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## Politics

#### GOP will give into *political pressure* but it’ll be a fight

Sargent 10-30-13 GREG SARGENT . Washington Post “Immigration reform is definitely undead” [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/10/30/immigration-reform-is-definitely-undead/] [MG]

We now have three House Republicans who have signed on to the House Dem comprehensive immigration reform bill, putting immigration reform officially back in the “undead” category. GOP Rep. David Valadao of California is officially on board with the bipartisan proposal, according to a statement from the Congressman sent my way: “I have been working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground on the issue of immigration reform. Recently, I have focused my efforts on joining with likeminded Republicans in organizing and demonstrating to Republican Leadership broad support within the Party to address immigration reform in the House by the end of the year. “By supporting H.R. 15 I am strengthening my message: Addressing immigration reform in the House cannot wait. I am serious about making real progress and will remain committed to doing whatever it takes to repair our broken immigration system.” Valadao’s move is not wholly unexpected, given that he inhabits a moderate district with a lot of Latinos. But his insistence that addressing immigration reform “cannot wait” is helpful. It seems like an implicit message to the GOP leadership: We must act this year, and on this bill, if necessary. This comes after GOP Reps. leana Ros-Lehtinen and Jeff Denham did the same. Denham has said he expects “more” Republicans to ultimately sign on, and has also said that the House GOP leadership told him there will be a vote on something immigration-related by the end of the year. It’s unclear whether there will actually be a House vote on anything involving immigration before the year runs out, and it seems very unlikely that there will be a vote on the House Dem measure, which is essentially the Senate comprehensive immigration reform bill, without the Corker-Hoeven border security amendment that House Dems dislike, and instead with another border security amendment House Dems like swapped in. However, the movement among Republicans towards the Dem bill — even if it is only a trickle for now — is interesting, as a reminder that immigration reform can happen if House GOP leaders actually want it to. To be sure, immigration reform faces a huge obstacle: The stark underlying structural realities of the House Republican caucus. Far too few Republican members have large enough Latino populations to impact the outcome in 2014. With primaries coming, there just may be no incentive for Republicans to act until after the 2014 elections. But there are other factors to consider. In some key respects, immigration reform poses its own unique set of political challenges and conditions — it is not quite as polarizing an issue as, say, Obamacare or even the question of whether to agree to new revenues as part of a budget deal. Major GOP aligned constituencies — the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, evangelicals, high tech and agricultural interests in the districts of House Republicans – want immigration reform. What’s more, there is a built-in incentive for Republicans to put this issue behind them, given the slow forward march of demographic realities. Also, as longtime immigration operative Simon Rosenberg explains, Congressional Republicans have a long history of working on this issue. And some polls show that even sizable chunks of Republican voters want comprehensive reform, particularly if it is packaged with border security (Republican pollster Whit Ayres’ research, in particular, has shown that even GOP primary voters want action when informed that the other option is the status quo or “de facto amnesty,” as some pro-reform Republicans put it. Indeed, if there is anything that can make something happen, it’s the possibility that inaction is far more difficult politically for Republicans than many of them (and many commentators) claim. The immigration problem — “de facto amnesty” is not going away. If more Republicans like these three urge action inside the GOP caucus, it’s not impossible that House GOP leaders will allow votes on border security, the Kids Act, or potentially the legalization proposal that Republicans are said to be working on. That could possibly get us to conference. Yes, immigration reform remains decidedly undead.

#### Economic Policies Unpop – Public and Congress

**Wilson ‘13**

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

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

#### PC Is Key to Getting the *Essential Parts* of the Bill Through

Anderson Robichaud October 25, 2013. n behalf of Robichaud, Anderson & Alcantara P.A. posted in US Immigration Law on “Beyond The Poisoned Well” http://www.robichaudlaw.com/blog/2013/10/beyond-the-poisoned-well-immigration-reform-tactics-changing.shtml

President Obama has not given up on enacting comprehensive immigration reform. ¶ To be sure, there is concern in Washington, DC and around the country that the partisan wrangling over the partial federal government shutdown "poisoned the well" of good will that may be needed to get the president and both chambers of Congress to agree on a specific proposal.¶ That is one reason why it may be necessary to break up the proposal passed by the Senate earlier this year into several different smaller bills. The smaller bills could tackle specific issues such as work visas or family immigration.¶ This week, there were indications that President Obama may be coming around to that point of view.¶ After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, the hope was that the U.S. House of Representatives would take up that bill. But the House did not do so. And now, after the passage of several months and the reality-check of the shutdown, the president appears to be shifting his tactics.¶ President Obama said this week that he is open to proposals from Republicans about possibly dividing up an immigration overhaul into several separate parts.¶ In political terms, it may be more practical to pass one or more of those parts than to keep holding out for a comprehensive reform that addresses all of the issues, all at once.¶ Of course, in either form -- either comprehensive or broken into separate parts -- it will take considerable political capital and probably some (often elusive) compromise to actually pass immigration reform. But President Obama is clearly still committed to making such reform one of the top priorities of his second term.

#### That contains the aging crisis

Joseph Nye 12, former US assistant secretary of defense and chairman of the US National Intelligence Council, 12/10/12, Immigration and American Power, www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye

While too rapid a rate of immigration can cause social problems, over the long term, immigration strengthens US power. It is estimated that at least 83 countries and territories currently have fertility rates that are below the level needed to keep their population constant. Whereas most developed countries will experience a shortage of people as the century progresses, America is one of the few that may avoid demographic decline and maintain its share of world population. For example, to maintain its current population size, Japan would have to accept 350,000 newcomers annually for the next 50 years, which is difficult for a culture that has historically been hostile to immigration. In contrast, the Census Bureau projects that the US population will grow by 49% over the next four decades. Today, the US is the world’s third most populous country; 50 years from now it is still likely to be third (after only China and India). This is highly relevant to economic power: whereas nearly all other developed countries will face a growing burden of providing for the older generation, immigration could help to attenuate the policy problem for the US. In addition, though studies suggest that the short-term economic benefits of immigration are relatively small, and that unskilled workers may suffer from competition, skilled immigrants can be important to particular sectors – and to long-term growth. There is a strong correlation between the number of visas for skilled applicants and patents filed in the US. At the beginning of this century, Chinese- and Indian-born engineers were running one-quarter of Silicon Valley’s technology businesses, which accounted for $17.8 billion in sales; and, in 2005, immigrants had helped to start one-quarter of all US technology start-ups during the previous decade. Immigrants or children of immigrants founded roughly 40% of the 2010 Fortune 500 companies. Equally important are immigration’s benefits for America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, connections between immigrants and their families and friends back home help to convey accurate and positive information about the US. Likewise, because the presence of many cultures creates avenues of connection with other countries, it helps to broaden Americans’ attitudes and views of the world in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances both. Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world and melds them into a diverse culture of creativity. China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US. That is a view that Americans should take to heart. If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to **maintain the strength of the US.**

#### Uncontrolled aging crisis causes nuclear war

**Howe and Jackson 09**, researchers at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and co-authors of "The Graying of the Great Powers: Demography and Geopolitics in the 21st Century," (Neil and Richard, “ The World Won't Be Aging Gracefully. Just the Opposite.” January 4, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/01/02/AR2009010202231.html>)

