though a lens of otherness creates a divide between them and ourselves, which makes it easier to exploit them. Rejecting this binary is necessary to breaking down complicity in violence

**Todres ’09** (Jonathan, Professor of Law at Georgia State University, “Law, Otherness, and Human Trafficking”, July 2009, Accessed via Project MUSE, [SG])

Trafficking and exploitation of individuals within the United States and other countries in the Global North also occurs in various labor settings. The market for domestic workers is one such site. Large numbers of middle- and upper-class individuals in Western countries employ domestic help, many of whom are from developing countries. In this setting, we observe familiar narratives that portray the Self as virtuous while neglecting the Other’s experience. Employers describe how they believe they are “helping” their domestic workers (some of whom may have been trafficked), based on an assessment that their workers are better off than they had been in their countries of origin. This analysis employs an othered conception of life “over there” and focuses on the comparative economic standing of the employee, while ignoring the role of the Self. Representative of the disconnect is that significant numbers of employers, while seeking to help their domestic workers, oppose basic rights for them such as the right to a minimum wage. Thus, while the magnanimous Self believes he/she is “rescuing” the Other, the actual Self may be benefiting from the further exploitation of the Other. In other words, even when exploitation is close to home, the narrative of otherness operates, consciously or subconsciously, to obstruct our view of the exploitation that occurs locally, including when we partake in it. Thus, domestic workers for families in New York City or Los Angeles, for example, may be perceived as having been exploited while in their home country, but the fact that their exploitation might be continuing in the United States goes unseen. And the fact that domestic trafficking rings are run by Americans and exploit Americans does not fit with our conception of the Self, and thus mention of their existence is met with disbelief. This manifestation of otherness makes it easier for traffickers to exploit significant numbers of individuals in the United States and other Western countries and for the rest of us to neglect their plight.

#### The devaluation of human beings because of patriarchy makes racism, classism, and other forms of oppression inevitable

ASFS ’87 (Alliance To Stop First Strike, Anti-militarism and Anti-Patriarchy activist organization, Nonviolent Civil Disobedience Handbook, Activism: Peace: NVCD: Discrimination, http://www.activism.net/peace/nvcdh/discrimination.shtml)

Part of struggling against nuclear weapons involves understanding the ways in which the oppression of particular groups of people supports militarism, makes the institutionalized system of war and violence appear "natural" and "inevitable." For instance, heterosexism, or the assumption that sexual relations are only permissible, desirable, and normal between opposite sexes, justifies a system of rigid sex roles, in which men and women are expected to behave and look in particular ways, and in which qualities attributed to women are devalued. Thus, men who are not willing to be violent are not virile -- they are threatened with the real sanctions placed on homosexuality (physical violence, housing and economic discrimination) unless they behave like "real men." The military relies upon homophobia (the fear of homosexuality) to provide it with willing enlistees, with soldiers who are trained to kill others to prove their masculinity. Sexism, or the systematic devaluation of women, is clearly related to this. Women have traditionally opposed war because women bear the next generation and feel a responsiblity to protect it. But feminists are not content to speak only from traditional roles as mothers and nurturers. Many activists see a feminist analysis as crucial to effectively challenging militarism. The system of patriarchy, under which men benefit from the oppression of women, supports and thrives on war. In a sexist or patriarchal society, women are relegated to limited roles and valued primarily for their sexual and reproductive functions, while men are seen as the central makers of culture, the primary actors in history. Patriarchy is enforced by the language and images of our culture; by keeping women in the lowest paying and lowest status jobs, and by violence against women in the home and on the streets. Women are portrayed by the media as objects to be violated; 50% of women are battered by men in their lives, 75% are sexually assaulted. The sexist splitting of humanity which turns women into others, lesser beings whose purpose is to serve men, is the same split which allows us to see our enemies as non-human, fair game for any means of destruction or cruelty. In war, the victors frequently rape the women of the conquered peoples. Our country's foreign policy often seems directed by teenage boys desparately trying to live up to stereotypes of male toughness, with no regard for the humanity or land of their "enemy." Men are socialized to repress emotions, to ignore their needs to nurture and cherish other people and the earth. Emotions, tender feelings, care for the living, and for those to come are not seen as appropriate concerns of public policy. This makes it possible for policymakers to conceive of nuclear war as "winnable." Similarly, racism, or the institutionalized devaluation of darker peoples, supports both the idea and the practice of the military and the production of nuclear weapons. Racism operates as a system of divide and conquer. It helps to perpetuate a system in which some people consistently are "haves" and others are "have nots." Racism tries to make white people forget that all people need and are entitled to self-determination, good health care, and challenging work. Racism limits our horizons to what presently exists; it makes us suppose that current injustices are "natural," or it makes those injustices invisible. For example, most of the uranium used in making nuclear weapons is mined under incredibly hazardous conditions by people of color: Native Americans and black South Africans. Similarly, most radioactive and hazardous waste dumps are located on lands owned or occupied by people of color. If all those people suffering right now from exposure to nuclear materials were white, would nuclear production remain acceptable to the white-dominated power structure? Racism also underlies the concept of "national security": that the U.S. must protect its "interests" in Third World countries through the exercise of military force and economic manipulation. In this world-view, the darker peoples of the world are incapable of managing their own affairs and do not have the right to self-determination. Their struggles to democratize their countries and become independent of U.S. military and economic institutions are portrayed as "fanatic," "terrorist," or "Communist." The greatest danger of nuclear war today lies in the likelihood of superpower intervention in Third World countries, fueled by government appeals to nationalistic and racist interests. All forms of discrimination are interrelated with economic discrimination, or classism. Classism justifies a system in which competition is the norm, and profit is believed to be a universal motivation. Thus, poor and working class people lack access to education, leisure time and frequently basic things like food and shelter. But a classist society blames them for their poverty, or devalues their particular way of living. Classism values certain kinds of work over others, and sets up a system of unequal rewards. Our society threatens the majority of our members with economic insecurity, forcing us to accept things the way they are for fear of losing the few things we've gained through hard work. Since most poor people are women, children and people of color, classism and other forms of discrimination work together to hide the injustice of our economic system. Poor and working class people feel the effects of the military directly, profoundly, and brutally. Vital social services have been cut to feed the Pentagon. Inflation, aggravated by the military budget, chews away at what is left after disproportionately high taxes are deducted from our pay. Poor people are prime military recruits, with historically little access to draft deferments or information about conscientious objection, forced by unemployment to think of the military as a "career opportunity." Our militarized society does not support cooperative and socially productive work, but counts on unequal competition and economic deprivation to provide workers in defense industries, miners in uranium mines, and soldiers in the armed forces. No human being is born with discriminatory attitudes and beliefs. Physical and cultural attitudes are not the causes of oppression; these differences are used to justify oppression. Racist, classist, sexist, heterosexist, and all other forms of discriminatory attitudes are a mixture of misinformation and ignorance which have to be imposed on young people through a painful process of social conditioning. These processes are left unchallenged partially because people feel powerless to do anything about them. But the situation is not hopeless. People can grow and change. Many successful struggles have taken place against structures of exploitation and discrimination. We are not condemned to repeat the past. Discriminatory condition ning can be analyzed and unlearned. All people come from traditions which have a history of resistance to injustice, and every person has their own individual history of resistance to discriminatory conditioning. This history needs to be recalled and celebrated, and people need to listen to and learn from other people's histories. When people act from a sense of informed pride in themselves and their own traditions, they will be more effective in all struggles for justice and peace.