The world is in crisis. A financial crash and a deepening recession are afflicting rich and poor countries alike. The threat of weapons of mass destruction looms ever larger. A bipartisan congressional panel announced last month that the odds of a nuclear or biological terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the year 2014 are better than 50-50. It looks as though we'll be grappling with these economic and geopolitical challenges well into the 2010s. But if you think that things couldn't get any worse, wait till the 2020s. The economic and geopolitical climate could become even more threatening by then -- and this time the reason will be demographics. Yes, demographics, that relentless maker and breaker of civilizations. From the fall of the Roman and the Mayan empires to the Black Death to the colonization of the New World and the youth-driven revolutions of the 20th century, demographic trends have played a decisive role in precipitating many of the great invasions, political upheavals, migrations and environmental catastrophes of history. By the 2020s, an ominous new conjuncture of these trends will once again threaten massive disruption. We're talking about global aging, which is likely to have a profound effect on economic growth, living standards and the shape of the world order. For the world's wealthy nations, the 2020s are set to be a decade of hyperaging and population decline. Many countries will experience fiscal crisis, economic stagnation and ugly political battles over entitlements and immigration. Meanwhile, poor countries will be buffeted by their own demographic storms. Some will be overwhelmed by massive age waves that they can't afford, while others will be whipsawed by new explosions of youth whose aspirations they cannot satisfy. The risk of social and political upheaval and military aggression will grow throughout the developing world -- even as the developed world's capacity to deal with these threats weakens. The rich countries have been aging for decades, due to falling birthrates and rising life spans. But in the 2020s, this aging will get an extra kick as large postwar baby boom generations move into retirement. According to the United Nations Population Division (whose projections are cited throughout this article), the median ages of Western Europe and Japan, which were 34 and 33 respectively as recently as 1980, will soar to 47 and 52, assuming no miraculous change in fertility. In Italy, Spain and Japan, more than half of all adults will be older than the official retirement age -- and there will be more people in their 70s than in their 20s. Graying means paying -- more for pensions, more for health care, more for nursing homes for the frail elderly. Yet the old-age benefit systems of most developed countries are already pushing the limits of fiscal and economic affordability. By the 2020s, political warfare over brutal benefit cuts seems unavoidable. On one side will be young adults who face declining after-tax earnings, including many who often have no choice but to live with their parents (and are known, pejoratively, as twixters in the United States, kippers in Britain, mammoni in Italy, nesthocker in Germany and freeters in Japan). On the other side will be retirees, who are often wholly dependent on pay-as-you-go public plans. In 2030, young people will have the future on their side. Elders will have the votes on theirs. Bold new investments in education, the environment or foreign assistance will be highly unlikely. Aging is, well, old. But depopulation -- the delayed result of falling birthrates -- is new. The working-age population has already begun to decline in several large developed countries, including Germany and Japan. By 2030, it will be declining in nearly all of them, and in a growing number, total population will be in steep decline as well. The arithmetic is simple: When the average couple has only 1.3 children (in Spain) or 1.7 children (in Britain), depopulation is inevitable, unless there's massive immigration. The economics of depopulation are grim. Even at full employment, real gross domestic product may decline, because the number of workers will be falling faster than productivity is rising. With the size of markets fixed or shrinking, businesses and governments may try to lock in their positions through cartels and protectionist policies, ushering in a zero-growth psychology not seen since the 1930s. With each new birth cohort smaller than the last, the typical workplace will be top-heavy with graybeards. Looking for a flexible, creative, entrepreneurial labor force? You'll have come to the wrong address. Meanwhile, with the demand for low-wage labor rising, immigration (assuming no rise over today's rate) will double the percentage of Muslims in France and triple it in Germany. By 2030, Amsterdam, Marseille, Birmingham and Cologne are likely to be majority Muslim. In Europe, the demographic ebb tide will deepen the crisis of confidence reflected in such best-selling books as "France is Falling," by Nicolas Baverez; "Can Germany Be Saved?" by Hans-Werner Sinn; or "The Last Days of Europe," by Walter Laqueur. The media in Europe are already rife with dolorous stories about the closing of schools and maternity wards, the abandonment of rural towns and the lawlessness of immigrant youths in large cities. A recent cover of Der Spiegel shows a baby hoisting 16 old Germans on a barbell with the caption: "The Last German -- On the Way to an Old People's Republic." In Japan, the government half-seriously projects the date at which there will be only one Japanese citizen left alive. An important but limited exception to hyperaging is the United States. Yes, America is also graying, but to a lesser extent. We are the only developed nation with replacement-rate fertility (2.1 children per couple). By 2030, our median age, now 36, will rise to only 39. Our working-age population, according to both U.N. and census projections, will continue to grow throughout the 21st century because of our higher fertility rate and substantial immigration -- which we assimilate better than most other developed countries. By 2015, for the first time ever, the majority of developed-world citizens will live in English-speaking countries. America certainly faces some serious structural challenges, including an engorged health-care sector and a chronically low savings rate that may become handicaps as we age. But unlike Europe and Japan, we will still have the youth and fiscal resources to afford a major geopolitical role. The declinists have it wrong. The challenge facing America by the 2020s is not the inability of a weakening United States to lead the developed world. It is the inability of the other developed nations to be of much assistance -- or indeed, the likelihood that many will be in dire need of assistance themselves. A major reason the wealthy countries will need strong leadership are the demographic storms about to hit the developing world. Consider China, which may be the first country to grow old before it grows rich. For the past quarter-century, China has been "peacefully rising," thanks in part to a one-child policy that has allowed both parents to work and contribute to China's boom. But by the 2020s, as the huge Red Guard generation born before the country's fertility decline moves into retirement, they will tax the resources of their children and the state. China's coming age wave -- by 2030 it will be an older country than the United States -- may weaken the two pillars of the current regime's legitimacy: rapidly rising GDP and social stability. Imagine workforce growth slowing to zero while tens of millions of elders sink into indigence without pensions, without health care and without children to support them. China could careen toward social collapse -- or, in reaction, toward an authoritarian clampdown. Russia, along with the rest of Eastern Europe, is likely to experience the fastest extended population decline since the plague-ridden Middle Ages. Amid a widening health crisis, the Russian fertility rate has plunged and life expectancy has collapsed. Russian men today can expect to live to 59, 16 years less than American men and marginally less than their Red Army grandfathers at the end of World War II. By 2050, Russia is due to fall to 20th place in world population rankings, down from fourth place in 1950. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin flatly calls Russia's demographic implosion "the most acute problem facing our country today." If the problem isn't solved, Russia will weaken progressively -- raising the nightmarish specter of a failed state with nukes. Or this cornered bear may lash out in revanchist fury rather than meekly accept its demographic fate. Of course, some developing regions will remain extremely young in the 2020s. Sub-Saharan Africa -- which is afflicted with the world's highest fertility rates and ravaged by AIDS -- will still be racked by large youth bulges. So will several Muslim-majority countries, including Afghanistan, Iraq, the Palestinian territories, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. In recent years, most of these countries have demonstrated the correlation between extreme youth and violence. If that correlation endures, chronic unrest and state failure could persist through the 2020s -- or even longer if fertility fails to drop. Many fast-modernizing countries where fertility has fallen very recently and very steeply will experience an ominous resurgence of youth in the 2020s. It's a law of demography that when a population boom is followed by a bust, it causes a ripple effect, with a gradually fading cycle of echo booms and busts. In the 2010s, a bust generation will be coming of age in much of Latin America, South Asia and the Muslim world. But by the 2020s, an echo boom will follow -- dashing economic expectations, swelling the ranks of the unemployed and perhaps fueling political violence, ethnic strife and religious extremism. These echo booms will be especially large in Pakistan and Iran. In Pakistan, the number of young people in the volatile 15- to 24-year-old age bracket will contract by 3 percent in the 2010s, then leap upward by 20 percent in the 2020s. In Iran, the youth boomerang will be even larger: minus 31 percent in the 2010s and plus 30 percent in the 2020s. These echo booms will be occurring in countries whose social fabric is already strained by rapid development. One teeters on the brink of chaos, while the other aspires to regional hegemony. One already has nuclear weapons, and the other seems likely to obtain them. All told, population trends point inexorably toward a more dominant U.S. role in a world that will need us more, not less. For the past several years, the U.N. has published a table ranking the world's 12 most populous countries over time. In 1950, six of the top 12 were developed countries. In 2000, only three were. By 2050, only one developed country will remain -- the United States, still in third place. By then, it will be the only country among the top 12 with a historical commitment to democracy, free markets and civil liberties. Abraham Lincoln once called this country "the world's last best hope." Demography suggests that this will remain true for some time to come.

## 1nc – Short

#### The utopian neoliberal discourse of nanotech glosses over the inherent risks of nanotech - risks environmental catastrophe, intergenerational inequality, and destroys democracy

Rudd 2009, - Jeffery Rudd is a lawyer who is now a doctoral student in Environmental Studies at the University of Wisconsin (“U.S. nanotechnology policy and the decay of environmental law, 1980 – 2005”, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 2009. 3399926,Portions of this dissertation are modified from previous publications in and reprinted with the permission of the Columbia Journal of Environmental Law, Ecology Law Quarterly, and the William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review. The preparation and writing of this dissertation was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant no. DMR0425880.)//RJ