#### This femicidal violence is a direct expression of a large project of structural violence that goes unchecked in modern politics

**Olivera ’06** (Meredes, Journalist for Sage Publications, “Violencia Femicida: Violence against Women and Mexico's Structural Crisis”, Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 33, No. 2, Accessed via JSTORE, [SG])

Violence against women, an expression of male power, is present in various forms and degrees throughout their lives. As a naturalized part of the culture, symbols, institutional functioning, and cultural prescriptions, it shapes identities and internalizes subjectivities. In all societies the cultural models for being a woman assign positions to women that subordinate them to the personal and institutionalized power of men, creating real and symbolic inequalities. These inequalities are expressed in direct or hidden messages, discriminatory actions and excluding omissions, lack of resources, limits on freedom and coercion, objectification, exploitation, self-depreciation, feelings of guilt and shame, deception, and false justifications. In all these situations violence against women progressively develops from insinuations, offensive comparisons, harassment, threats, verbal intimidation, abuse, irresponsibility, betrayals, and abandonment to beatings, forced sex, rape, and persecution. It even appears in other realms such as counterinsurgency and war. From this perspective, femicide and femicidal violence can be identified as specific forms of gender violence, which is defined by the United Nations as a mechanism of domination, control, oppression, and power over women (UN, 1979). Although gender violence does not always result in murder, it does increase the possibility of it. Gender violence is a constant violation of the human rights of women and girls. Its presence in the home, on the street, in the community, in the workplace, in government, church, and organizations and within couples allows tension and hatred to build up and reaffirms and reproduces gender relations of domination/subordination. In this article, I analyze briefly some of the structural causes of recent violence against women in Mexico. Taken together, they demonstrate the failure of the neoliberal system to provide either development or a model of democracy in our country. Having defined femicide and femicidal violence as a direct expression of the structural violence of the neoliberal social system, we could pursue its causes in the political realm or in the ways in which individuals have been divided and battered by the violent dynamics of social transformation. Putting the neoliberal mandates into practice through institutionalized patriarchal power, Mexico's so-called political class and its business and financial sectors have undermined and violated both society's and individuals' rights, interests, and needs. In the case of women, one outcome of the processes on both levels has been murder. At the same time as we consider the increase in violence against women, we must also take into account the increase of violence within families and personal violence in general. These are the other side of the systemic violence of the neoliberal social structure, which creates a social ecology in which men are driven to hypermasculinity, exaggerating the violent, authoritarian, aggressive aspects of male identity in an attempt to preserve that identity. The counterpart of these attitudes is found in the subordinate positions of women in relation both to men and to institutionalized masculine power. In the face of neoliberalism's increasing demands, the dysfunction and obsolescence of these stereotypes is ever more evident. The disturbances they have always produced in personal relations are inflamed by the current social violence. Conflicts within couples and families as masculine domination is brought into question and delegitimized steadily increase the levels of violence and, of course, the risk of murder. These conflicts are multiplied under the pressure produced by unemployment, poverty, social polarization, alcoholism, and insecurity, among the many other problems that fill daily life with tension.

#### Patriarchy has infiltrated modern politics- only a rejection of patriarchy can open up space beyond hegemonic masculinity

**Tickner ’92** (J. Ann, Professor of International Studies at American University, “Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, Engendered Insecurities”, Columbia University Press 1992, <http://www.ciaonet.org/book/tickner/tickner12.html> [SG])