This dissertation analyzes institutional and ideological changes occurring since the Environmental Era supporting its thesis that neoliberalism's economic logic has transformed environmental law and eroded its normative authority to protect humans and the environment from me risks of economic development. Chapter 1 illustrates how institutions resting beneath the surface of environmental law combined with political shifts toward neoliberalism to undercut legal protections for health and the environment. The legal process school's "institutional competence" idea, born during the New Deal, produced administrative standards of technical expertise and political independence that evolved to undermine Environmental Era visions of a fundamental normative shift in the exercise of political authority over public policy. Supreme Court decisions in Vermont Yankee and Baltimore Gas expanded regulatory agencies' authority over the role of science in environmental law to the detriment of normative concerns. The Court's Chadha and Chevron decisions insulated administrative rulemaking from meaningful deliberative adjustment. Institutional competence themes of economic efficiency and rational order combined with regulatory agencies' broad authority to support the gradual domination of neoliberalism's economic logic over the environmental regulatory regime. Chapter 2 analyzes the institutional evolution of nanotechnology policy in the United States between the late 1980s and 2003. Nanotechnology is the manipulation of matter on an Id. at 703. 38 atomic or near-atomic scale to produce new materials and devices. The policy's primary legal institutions are the National Nanotechnology Initiative ("NNI") and the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act200 ("NRDA"). Economic logic drove the genesis of nanotechnology policy, contributing subtly to the erosion of environmental law's normative authority. Congress failed to ensure that environmental law would adequately protect humans and the environment from the risks nanotechnology posed to humans and the environment. Nanotechnology policy developed at odds with sustainable development ideals of intergenerational equity, environmental protection, and deliberative democratic governance. Chapter 3 takes a closer look at the discourse contained in government reports that drove the genesis of nanotechnology policy. It shows how an insulated group of like-minded individuals may produce a one-sided view of the risks or benefits of a new technology. The reports' economic discourse helps explain Congress's failure to ensure that nanotechnology policy adequately protected humans and the environment. The discourse reflects a system of beliefs about nanotechnology that resist recognizing the potential for the technology to pose significant risks to society and the environment. The reports' Utopian conception of nanotechnology lacked space for a reasonable portrayal of its risks, subtly devaluing concerns about health and environmental protections. The policy discourse also undercut the force of environmental laws designed to integrate the protection of human health and the environment with the commercialization of new technologies. 39 Chapter 4 analyzes the institutional evolution of the Toxic Substance Control Act 901 ("TSCA") to integrate the first chapter's overarching discussion of environmental law's transformation with subsequent chapters' analysis of nanotechnology policy. It continues the third chapter's focus on power over information to illuminate differences between neoliberalism and sustainable development. It describes TSCA's transformation from a law intended to protect public health and the environment into a symbol of the market's power over the implementation of environmental legislation. It compares the relative costs of risk-related information among government, industry, and the public and concludes that industry's low costs of information allow it to dominate administrative decision-making. This institutional arrangement undercuts transparency and weakens the environmental regulatory regime, forcing the Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") to adopt deregulatory or voluntary compliance policies. The chapter concludes with a proposal to amend TSCA with regulatory penalty default rules that lower the EPA's information and litigation costs, create incentives for industry to share riskrelated information, and enhance the EPA's political accountability

#### The affirmative is confined to the dominant discourse of transnational capital. The affirmative buys into a system which produces unethical policy based on the short term logic of growth. This causes economic crisis and environmental destruction

Makwana 06 (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization¶ The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.¶ The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.¶ There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.¶ The neoliberal experiment has failed to combat extreme poverty, has exacerbated global inequality, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.¶ Introduction ¶ After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.¶ Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.¶ The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.¶ There is a consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.¶ There is a huge discrepancy between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)¶ Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).¶ The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.¶ The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.¶ According to Maria Páez Victor:¶ “Since 1846 the United States has carried out no fewer than 50 military invasions and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of perceived threats to its economic control and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”¶ As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.¶ So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.¶ However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.¶ The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.¶ Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.¶ Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.¶ Economic Growth¶ Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.¶ Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.¶ Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.¶ The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.¶ Free Trade¶ Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.¶ With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.¶ The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, increased inequality and caused environmental destruction.¶ In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.¶ The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.¶ These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly biased in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.¶ Liberalization¶ The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.¶ According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.¶ Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely destroys local industries. It creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and economic crisis in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.¶ A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.¶

#### The alternative is a process of critique that challenges the ideology of capital by prioritizing human development over production

Lebowitz 07 (Michael A. Lebowitz is author of Beyond Capital: Marx’s Political Economy of the Working Class (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), Build It Now: Socialism for the Twenty-First Century (Monthly Review Press, 2006), and The Socialist Alternative: Real Human Development (Monthly Review Press, forthcoming in 2008). Portions of this essay were presented as “Going Beyond Survival: Making the Social Economy a Real Alternative” at the Fourth International Meeting of the Solidarity Economy, July 21–23, 2006, at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, “Venezuela: A Good Example of the Bad Left of Latin America”, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/07/01/venezuela-a-good-example-of-the-bad-left-of-latin-america>,)

What constitutes a real alternative to capitalism? I suggest that it is a society in which the explicit goal is not the growth of capital or of the material means of production but, rather, human development itself—the growth of human capacities. We can see this perspective embodied in the Bolivarian Constitution of Venezuela—in Article 299’s emphasis upon “ensuring overall human development,” in the declaration of Article 20 that “everyone has the right to the free development of his or her own personality,” and in the focus of Article 102 upon “developing the creative potential of every human being and the full exercise of his or her personality in a democratic society.”¶ In these passages (which are by no means the whole of that constitution), there is the conception of a real alternative—an economy whose logic is not the logic of capital. “The social economy,” President Hugo Chávez said in September 2003, “bases its logic on the human being, on work, that is to say, on the worker and the worker’s family, that is to say, in the human being.” That social economy, he continued, does not focus on economic gain, on exchange values; rather, “the social economy generates mainly use-value.” Its purpose is “the construction of the new man, of the new woman, of the new society.”¶ These are beautiful ideas and beautiful words, but they are, of course, only ideas and words. The first set comes from a constitution and the second comes from the regular national educational seminar known as Aló Presidente. How can such ideas and words be made real? Let me suggest four preconditions for the realization of this alternative to capitalism.¶ (1) Any discussion of structural change must begin from an understanding of the existing structure—in short, from an understanding of capitalism. We need to grasp that the logic of capital, the logic in which profit rather than satisfaction of the needs of human beings is the goal, dominates both where it fosters the comparative advantage of repression and also where it accepts an increase in slave rations. (2) It is essential to attack the logic of capital ideologically. In the absence of the development of a mass understanding of the nature of capital—that capital is the result of the social labor of the collective worker—the need to survive the ravages of neoliberal and repressive policies produces only the desire for a fairer society, the search for a better share for the exploited and excluded: in short, barbarism with a human face.¶ (3) A critical aspect in the battle to go beyond capitalism is the recognition that human capacity develops only through human activity, only through what Marx understood as “revolutionary practice,” the simultaneous changing of circumstances and self-change. Real human development does not drop from the sky in the form of money to support survival or the expenditures of popular governments upon education and health. In contrast to populism, which produces people who look to the state for all answers and to leaders who promise everything, the conception which truly challenges the logic of capital in the battle of ideas is one which explicitly recognizes the centrality of self-management in the workplace and self-government in the community as the means of unleashing human potential—i.e., the idea of socialism for the twenty-first century.¶ (4) But, the idea of this socialism cannot displace real capitalism. Nor can dwarfish islands of cooperation change the world by competing successfully against capitalist corporations. You need the power to foster the new productive relations while truncating the reproduction of capitalist productive relations. You need to take the power of the state away from capital, and you need to use that power when capital responds to encroachments—when capital goes on strike, you must be prepared to move in rather than give in. Winning the “battle of democracy” and using “political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie” remains as critical now as when Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. Consider these preconditions. Are they being met by the new Latin American governments on the left? On the contrary, for the most part, we can see the familiar characteristics of social democracy—which does not understand the nature of capital, does not attack the logic of capital ideologically, does not believe that there is a real alternative to capitalism, and, not surprisingly, gives in when capital threatens to go on strike.¶ “We can’t kill the goose that lays the golden eggs,” announced the social democratic premier of British Columbia in Canada (in the 1970s when I was party policy chairman). Here, crystallized, is the ultimate wisdom of social democracy—the manner in which social democracy enforces the logic of capital and ideologically disarms and demobilizes people.¶ Venezuela, however, is going in a different direction at this point. While the Bolivarian Revolution did not start out to build a socialist alternative (and its continuation along this path is contested every step of the way), it is both actively rejecting the logic of capital and also ideologically arming and mobilizing people to build that alternative.

## 1NC

#### Text: The Department of Defense should increase its funding for the development, regulation, and use of advanced and equitable nanotechnology toward Mexico

#### The DoD will solve the case better – avoids politics

Shaffer 7 [Alan, Department of Defense Director of Defense Research and Engineering, April 26 2007, “Defense Nanotechnology Research and Development”Program http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/nano2007.pdf.]