While the purpose of this book is to introduce gender as a category of analysis into the discipline of international relations, the marginalization of women in the arena of foreign policy-making through the kind of gender stereotyping that I have described suggests that international politics has always been a gendered activity in the modern state system. Since foreign and military policy-making has been largely conducted by men, the discipline that analyzes these activities is bound to be primarily about men and masculinity. We seldom realize we think in these terms, however; in most fields of knowledge we have become accustomed to equating what is human with what is masculine. Nowhere is this more true than in international relations, a discipline that, while it has for the most part resisted the introduction of gender into its discourse, bases its assumptions and explanations almost entirely on the activities and experiences of men. Any attempt to introduce a more explicitly gendered analysis into the field must therefore begin with a discussion of masculinity. Masculinity and politics have a long and close association. Characteristics associated with "manliness," such as toughness, courage, power, independence, and even physical strength, have, throughout history, been those most valued in the conduct of politics, particularly international politics. Frequently, manliness has also been associated with violence and the use of force, a type of behavior that, when conducted in the international arena, has been valorized and applauded in the name of defending one's country. This celebration of male power, particularly the glorification of the male warrior, produces more of a gender dichotomy than exists in reality for, as R. W. Connell points out, this stereotypical image of masculinity does not fit most men. Connell suggests that what he calls "hegemonic masculinity," a type of culturally dominant masculinity that he distinguishes from other subordinated masculinities, is a socially constructed cultural ideal that, while it does not correspond to the actual personality of the majority of men, sustains patriarchal authority and legitimizes a patriarchal political and social order. Hegemonic masculinity is sustained through its opposition to various subordinated and devalued masculinities, such as homosexuality, and, more important, through its relation to various devalued femininities. Socially constructed gender differences are based on socially sanctioned, unequal relationships between men and women that reinforce compliance with men's stated superiority. Nowhere in the public realm are these stereotypical gender images more apparent than in the realm of international politics, where the characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity are projected onto the behavior of states whose success as international actors is measured in terms of their power capabilities and capacity for self-help and autonomy.

#### Interrogating the gendered assumptions surrounding current policy making exposes androcentric assumption that allow formulation of better actions

**Peterson and Runyan ‘99** (V. Spike and Anne professor of political science at the University of Arizona and professor of women’s studies at Wright State University, “Global Gender Issues”, 2nd edition, p. 14-15, accessed via JSTORE, [SG])

Gender issues surface now because new questions have been raised that cannot be addressed within traditional frameworks. The amassing of global data reveals the extent and pattern of gender inequality: Women everywhere have less access to political power and economic resources and less control over processes that reproduce this systemic inequality. Moreover, our knowledge of the world of men and the politics they create is biased and incomplete in the absence of knowledge about how men's activities, including their politics, are related to, even dependent upon, what women are doing--and why. Additionally, recognizing the power of gender as a lens forces us to reevaluate traditional explanations, to ask how they are biased and hence render inadequate accounts. As in other disciplines, the study of world politics is enriched by acknowledging and systematically examining how gender shapes categories and frameworks that we take for granted. This is necessary for answering the new questions raised and for generating fresh insights--about the world as we currently "know" it and how it might be otherwise. Finally, gender-sensitive studies improve our understanding of global crises, their interactions, and the possibilities of moving beyond them. These include crises of political legitimacy and security as states are increasingly unable to protect their citizens against economic, epidemic, nuclear, or ecological threats; crises of maldevelopment as the dynamics of our global economic system enrich a few and impoverish most; and crises of environmental degradation as the exploitation of natural resources continues in unsustainable fashion. These global crises cannot be understood or addressed without acknowledging the structural inequalities of the current world system, inequalities that extend well beyond gender issues: They are embodied in interacting hierarchies of race, class, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, physical ability, age, and religious identification. In this text, we focus on how the structural inequalities of gender work in the world: how the hierarchical dichotomy of masculinity-femininity is institutionalized, legitimated, and re- produced, and how these processes differentially affect men's and women's lives. We also begin to see how gender hierarchy interacts with other structural inequalities. The dichotomy of masculinity and femininity is not separate from racism, classism, ageism, nationalism, and so on. Rather, gender both structures and is structured by these hierarchies to render complex social identities, locations, responsibilities, and social practices. Gender shapes, and is shaped by, all of us. We daily reproduce its dynamics--and suffer its costs--in multiple ways. By learning how gender works, we learn a great deal about intersecting structures of inequality and how they are intentionally and unintentionally reproduced. We can then use this knowledge in our struggles to transform global gender inequality by also transforming other oppressive hierarchies at work in the world.

## Contention 3- This speech act

#### **Violence against women goes unnoticed by society and is the largest systemic impact—it’s an ethical and political obligation to take a step in the right direction**

French et al 98 (Stanley, Professor of Philosophy at Concordia University in Montreal, Wanda Teays, professor and chair of the Philosophy Department at Mount St. Mary's College in Los Angeles, Ph.D. in Humanities from Concordia University in Montreal, and an M.T.S. (Applied Ethics) from Harvard University, "Violence Against Women. Philosophical Perspectives", Cornell University, <http://books.google.com/books?id=5_deWNO1GEUC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false>.)

Women are the victims of widespread personal and systemic violence, the true scope and gender-specific nature of which emergy clearly when all types of violence are set in context in a collection such as this one. The sweep of violence—over or subtle—is striking: common in North America and elsewhere are sexual assault and rape, wife battering, sexual harassment, prostitution, sadistic pornography, and sexual exploitation by medical personnel. Cultures beyond these shores add their own forms of violence such as dowry death and female genital mutilation as well as the disproportionate abortion of female fetuses and systematic neglect of girl children. Only recently have philosophers begun to inquire into violence against women. Yet it is striking that such an important social phenomenon did not capture philosophical attention long ago. It cries out for conceptual analysis: what do we mean by “violence”, and what can we conclude about the special forms of violence directed toward women? Moreover, such violence is precisely the sort of issue that ethics, political philosophy, and philosophy of law deal with; so how can there be an elaborate historical discourse on just war theory and no theory of rape or wife beating? Despite their impact on women’s lives**,** such practices have simply been part of the backdrop, unnoticedand certainly not treated as fit subjects for serious theorizing. According to former U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, domestic violence is the top problem for American women, causing more inujuries than automobile accidents, muggings, and rapes combined. According to a U.S. Justice Department study, nearly 700,000 victims of violence or suspected violence treated in hospital emergency rooms in 1994 were hurt by someone they knew. Of these approximately 243,000 (or 34 percent) were injured by someone they knew intimately—a current of former spouse, boyfriend, or girlfriend. Of these, 203,000 (over 80 percent) were women. One of the distinctive characteristics of violence directed toward women is that it tends, unlike violence toward men, to come from those they know (Blodgett-Ford, 1993: 510). That it is rooted in asymmetrical assumptions about the nature of the two sexes is illustrated by the belated recognition of marital rape as a crime in most states. (Some, like Oklahoma and North Carolina, still fail to recognize it as such [Down, 1992: 569].) Sexist assumptions clearly play a role, too, in the massive exploitation of women as prostitutes. The consequences for these women may be dire, especially when, as in India, a majority are indentured slaves, many of whom are doomed to die of AIDS (Friedman, 1996: 12). The specifically sexual element in gender relations comes to the fore in pornography, especially sadistic pornography. Both the production of such materials and their disproportionate consumption by males reinforce and promote the attitudes toward women that fuel the practices discussed here. Such attitudes become especially apparent in war, when rape is used as a weapon against the enemy.

#### Legislation is the only way to actualize change—laundry list

**ILO, 5** (International Labour Organization, 4/1/5, “Human Trafficking and Forced Labour Exploit at ion: Guidance for Legislation and Law Enforcement”, http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1021&context=forcedlabor)//EM

The act of ratification constitutes a commitment by the State to take action that will lead to the goal of eradicating trafficking, which is the second main role of legislative bod- ies. Legislation is the basis for such action as it: • Translates the aims and principles of international standards into national law. • Sets the principles, objectives and priorities for national action to combat traf- ficking and other forced labour outcomes of migration. • Creates the machinery for carrying out that action. • Creates specific rights and responsibilities. • Places the authority of the State behind the protection of victims of traffick- ing/migrant workers. • Creates a common understanding among all actors involved. • Provides a basis and procedure for complaints and investigations. • Provides legal redress for victims. • Provides sanctions for offenders. A number of questions arise from these points, for instance: do criminal laws prohibit all forms of forced labour and trafficking? Do they include provisions to prosecute all the per- petrators involved? Do the laws provide adequate protection for victims, regardless of whether they agree to file a complaint against the perpetrators of trafficking and forced labour upon identification? Legislative bodies must make sure that their country’s legislation effectively prohibits all forms of exploitation as defined by the Protocol and the relevant ILO Conventions, as well as providing appropriate protection and assistance for victims.