Nanotechnology research remains a major national initiative, and DoD remains at the forefront as a major contributor, as it has even before the inception of this initiative. Considerable scientific knowledge is yet to be learned, and DoD guidance is critical to assure both the optimum direction of ongoing research efforts and the optimum leveraging of this knowledge to advance war fighter and battle systems capabilities. The current DoD nanotechnology programs represent a balanced and dynamic investment portfolio addressing both near-term national security needs and long-term challenges. As a part of the reliance process, DoD will continue to coordinate its nanotechnology programs amongst the services, DARPA, and other federal agencies to maximize leveraging and avoid duplication and redundancy. As basic research efforts in nanotechnology continue to mature, it is anticipated that the results will be transitioned to applied research efforts and advanced technology development in both the military and industry sectors. Increasing emphasis is being put on communication and effective transitioning of research to technology development for the services, which will require more effective coupling between the different funding categories, and between the basic research programs and SBIR/STTR and MANTECH programs. Also, DoD is continuing to work with the NSTC Interagency Working Group to augment the federal program in nanomanufacturing, since this area remains a significant barrier to the commercialization of nanomaterials and nanotechnology-based products. Current research and development programs in support of nanotechnology span a broad range of science and technology areas that are of primary interest to DoD. Because these programs are inherently high risk with the potential for extremely high payoff, major advances in the application of nanotechnology to the military are often unpredictable (particularly when attempting to assess basic research and early applied research efforts). For this reason, it is critical to maintain a stable (relative to the overall DoD research and development budget) and strategic (relative to the worldwide investment) nanotechnology research and development investment portfolio in order to identify and capture the critical technological breakthroughs needed to provide revolutionary advantages for war fighter and battle systems capabilities. It is essential that breakthroughs in nanotechnology be exploited for these capabilities, but also that DoD’s support for highly adaptive and innovative research and development (which helped conceive the current international nanotechnology focus) not be restricted by a singular focus on nanotechnology (or any other single area). 1. Fundamental Nanoscale Phenomena and Processes: Sustained support is recommended to ensure the discovery of new phenomena and processes necessary for breakthrough advantages in DoD systems, particularly in the areas of: chemical/biological sensing; electronic phenomena; and energetics. 2. Nanomaterials: Sustained support and increased attention is recommended to realize strategies for robust incorporation and design of nanoscale phenomena into advanced materials for a broad spectrum of revolutionary target applications. Significant barriers continue to persist between the discovery of promising nanoscale phenomena and the realization of novel (particularly bulk) materials properties based on these phenomena. 3. Nanoscale Devices and Systems: Sustained support is recommended to assure the continual development of novel devices and systems to enhance DoD capabilities, particularly in the areas of: chemical/biological defense; information technology; energy storage; multifunctional materials and devices; and health monitoring and sensing. 4. Instrumentation Research, Metrology, and Standards for Nanotechnology: Sustained support is recommended to ensure appropriate involvement, guidance, and leveraging by DoD in this area to enhance research and development progress in all other component areas. 5. Nanomanufacturing: Increased support is recommended by means of the SBIR/STTR and MANTECH programs in order to facilitate transitioning and a sufficient supply of materials and devices for defense technologies. While the SBIR/STTR programs have demonstrated significant support for nanotechnology-based products during the past few years, further increases in SBIR/STTR activities and significant MANTECH investments are strongly encouraged in order to achieve the greatest success. 6. Major Research Facilities and Instrumentation Acquisition: Sustained support is recommended to ensure continual development of advanced instrumentation and opportunities for leveraging of unique capabilities in these areas by other agencies. 7. Societal Dimensions: Sustained support is recommended to assure the health and safety of war fighters utilizing future nanotechnology-based applications, particularly in terms of the newly formed Nanomaterials Working Group under the Emerging Contaminant Governance Board, in order address emerging international attention on the potential environmental health and safety effects of nanotechnology. Additionally, this working group is expected to enhance DoD’s ability to collaborate with other agencies in this area, to leverage the investments and expertise of major health agencies worldwide, to identify potential health risks, and to implement optimal and appropriate safety practices for both war fighters and defense product developers.

## 1nc - mexico

#### Interpretation – affs must only be government-to-government assistance – toward means they have to reach the government

**Oxford English Dictionary Online 13**

(<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/204005?rskey=RB1oz4&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid> Accessed 7/7/13)

†c. With implication of reaching; to. Obs.

#### Most studies of economic engagement support our interpretation

Kahler and Kastner 06

Miles, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at University of California, San Diego, and Scott, Department of Government and Politics at University of Maryland, “STRATEGIC USES OF ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE: ENGAGEMENT POLICIES IN SOUTH KOREA, SINGAPORE, AND TAIWAN”, Journal of Peace Research, Sage.

Economic engagement – a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations – is a subject of growing interest in international relations. Most research on economic statecraft emphasizes coercive policies such as economic sanctions. This emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa, 1994; Pollins, 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how often strategies of economic engagement are deployed: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno, 2003). Beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies of economic engagement have been limited to the policies of great powers (Mastanduno, 1992; Davis, 1999; Skalnes, 2000; Papayoanou & Kastner, 1999/2000; Copeland, 1999/2000; Abdelal & Kirshner, 1999/2000). However, engagement policies adopted by South Korea and one other state examined in this study, Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics and that it may be more widespread than previously recognized. We begin by developing a theoretical approach to strategies of economic engagement. Based on the existing literature, our framework distinguishes different forms of economic engagement and identifies the factors likely to facilitate or undermine the implementation of these strategies. We then evaluate our hypotheses by examining the use of economic engagement on the Korean Peninsula and across the Taiwan Strait. Because our conclusions are derived from a small number of cases, we are cautious in making claims that our findings can be generalized. The narratives that we provide and the conclusions that we draw from them may, however, spur further research on this interesting and important feature of security policy and international politics.

#### Mexico means the government

**Free Dictionary.com** (<http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Mexico>)

a republic in S North America. 100,294,036; 761,604 sq. mi. (1,972,545 sq. km). Cap.: [Mexico City.](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Mexico%20City)

**Violation – they use [the private sector/etc]**

**That’s a voting issue**

**They explode the topic – allows them to use hundreds of different companies with distinct advantages and let’s them invite other countries like Europe or China to be part of the engagement**

**And wrecks neg ground – we can’t get country politics or relations DAs**

## 1

#### No Regulatory Framework for Nanotech – The Plan Changes That – Turns the Case

CRN, 08 – non-profit research and advocacy think tank concerned with the major societal and environmental implications of advanced nanotechnology and a modern, networked, virtual organization -- with no "brick and mortar" -- a collection of more than 100 volunteers, over 1000 interested followers, and a small team of primary coordinators with no direct affiliation to any government, business, or academic organization (“Dangers of Molecular Manufacturing”, Center for Responsible Nanotechnology, 2008, http://www.crnano.org/dangers.htm#terrorists)//EX

Uncontrolled availability of nanofactory technology can result from either insufficient or overzealous regulation. Inadequate regulation would make it easy to obtain and use an unrestricted nanofactory. Overzealous regulation would create a pent-up demand for nanotech products, which if it gets strong enough, would fund espionage, cracking of restricted technology, or independent development, and eventually create a black market beyond the control of central authorities (nanofactories are very smugglable). Note that sufficiently abusive or restrictive regulation can motivate internal espionage; at least one atomic spy in the US was idealistically motivated. Uncontrolled availability of molecular manufacturing greatly increases many of the dangers cited above. Competing nanotech programs increase the danger. The existence of multiple programs to develop molecular manufacturing greatly increases some of the risks listed above. Each program provides a separate opportunity for the technology to be stolen or otherwise released from restriction. Each nation with an independent program is potentially a separate player in a nanotech arms race. The reduced opportunity for control may make restrictions harder to enforce, but this may lead to greater efforts to impose harsher restrictions. Reduced control also makes it less likely that a non-disruptive economic solution can develop. Relinquishment is counterproductive. Facing all these risks, there will be a strong temptation simply to outlaw the technology. However, we don't believe this can work. Many nations are already spending millions on basic nanotechnology; within a decade, advanced nanotech will likely be within the reach of large corporations. It can't be outlawed worldwide. And if the most risk-aware countries stop working on it, then the less responsible countries are the ones that will be developing it and dealing with it. Besides, legal regulation may not have much effect on covert military programs. Molecular manufacturing may be delayed by strict regulation, but this would probably make things worse in the long run. If MM development is delayed until it's relatively easy, it will then be a lot harder to keep track of all the development programs. Also, with a more advanced technology base, the development of nano-built products could happen even faster than we have described, leaving less time to adjust to the societal disruptions. Solving these problems won't be easy. Some of these risks arise from too little regulation, and others from too much regulation. Several different kinds of regulation will be necessary in several different fields. An extreme or knee-jerk response to any of these risks will simply create fertile ground for other risks. The risks are of several different types, so a single approach (commercial, military, free-information) cannot prevent all of them. Some of the risks are sufficiently extreme that society cannot adjust to the risk while testing various approaches to prevent it. A single grey goo release, or unstable nanotech arms race, is intolerable. Threading a path between all these risks will require careful advance planning.

#### Nanotech laboratories would be bombed by eco-anarchist groups, turns the case

**The Verge, 12** – National News Report Service (“Eco-anarchists fight nanotechnology research with bombs”, The Verge, 9/2/2012, http://www.theverge.com/2012/9/2/3285426/mexico-its-nanotechnology-eco-anarchists-bombs)//EX

Major advances in technology often stir opposition, and as Nature reports, nanotechnology is no exception: an eco-anarchist group known as Individuals Tending Towards Savagery (ITS) has been responsible for several bombings at prominent nanotechnology universities in Mexico over the past two years. The group reportedly looks to prevent "nanocontamination" and agrees with author Derrik Jensen's view that "industrial civilization is responsible for environmental destruction and must be dismantled." Nanotechnology concerns are a global issue — in 2010 another group attempted to bomb IBM's nanotechnology lab in Switzerland — but Nature explores why Mexico appears to be the epicenter of the violence. Mexico began investing heavily in nanotechnology in 2002 in an attempt to develop the country's economy, and Nature speculates that concern over the environmental and health impacts of nanotechnology combined with growing violence and political upheaval in the country may have lead to the inception of groups like the ITS. Nature says that while other environmental activist groups like the Canada-based ETC condemn the violence, they're worried about even more elaborate consequences, like a future in which "the merger of living and non-living matter will reskkult in hybrid organisms and products that are not easy to control." Regardless of whether the violence continues to spread, universities have instituted new stringent security measures to combat the attacks, and researchers told Nature that they will not be discouraged from their work.

#### Latin American nanotech initiatives aren’t aligned with key industries—devastates nanotech projects

Kay et al 09

School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology; Shapira- Manchester Institute of Innovation Research, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester (Luciano, Philip, “Developing nanotechnology in Latin America”, 02/11/2009, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#__ffn_sectitle>//VS)

Related to this, we observe the concentration of nanotechnology research in a few disciplines and sectors in the four focal countries.29 Although this finding is not surprising when compared with results of previous research, we suggest that these countries might consider strategies that seek to better align public R&D with industry and innovation priorities. At the same time, given the convergent scientific characteristics of nanotechnology, any approach should incorporate different disciplines (de la Vega et al. 2007) as intended by, for example, by the Brazil multidisciplinary research programs. However, the data suggest that nanotechnology research may be not fully aligned with all key industry sectors. For example, there may be needs for additional efforts at nanotechnology interfaces in engineering and electronics in Brazil, and biology and agriculture in both Argentina and Uruguay. On the other hand, Chile is undertaking nanotechnology research in more diverse areas including biology, which is related to important sectors for the country such as forestry and fishing. We note that allying research with economic sectors and potential commercialization targets is not an insignificant task, and even in the leading international centers is not clear what (and how) opportunity area in nanotechnology should best be targeted (Zucker and Darby 2005). Still, there seem to be challenges here for Latin American countries in the mix of research areas: at present, research occurs where academic presence is strongest, but these areas may not always mesh with economic sector opportunities. At the same time, given the existing problems of research scale and resources, it may not be feasible for most Latin American countries to develop new research areas.¶ We found that “Southern” (or intra-MERCOSUR) collaboration levels are relatively low in these four countries.

#### Patenting failures and lack of incentives kills nanotech development

Kay et al 09

School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology; Shapira- Manchester Institute of Innovation Research, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester (Luciano, Philip, “Developing nanotechnology in Latin America”, 02/11/2009, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#__ffn_sectitle>//VS)

Finally, the lack of nanotechnology patenting activity has two possible explanations. The first is that these countries are in an early stage of nanotechnology development and only after some years they will be able to transform research knowledge to intellectual property that can be used for the commercialization of nanotechnology applications and nanotechnology-based products. The second explanation has more policy implications: not only may these countries be undertaking nanotechnology research that is not aligned to local industry priorities but there may also be insufficient incentives for researchers to collaborate with incumbent industries and to initiate their own start-up enterprises. If Latin American S&T policymakers want to foster the development of nanotechnology and increase transfer to and take-up by key industry sectors, they may need to encourage research and incentives that can lead to the commercialization of new technologies in national and international markets. For this, it may be necessary to increase industry–academy collaborations, intellectual property protection, and enterprise support—all pending tasks for Latin American countries (Kraul [2003](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#CR29); Fernández and Schatzmann [2007](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#CR12); Foladori and Fuentes [2007](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#CR15)).

#### Weigh consequences—moral absolutism *reproduces evil*.

Isaac 2 — Jeffrey C. Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, 2002 (“Ends, Means, and Politics,” *Dissent*, Volume 49, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via EBSCOhost, p. 35-36)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. [end page 35] This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Low industry involvement means Latin American nanotech fails

Kay et al 09

School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology; Shapira- Manchester Institute of Innovation Research, Manchester Business School, University of Manchester (Luciano, Philip, “Developing nanotechnology in Latin America”, 02/11/2009, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2988220/#__ffn_sectitle>//VS)

Our findings suggest policy issues and implications for our group of Latin American countries. For example, all four countries present some level of institutional concentration in their research. This is most pronounced in the case of Brazil, which seems to follow a strategy based on national targets rather than international collaboration, as suggested by the implementation of programs aimed at creating national research networks, like the Rede BrasilNano program. The institutional concentration of research is even greater in Uruguay (which is a much smaller country), but in this case it is consistent with its emphasis in regional collaborations and less developed S&T system. Whether greater incentives for international collaboration in nanotechnology research in Latin America are appropriate is an issue that policymakers in these countries may wish to consider.¶ Moreover, we note the weakness of industry involvement in nanotechnology research. For countries like Chile or Uruguay this is perhaps not surprising, given the emerging state of development in their industrial sectors. The weakness of industry involvement is most significant for Brazil (where conglomerates and internatioally oriented companies have emerged in technology and natural resource sectors) and, to less extent, Argentina. Possible explanations for low industry involvement include the still early stage of nanotechnology development in Latin America, the weakness of domestic corporate R&D, the dominance of foreign multi-national branches who draw on their own company rather than local universities for R&D, a general lack of industry awareness of nanotechnology, and bureaucratic barriers faced by industry in working with universities. Whatever the causes, this finding foreshadows weaknesses not only in industry R&D but also in the absorptive capabilities of firms in Latin America to apply nanotechnology applications. In Brazil, given its efforts to develop aerospace, electronics, and other advanced technologies, as well as in the resource-intensive areas of all the countries (such as the prominent minerals, metals, and pulp and paper sectors in Chile) there may be unexploited opportunities for collaborative nanotechnology R&D with industry in nanomaterials and other nanotechnology domains.

#### Voting neg doesn’t necessitate absolute utilitarianism – there is a high threshold past which we should compromise morals to avoid catastrophic consequences

Moore – law prof, U San Diego – ‘97

Michael Moore, Warren Distinguished Professor of Law at University of San Diego School of Law, 1997, Placing Blame, p. 719-722