#### Reshaping our gender relations is a first step to ever solve anything- negative connotations with “feminism” lead all traditional policy actions to fail.

Cohn, Ruddick and Hill 5 (Carol, Director of the Boston Consortium on Gender, Security and Human Rights, and a Senior Research Scholar at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and Sara, Professor Emerita of Philosophy and Feminist Studies at Lang College of the New School for Social Research,  and Felicity, is the Greenpeace International Political Adviser on Nuclear and Disarmament Issues., Disarmament Diplomacy, Issue No. 80, Autumn, “The Relevance of Gender for Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction”, <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd80/80ccfhsr.htm>)

Ideas about gender shape, limit and distort professional and political discourses about WMD We start with a true story, told to Dr. Cohn by a member of a group of nuclear strategists, a white male physicist: "Several colleagues and I were working on modelling counterforce nuclear attacks, trying to get realistic estimates of the number of immediate fatalities that would result from different deployments. At one point, we re-modelled a particular attack, using slightly different assumptions, and found that instead of there being 36 million immediate fatalities, there would only be 30 million. And everybody was sitting around nodding, saying, 'Oh yeh, that's great, only 30 million,' when all of a sudden, I heard what we were saying. And I blurted out, 'Wait, I've just heard how we're talking - Only 30 million! Only 30 million human beings killed instantly?' Silence fell upon the room. Nobody said a word. They didn't even look at me. It was awful. I felt like a woman." The physicist added that henceforth he was careful never to blurt out anything like that again. Why did he feel that way? First, he was transgressing a code of professional conduct. Expressing concern about human bodies is not the way you talk within the terms of the strategic expert discourse, which is, after all, a discourse about weapons and their relation to each other, not to human bodies. But even worse than that, he evinced some of the characteristics on the "female" side of the dichotomies - in his "blurting" he was being impulsive, uncontrolled, emotional, concrete, upset and attentive to fragile human bodies. Thus, the hegemonic discourse of gender positioned him as feminine, which he found doubly threatening. It was not only a threat to his own sense of self as masculine, his gender identity; it also positioned him in the devalued or subordinate position in the discourse. Thus, both his statement, "I felt like a woman," and his subsequent silence in that and other settings, are completely understandable. To find the strength of character and courage to transgress the strictures of both professional and gender codes and to associate yourself with a lower status is very difficult. This story is not simply about one individual, his feelings and actions; it illustrates the role and meaning of gender discourse in the defence community. The impact of gender discourse in that room (and countless others like it) is that some things are excluded and get left out from professional deliberations. Certain ideas, concerns, interests, information, feelings and meanings are marked in national security discourse as feminine, and devalued. They are therefore very difficult to speak, as exemplified by the physicist who blurted them out and wished he hadn't. And if they manage to be said, they are also very difficult to hear, to take in and work with seriously. For the others in the room, the way in which the physicist's comments were marked as feminine and devalued served to delegitimate them; it also made it very unlikely that any of his colleagues would find the courage to agree with him. This example should not be dismissed as just the product of the idiosyncratic personal composition of that particular room; it is replicated many times and in many places. Women, in professional and military settings, have related experiences of realising that something terribly important is being left out but feeling constrained, as if there is almost a physical barrier preventing them from pushing their transgressive truths out into the open. What is it that cannot be spoken? First, any expression of an emotional awareness of the desperate human reality behind the sanitised abstractions of death and destruction in strategic deliberations. Similarly, weapons' effects may only be spoken of in the most clinical and abstract terms, and usually only by those deemed to have the appropriate professional qualifications and expertise. What gets left out, then, is the emotional, the concrete, the particular, human bodies and their vulnerability, human lives and their subjectivity - all of which are marked as feminine in the binary dichotomies of gender discourse. In other words, gender discourse informs and shapes nuclear and national security discourse, and in so doing creates silences and absences. It keeps things out of the room, unsaid, and keeps them ignored if they manage to get in. As such, it degrades our ability to think well and fully about nuclear weapons and national security, and so shapes and limits the possible outcomes of our deliberations. With this understanding, it becomes obvious that defence intellectuals' standards of what constitutes "good thinking" about weapons and security have not simply evolved out of trial and error; it is not that the history of nuclear discourse has been filled with exploration of other ideas, concerns, interests, information, questions, feelings, meanings and stances which were then found to create distorted or poor thought. On the contrary, serious consideration of a whole range of ideas and options has been preempted by their gender coding, and by the feelings evoked by living up to or transgressing normative gender ideals. To borrow a strategists' term, we can say that gender coding serves as a "preemptive deterrent" to certain kinds of thought about the effects and consequences of strategic plans and WMD.