Non-Absolute Moral Norms: Threshold Deontology Apart from the exceptions that the content of moral norms must have for them to be plausible, a third modification of absolutism is the softening of the ‘whatever the consequences’ aspect mentioned earlier. This aspect of absolutism is often attributed to Kant, who held that though the heavens may fall, justice must be done. Despite my non­consequentialist views on morality, I cannot accept the Kantian line. It just is not true that one should allow a nuclear war rather than killing or torturing an innocent person. It is not even true that one should allow the destruction of a sizable city by a terrorist nuclear device rather than kill or torture an innocent person. To prevent such extraordinary harms extreme actions seem to me to be justified. There is a story in the Talmudic sources that may appear to appeal to a contrary intuition.122 It is said that where the city is sur­rounded and threatened with destruction if it does not send out one of its inhabitants to be killed, it is better that the whole city should perish rather than become an accomplice to the killing of one of its inhabitants. Benjamin Cardozo expressed the same intuition in rejecting the idea that those in a lifeboat about to sink and drown may jettison enough of their number to allow the remainder to stay afloat. As Cardozo put it: Where two or more are overtaken by a common disaster, there is no right on the part of one to save the lives of some by the killing of another. There is no rule of human jettison. Men there will often be who, when told that their going will be the salvation of the remnant, will choose the nobler part and make the plunge into the waters. In that supreme moment the dark­ness for them will be illumined by the thought that those behind will ride to safety. If none of such mold are found aboard the boat, or too few to save the others, the human freight must be left to meet the chances of the waters. 123 There is admittedly a nobility when those who are threatened with destruction choose on their own to suffer that destruction rather than participate in a prima facie immoral act. But what happens when we eliminate the choice of all concerned to sacrifice them­selves? Alter the Talmudic example slightly by making it the ruler of the city who alone must decide whether to send one out in order to prevent destruction of the city. Or take the actual facts of the lifeboat case’24 to which Cardozo was adverting, where it was a sea­man who took charge of the sinking lifeboat and jettisoned enough of its passengers to save the rest. Or consider Bernard Williams’s example, where you come across a large group of villagers about to be shot by the army as an example to others, and you can save most of them if you will but shoot one; far from choosing to ‘sink or swim’ together, the villagers beg you to shoot one of their number so that the rest may be saved.125 In all such cases it no longer seems virtuous to refuse to do an act that you abhor. On the contrary, it seems a narcissistic preoccupation with your own ‘virtue’—that is, the ‘virtue’ you could have if the world were ideal and did not pre­sent you with such awful choices—if you choose to allow the greater number to perish. In such cases, I prefer Sartre’s version of the Orestes legend to the Talmud: the ruler should take the guilt upon himself rather than allow his people to perish.’26One should feel guilty **in such cases,** but it is nobler to undertake such guilt than to shut one’s eyes to the horrendous consequences of not acting. I thus have some sympathy for the Landau Commission’s conclusion that ‘actual torture . . . would perhaps be justified in order to uncover a bomb about to explode in a building full of people’. If one does not know which building is going to explode, one does not have the consent of all concerned to ‘sink or swim’ together. On the contrary, one suspects that like Williams’s villagers, the occupants of the building, if they knew of their danger, would choose that one of their number (to say nothing of one of the ter­rorist group) be tortured or die to prevent the loss of all. In any case, the GSS interrogator must choose for others who will pay the costs for his decision if he decides not to act, a cost he does not have to bear; this situation is thus more like my variation of the Talmudic example than the original. Many think that the agent-relative view just sketched, allowing as it does consequences to override moral absolutes when those consequences are horrendous enough, collapses into a consequen­tialist morality after all. Glanville Williams, for example, in his discussion of the legal defence of necessity, recognizes the agent-relative view that ‘certain actions are right or wrong irrespective of their consequences’ and that ‘a good end never justifies bad means’. Williams nonetheless concludes that ‘in the last resort moral decisions must be made with reference to results’. Williams reaches this conclusion because, as Williams sees it, the agent-relative slogans just quoted reduce to the claim ‘that we ought to do what is right regardless of the consequences, as long as the consequences are not serious’. Contrary to Williams, there is no collapse of agent-relative views into consequentialism just because morality’s norms can be over­ridden by horrendous consequences.13’ A consequentialist is com­mitted by her moral theory to saying that torture of one person is justified whenever it is necessary to prevent the torture of two or more. The agent-relative view, even as here modified, is not com­mitted to this proposition. To justify torturing one innocent person requires that there be horrendous consequences attached to not tor­turing that person—the destruction of an entire city, or, perhaps, of a lifeboat or building full of people. On this view, in other words, there is a very high threshold of bad consequences that must be threatened before something as awful as torturing an innocent per­son can be justified. Almost all real-life decisions a GSS interroga­tor will face—and perhaps all decisions—will not reach that threshold of horrendous consequences justifying torture of the innocent. Short of such a threshold, the agent-relative view just sketched will operate as absolutely as absolutism in its ban on tor­turing the innocent.

#### **There’s a distinction between public and personal policy – Governments must make utilitarian calculations**

Goodin 95 – Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (Robert E., Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, at relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

#### Extinction outweighs structural violence

Bostrum 12 (Nick, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute and winner of the Gannon Award, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/>)

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

#### Nuke war threat is real and o/w racism and invisible violence---their expansion of structural violence to an all-pervasive omnipresence makes preventing war impossible – also answers their value to life claim

Boulding 78

(Ken is professor of economics and director, Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan, “Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies,” The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 22, No. 2 Jun., 1978, pp. 342-354)

Galtung is very legitimately interested in problems of world poverty and the failure of development of the really poor. He tried to amalga- mate this interest with the peace research interest in the more narrow sense. Unfortunately, he did this by downgrading the study of inter- national peace, labeling it "negative peace" (it should really have been labeled "negative war") and then developing the concept of "structural violence," which initially meant all those social structures and histories which produced an expectation of life less than that of the richest and longest-lived societies. He argued by analogy that if people died before the age, say, of 70 from avoidable causes, that this was a death in "war"' which could only be remedied by something called "positive peace." Unfortunately, the concept of structural violence was broadened, in the word of one slightly unfriendly critic, to include anything that Galtung did not like. Another factor in this situation was the feeling, certainly in the 1960s and early 1970s, that nuclear deterrence was actually succeeding as deterrence and that the problem of nuclear war had receded into the background. This it seems to me is a most danger- ous illusion and diverted conflict and peace research for ten years or more away from problems of disarmament and stable peace toward a grand, vague study of world developments, for which most of the peace researchers are not particularly well qualified. To my mind, at least, the quality of the research has suffered severely as a result.' The complex nature of the split within the peace research community is reflected in two international peace research organizations. The official one, the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), tends to be dominated by Europeans somewhat to the political left, is rather, hostile to the United States and to the multinational cor- porations, sympathetic to the New International Economic Order and thinks of itself as being interested in justice rather than in peace. The Peace Science Society (International), which used to be called the Peace Research Society (International), is mainly the creation of Walter Isard of the University of Pennsylvania. It conducts meetings all around the world and represents a more peace-oriented, quantitative, science- based enterprise, without much interest in ideology. COPRED, while officially the North American representative of IPRA, has very little active connection with it and contains within itself the same ideological split which, divides the peace research community in general. It has, however, been able to hold together and at least promote a certain amount of interaction between the two points of view. Again representing the "scientific" rather than the "ideological" point of view, we have SIPRI, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, very generously (by the usual peace research stand- ards) financed by the Swedish government, which has performed an enormously useful service in the collection and publishing of data on such things as the war industry, technological developments, arma- ments, and the arms trade. The Institute is very largely the creation of Alva Myrdal. In spite of the remarkable work which it has done, how- ever, her last book on disarmament (1976) is almost a cry of despair over the folly and hypocrisy of international policies, the overwhelming power of the military, and the inability of mere information, however good, go change the course of events as we head toward ultimate ca- tastrophe. I do not wholly share her pessimism, but it is hard not to be a little disappointed with the results of this first generation of the peace research movement. Myrdal called attention very dramatically to the appalling danger in which Europe stands, as the major battleground between Europe, the United States, and the Soviet Union if war ever should break out. It may perhaps be a subconscious recognition-and psychological denial-of the sword of Damocles hanging over Europe that has made the European peace research movement retreat from the realities of the international system into what I must unkindly describe as fantasies of justice. But the American peace research community, likewise, has retreated into a somewhat niggling scientism, with sophisticated meth- odologies and not very many new ideas. I must confess that when I first became involved with the peace research enterprise 25 years ago I had hopes that it might produce some- thing like the Keynesian revolution in economics, which was the result of some rather simple ideas that had never really been thought out clearly before (though they had been anticipated by Malthus and others), coupled with a substantial improvement in the information system with the development of national income statistics which rein- forced this new theoretical framework. As a result, we have had in a single generation a very massive change in what might be called the "conventional wisdom" of economic policy, and even though this conventional wisdom is not wholly wise, there is a world of difference between Herbert Hoover and his total failure to deal with the Great Depression, simply because of everybody's ignorance, and the moder- ately skillful handling of the depression which followed the change in oil prices in 1-974, which, compared with the period 1929 to 1932, was little more than a bad cold compared with a galloping pneumonia. In the international system, however, there has been only glacial change in the conventional wisdom. There has been some improvement. Kissinger was an improvement on John Foster Dulles. We have had the beginnings of detente, and at least the possibility on the horizon of stable peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, indeed in the whole temperate zone-even though the tropics still remain uneasy and beset with arms races, wars, and revolutions which we cannot really afford. Nor can we pretend that peace around the temper- ate zone is stable enough so that we do not have to worry about it. The qualitative arms race goes on and could easily take us over the cliff. The record of peace research in the last generation, therefore, is one of very partial success. It has created a discipline and that is something of long-run consequence, most certainly for the good. It has made very little dent on the conventional wisdom of the policy makers anywhere in the world. It has not been able to prevent an arms race, any more, I suppose we might say, than the Keynesian economics has been able to prevent inflation. But whereas inflation is an inconvenience, the arms race may well be another catastrophe. Where, then, do we go from here? Can we see new horizons for peace and conflict research to get it out of the doldrums in which it has been now for almost ten years? The challenge is surely great enough. It still remains true that war, the breakdown of Galtung's "negative peace," remains the greatest clear and present danger to the human race, a danger to human survival far greater than poverty, or injustice, or oppression, desirable and necessary as it is to eliminate these things. Up to the present generation, war has been a cost and an inconven- ience to the human race, but it has rarely been fatal to the process of evolutionary development as a whole. It has probably not absorbed more than 5% of human time, effort, and resources. Even in the twenti- eth century, with its two world wars and innumerable smaller ones, it has probably not acounted for more than 5% of deaths, though of course a larger proportion of premature deaths. Now, however, ad- vancing technology is creating a situation where in the first place we are developing a single world system that does not have the redundancy of the many isolated systems of the past and in which therefore if any- thing goes wrong everything goes wrong. The Mayan civilization could collapse in 900 A.D., and collapse almost irretrievably without Europe or China even being aware of the fact. When we had a number of iso- lated systems, the catastrophe in one was ultimately recoverable by migration from the surviving systems. The one-world system, therefore, which science, transportation, and communication are rapidly giving us, is inherently more precarious than the many-world system of the past. It is all the more important, therefore, to make it internally robust and capable only of recoverable catastrophes. The necessity for stable peace, therefore, increases with every improvement in technology, either of war or of peacex

## 2

**Risk management is good---the inherent unpredictability of social events is all the more reason for creating optimal resiliency through scenario planning**

**Cochrane 11** John H. Cochrane is a **Prof**essor of finance **at** the **U**niversity of **Chicago** Booth School of Business and a contributor to Business Class "IN DEFENSE OF THE HEDGEHOGS" July 15 www.cato-unbound.org/2011/07/15/john-h-cochrane/in-defense-of-the-hedgehogs/

Risk Management Rather than Forecast-and-Plan

**The answer is to change the question**, to **focus on risk management**, **as Gardner and Tetlock suggest**. **There is a set of events that could happen tomorrow**—Chicago could have an earthquake, there could be a run on Greek debt, the Administration could decide “Heavens, Dodd–Frank and Obamacare were huge mistakes, let’s fix them” (Okay, not the last one.) **Attached to each event, there is some probability that it could happen.**

**Now “forecasting”** as Gardner and Tetlock characterize it, **is an attempt to figure out which event really will happen**, whether the coin will land on heads or tails, **and then make a plan based on that knowledge. It’s a fool’s game**.

**Once we recognize that uncertainty will always remain**, **risk management rather than forecasting is much wiser**. **Just the step of naming the events that could happen is useful**. **Then, ask yourself, “if this event happens, let’s make sure we have a contingency plan so we’re not really screwed**.” Suppose you’re counting on diesel generators to keep cooling water flowing through a reactor. What if someone forgets to fill the tank?

**The good use of “forecasting” is to get a better handle on probabilities**, so we focus our risk management resources on the most important events. But **we must still pay attention to events**, **and buy insurance against them**, **based as much on the painfulness of the event as on its probability.** (Note to economics techies: what matters is the risk-neutral probability, probability weighted by marginal utility.) **So it’s not really the forecast that’s wrong, it’s what people do with it. If we all understood the essential unpredictability of the world**, especially of rare and very costly events, if we got rid of the habit of mind that asks for a forecast and then makes “plans” as if that were the only state of the world that could occur; **if we instead focused on laying out all the bad things that could happen and made sure we had insurance or contingency plans, both personal and public policies might be a lot better**.

**Total rejection of security leaves us defenseless to those who still endorse security – that causes war**

**Doran 99,** (Andrew W. Mellon Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, Washington DC,Charles, “Is Major War Obsolete? An Exchange” Survival, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 139—52)

The conclusion, then, is that the probability of major war declines for some states, but increases for others. And it is very difficult to argue that it has disappeared in any significant or reliable or hopeful sense. Moreover, a problem with arguing a position that might be described as utopian is that such arguments have policy implications. It is worrying that as a thesis about the obsolescence of major war becomes more compelling to more people, including presumably governments, the tendency will be forget about the underlying problem, which is not war per Se, but security. And by neglecting the underlying problem of security, the probability of wars perversely increases: as governments fail to provide the kind of defence and security necessary to maintain deterrence, one opens up the possibility of new challenges. In this regard it is worth recalling one of Clauswitz’s most important insights: A conqueror is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed. That is the underlying dilemma when one argues that a major war is not likely to occur and, as a consequence, one need not necessarily be so concerned about providing the defences that underlie security itself. History shows that surprise threats emerge and rapid destabilising efforts are made to try to provide that missing defence, and all of this contributes to the spiral of uncertainty that leads in the end to war.

**Threats are real and our disaster discourse mobilizes people to deal with them**

**Kurasawa 04**

(Fuyuki Kurasawa, Associate Professor of Sociology at York University in Toronto, Canada, 2004, Constellations Vol 11, No 4, 2004, Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention and the Work of Foresight <http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Kurasawa%20Articles/Constellations%20Article.pdf>)

In addition**,** farsightedness has become a priority in world affairs due to the appearance of new global threats and the resurgence of ‘older’ ones. Virulent forms of ethno-racial nationalismand religious fundamentalismthat had mostly been kept in check or bottled up duringthe Cold War have reasserted themselves in ways that are now all-too-familiar – civil warfare, genocide, ‘ethnic cleansing,’ and global terrorism. And if nuclear mutually assured destruction has come to pass, other dangers are filling the vacuum: climate change, AIDS and other diseases (BSE, SARS, etc.), as well as previously unheralded genomic perils (genetically modified organisms, human cloning). Collective remembrance of past atrocities and disasters has galvanized some sectors of public opinion and made the international community’s unwillingness to adequately intervene before and during the genocides in the ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda, or to take remedial steps in the case of the spiraling African and Asian AIDS pandemics, appear particularly glaring. Returning to the point I made at the beginning of this paper, the significance of foresight is a direct outcome of the transition toward a dystopian imaginary(or what Sontag has called “the imagination of disaster”).11 Huxley’s Brave New World and Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four, two groundbreaking dystopiannovels of the first half of the twentieth century, remain as influential as ever in framing public discourse and understanding current techno-scientific dangers, while recent paradigmatic cultural artifacts – films like The Matrix and novels like Atwood’s Oryx and Crake – reflect and give shape to this catastrophic sensibility.12 And yet dystopianism need not imply despondency, paralysis, or fear. Quite the opposite, in fact, since the pervasiveness of a dystopian imaginary can help notions of historical contingency and fallibilism gain traction against their determinist and absolutist counterparts.13 Once we recognize that the future is uncertain and that any course of action produces both unintended and unexpected consequences, the responsibility to face up to potential disasters and intervene before they strike becomes compelling. From another angle, dystopianism lies at the core of politics in a global civil society where groups mobilize their ownnightmare scenarios (‘Frankenfoods’ and a lifeless planet for environmentalists, totalitarian patriarchy of the sort depicted in Atwood’s Handmaid’s Tale for Western feminism, McWorld and a global neoliberal oligarchy for the alternative globalization movement, etc.). Such scenarios can act as catalysts for public debate and socio-political action**,** spurring citizens’ involvement in the work of preventive foresight.

#### Nationalism, economics, and security make war likely

Mearsheimer 99 (John J., pg. http://www.ciaonet.org.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/conf/cfr10/cfr10.html)

Now I think the central claim that’s on the table is wrong-headed, and let me tell you why. First of all, there are a number of good reasons why great powers in the system will think seriously about going to war in the future, and I’ll give you three of them and try and illustrate some cases. First, states oftentimes compete for economic resources. Is it hard to imagine a situation where a reconstituted Russia gets into a war with the United States and the Persian Gulf over Gulf oil? I don’t think that’s implausible. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war in the South China Sea over economic resources? I don’t find that hard to imagine. A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that. What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers.

#### War still likely --- the world is more dangerous now than during the Cold War.

Paul Miller, 12/20/2011. Assistant professor of international security studies at the National Defense University, former director for Afghanistan on the National Security Council and political analyst in the U.S. intelligence community, specializing in South Asia. “[How Dangerous is the World? Part IV](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/19/how_dangerous_is_the_world_part_iv),” Foreign Policy, http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/19/how\_dangerous\_is\_the\_world\_part\_iv.