#### Gender should be included as a focal part of policy debates

Lovenduski 2005(Joni, Professor of Politics at Birkbeck college, University of London, author of Women and European Politics and Feminizing politics, “State Feminism and Political Representation”, p. 7)

**Gender is therefore an important component of the way in which issues are framed in policy debates**. Policy-making can be construed as a set of arguments among policy actors about what problems deserve attention, how those problems are defined and what the solutions are (John 1998; Mazur 2002). In this conflict of ideas only a few issues are taken up for action. The problem for women's advocates therefore is twofold: first, they must gain attention for their issues and the ideas they promote, and second, they must ensure that the problem is defined in terms that are compatible with movement goals. **The public definition of a problem is amongst other things a frame that affects how an issue is considered and treated. Paradoxically gender issues are often framed in gender-blind terms. Historically the gendering of debates about political representation has 'been 'invisible', built on the unspoken assumption that the political actor** (the voter, the citizen**) is male.** Feminist theorists have unmasked this convention (Pateman 1988; Lister 1997) pointing out not only that women are citizens, voters and activists, but also that women in traditional gender roles have made possible the functioning and dominance of the male political actor. **Historically, when issues of political representation were discussed, traditional gendering went unnoticed until the suffrage movements claimed votes for women.**

#### As debaters, we have an obligation to place trafficking at the center of our discussions. This is key to understanding the development of policy necessary to solve

**Dragiewicz ’08** (Molly, Professor of Feminist Studies at the University of Illinois, “Teaching about Trafficking: Opportunities and Challenges for Critical Engagement”, University of Illinois Press, *Feminist Teach* vol. 18 no. 3, pgs. 2-3, accessed via JSTORE, [SG])

Teachers and students must consider the complicated and interrelated factors that contribute to the problem in order to understand it. Trafficking makes visible the intersectional nature of structural and ideological contributions to exploitation, oppression, and violence. It also confounds traditional liberal/conservative political divisions. Feminist scholars have a responsibility to teach about this issue because of what we can contribute to understanding the phenomenon of trafficking, the nature of interest in the problem, and the implications of policy development for women. In short, feminism's analyses of power in general and the social construction of sexuality, sex, and gender in particular have something special and essential to contribute to the conversation. Like any other social issue, the research and writing on trafficking originates from implicit or explicit theories about the nature, causes, and implications of the problem. Naturally these lead to different ideas about the best way to address it. Since trafficking touches on so many symbolically loaded issues, it is not surprising that these debates are especially contentious. Trafficking includes many forms of work such as farm work, construction, cleaning, and apparel production in addition to sex work. However, debates about what it means to sell sexualized services for money are central to the history of pol- icy development around trafficking. Without going into explicit detail about the long history of internecine feminist and anti- feminist debates about what is variously termed sex work, prostitution, or commercial sexual exploitation, recognition and understanding of this debate are essential to decoding the literature on trafficking. For those who are new to this area of inquiry, I will provide a very simplified overview of the major divides as I see them.

#### Only engaging trafficking through a discursive lens can effectively transform the social conditions that create the possibility for violence

**Lobasz ’12** (Jennifer, Professor of International Relations at the University of Minnesota, “Victims, Villains, and the Virtuous Constructing the Problems of ‘Human Trafficking’”, June 2012, http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/131822/1/Lobasz\_umn\_0130E\_12756.pdf, pgs. 80-82, [SG])

In this dissertation, I carry out a genealogical discourse analysis. Genealogy in the tradition of Michel Foucault and Friedrich Nietzsche calls into question “ready-made syntheses” of the supposedly real, concrete, or self-evident, revealing that which is taken as to be contingent and contentious. In short, genealogy “seeks to defamiliarize—to literally make strange—commonsense understandings and so to make their constructedness apparent.” A genealogical approach transforms how social scientific questions are asked. In contrast to scholars who start from the assumption that human trafficking is a rapidly growing problem, for example, I ask how anti-trafficking discourses in the United States “set the term s of intelligibility of thought, speech, and action,” establishing the conditions of possibility for what can be meaningfully said or done in any given set of circumstances. Genealogy lies in contrast to positivist approaches to policy analysis that, according to Dvora Yanow, share the presumption that the nature of the problem is real and concrete: that problems exist in the world as unambiguous facts, and that the purpose of policy and implementation analysis is to mirror that reality as closely as possible. In this view, we can take action to correct the problem when we are able to capture its definition appropriately and correctly…If we cannot narrow the ‘gap’ between policy intentions and outcomes, we simply have not grasped ‘the nature’ of the problem, seen it in the right light, or hit on the correct solution to it. A genealogical approach to trafficking, for example, moves beyond critiques of policy implementation and rejects the position that a “trafficking victim” is a natural kind that investigators must simply “look harder” to find, or “do more” to help. Instead, a “trafficking victim” is seen as a person who occupies a particular subject position in domestic and international moral and political orders, and in trafficking discourses is distinguished from prostitutes and undocumented migrants among others. Along these lines, I hold that the challenges associated with establishing definitional parameters for “victims of trafficking” are interesting not because there should be greater precision and consistency, or because this is possible, but because actors’ difficulties in doing so provides a clearer glimpse into the discursive work and particular constellations of power necessary to produce the category in the first place. I use discourse analysis as a tool of genealogical investigation that works to highlight the productive power of anti-trafficking discourses. Discourse refers to far more than simply what is said or written. In Laura Shepherd’s words, discourses are “systems of meaning-production rather than simply statements or language, systems that ‘fix’ meaning, however temporarily, and enable us to make sense of the world.” Social construction is a discursive process through which power relations are produced, reproduced, and contested. In short, “discourses are productive. They produce subjects, objects, and the relations among them.” An effective genealogy requires thorough empirical investigation as much, if not more so, as it requires theoretical probing. Analysis of a discursive field is necessarily analysis of discourse in action, tracing its deployment by and production of specific actors in specific contexts. For Foucault: Discourse must not be referred to the distant presence of the origin, but treated as and when it occurs… we must grasp the statement in the exact specificity of its occurrence; determine its conditions of existence, fix at least its limits, establish its correlations with other statements that may be connected with it, and show what other forms of statements it excludes. My primary concern in choosing texts was to ensure coverage of dominant discourses—in this case, those associated with feminist and religious abolitionism. Immersion in abolitionist literature, news media reports, speeches, congressional hearings, and web sites allowed me to identify key texts—those frequently cross-referenced or cited, or given particular emphasis by the actors themselves—that serve as the backbones of the following three chapters. Multiple readings of these texts, seen in concert with one another, are required to account for the principle of intertextuality, or the notion that statements and actions are always within a broader text that give them intersubjective meaning, and this single text itself is in meaning-giving and meaning-taking relationships with other texts. Determination of texts as key is an inductive, recursive, and reflexive process; key texts were not chosen before the study but discovered as part of it through a process of reading that is ongoing, repeated, and subject to feedback and revision. I judged coverage to have been reached once key texts and basic discourses began to reappear without major changes or additions.