In my [previous](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/16/how_dangerous_is_the_world_part_i_by_paul_miller) [three](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/16/how_dangerous_is_the_world_part_ii) posts, I argued that the world today is more dangerous than it was during the Cold War because the threat from Russia and China is still present, on top of which we face new threats from new nuclear autocracies hostile to the United States, including North Korea, soon Iran, and possibly Pakistan.

In addition to the old-fashioned state-centric threats of hostile nuclear powers, the United States now faces a whole new category of threats that simply did not exist during the Cold War:  the threats that come when state failure meets globalization, when non-state actors can operate with impunity outside the write of any law but act with global reach because of new technology.  These are the threats that are the current fads of IR and security studies:  pirates, organized crime, drug cartels, human traffickers, WikiLeaks, hackers, the global Islamist "pansurgency," and, yes, terrorists.  (Throw in pandemic disease and ecological disaster and you get all the research funding you want.)

There is nothing new about the existence of many of these actors, of course.  Pirates and terrorists have existed for centuries.  However, their ability to present an immediate and large-scale threat to the United States is new, or at least greater than during the Cold War.  Travel and communication is easier and weapons technology is more lethal, state failure is more widespread (giving them more space to operate with impunity), while U.S. and allied border, port, and infrastructure security has not kept up.

I earlier argued that the faddish, new-fangled theories about non-state actors were overstated.  They are, but that doesn't mean they're completely wrong.  Osama bin Laden and Julian Assange clearly did massive and irrevocable harm to the United States in ways literally inconceivable for a non-state actor during the Cold War; the same may be true of the drug gangs in Mexico today.  Coupled with the United States' almost complete lack of homeland security, and there is a very real possibility of large-scale, massive, direct harm to the U.S. homeland from a globalized non-state actor.

The preeminent threat of this type is, of course, the global campaign by violent Islamist militants and terrorists to eject the "west" from "Muslim lands," overthrow secular governments and replace them with Islamic regimes, and establish the supremacy of their brand of Islam across the world.  (I agree here with David Kilcullen's [characterization](http://smallwarsjournal.com/documents/kilcullen.pdf) of the conflict as a global insurgency).  Violent Islamist movements have done most of their direct damage to people and states across the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia.  But those attacks certainly don't make the world safer for the United States, nor would their victory in, for example, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia.  And the movement has, of course, directly attacked the United States and our European allies.  Note that violent Islamist groups-whether al Qaida or Hamas or Hezbollah or al Shabaab or Lashkar-e Taiba-typically flourish in and around weak and failing states.

The only thing comparable to the global proliferation of Islamist insurgencies and terrorist movements over the last two decades was the Soviet Union's sponsorship of communist insurgencies around the world during the Cold War.  But the Islamist insurgencies are likely to be more resilient, harder to defeat, and more dangerous because they are decentralized, because their ideology is not linked to the fate of one particular regime, because globalization has made it easier for them to operate on a global scale, and because of the higher risk that Islamists will acquire and use weapons of mass destruction since they are not accountable to a deterable sponsoring power.

Even setting the threat from violent Islamism aside, a host of other non-state actors threaten the world order and make American leadership more costly.  In fact, the aggregate effect of state failure multiplied across scores of states across the world is so great that "failed states may eventually present a systemic risk to the liberal world order, of which the United States is the principal architect and beneficiary," as I argue in the [current issue of PRISM](http://www.ndu.edu/press/how-to-fix-failed-states.html).  State failure and the rise of non-state actors-a problem non-existent during the cold war-is a threat to American national security.

Conclusion

Essentially, the United States thus faces two great families of threats today:  first, the nuclear-armed authoritarian powers, of which there are at least twice as many as there were during the Cold War; second, the aggregate consequences of state failure and the rise of non-state actors in much of the world, which is a wholly new development since the Cold War.  On both counts, the world is more dangerous than it was before 1989.  Essentially take the Cold War, add in several more players with nukes, and then throw in radicalized Islam, rampant state failure, and the global economic recession, and you have today.

I recognize that the world doesn't feel as dangerous as it did during the Cold War.  During the Cold War we all knew about the threat and lived with a constant awareness-usually shoved to the back of ours minds to preserve our sanity-that we might die an instantaneous firey death at any moment.  We no longer feel that way.

Our feelings are wrong.  The Cold War engaged our emotions more because it was simple, easily understood, and, as an ideological contest, demanded we take sides and laid claim to our loyalties.  Today's environment is more complex and many-sided and so it is harder to feel the threat the same way we used to.  Nonetheless, the danger is real.

#### Ethical policymaking requires calculation of consequences

**Gvosdev 5** – Rhodes scholar, PhD from St. Antony’s College, executive editor of The National Interest (Nikolas, The Value(s) of Realism, SAIS Review 25.1, pmuse)

As the name implies, realists focus on promoting policies that are achievable and sustainable. In turn, the morality of a foreign policy action is judged by its results, not by the intentions of its framers. A foreign policymaker must weigh the consequences of any course of action and assess the resources at hand to carry out the proposed task. As Lippmann warned, Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purposes, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign affairs.8 Commenting on this maxim, Owen Harries, founding editor of The National Interest, noted, "This is a truth of which Americans—more apt to focus on ends rather than means when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world—need always to be reminded."9 In fact, Morgenthau noted that "there can be no political morality without prudence."10 This virtue of prudence—which Morgenthau identified as the cornerstone of realism—should not be confused with expediency. Rather, it takes as its starting point that it is more moral to fulfill one's commitments than to make "empty" promises, and to seek solutions that minimize harm and produce sustainable results. Morgenthau concluded: [End Page 18] Political realism does not require, nor does it condone, indifference to political ideals and moral principles, but it requires indeed a sharp distinction between the desirable and the possible, between what is desirable everywhere and at all times and what is possible under the concrete circumstances of time and place.11 This is why, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the former Yugoslavia, U.S. and European realists urged that Bosnia be decentralized and partitioned into ethnically based cantons as a way to head off a destructive civil war. Realists felt this would be the best course of action, especially after the country's first free and fair elections had brought nationalist candidates to power at the expense of those calling for inter-ethnic cooperation. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that the United States and Western Europe would be unwilling to invest the blood and treasure that would be required to craft a unitary Bosnian state and give it the wherewithal to function. Indeed, at a diplomatic conference in Lisbon in March 1992, the various factions in Bosnia had, reluctantly, endorsed the broad outlines of such a settlement. For the purveyors of moralpolitik, this was unacceptable. After all, for this plan to work, populations on the "wrong side" of the line would have to be transferred and resettled. Such a plan struck directly at the heart of the concept of multi-ethnicity—that different ethnic and religious groups could find a common political identity and work in common institutions. When the United States signaled it would not accept such a settlement, the fragile consensus collapsed. The United States, of course, cannot be held responsible for the war; this lies squarely on the shoulders of Bosnia's political leaders. Yet Washington fell victim to what Jonathan Clarke called "faux Wilsonianism," the belief that "high-flown words matter more than rational calculation" in formulating effective policy, which led U.S. policymakers to dispense with the equation of "balancing commitments and resources."12 Indeed, as he notes, the Clinton administration had criticized peace plans calling for decentralized partition in Bosnia "with lofty rhetoric without proposing a practical alternative." The subsequent war led to the deaths of tens of thousands and left more than a million people homeless. After three years of war, the Dayton Accords—hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy—created a complicated arrangement by which the federal union of two ethnic units, the Muslim-Croat Federation, was itself federated to a Bosnian Serb republic. Today, Bosnia requires thousands of foreign troops to patrol its internal borders and billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep its government and economy functioning. Was the aim of U.S. policymakers, academics and journalists—creating a multi-ethnic democracy in Bosnia—not worth pursuing? No, not at all, and this is not what the argument suggests. But aspirations were not matched with capabilities. As a result of holding out for the "most moral" outcome and encouraging the Muslim-led government in Sarajevo to pursue maximalist aims rather than finding a workable compromise that could have avoided bloodshed and produced more stable conditions, the peoples of Bosnia suffered greatly. In the end, the final settlement was very close [End Page 19] to the one that realists had initially proposed—and the one that had also been roundly condemned on moral grounds.

#### OUR EV IS SCIENTIFIC AND YOURS IS POLITICAL – NUCLEAR WAR CREATES MULTIPLE SCENAREOS FOR EXTINCTION\*\*\*

#### Starr 2000 – Nuclear Engineer; http://cndyorks.gn.apc.org/news/articles/nwinter.htm

You would think that the destruction of the Northern Hemisphere should be a topic that humanity might want to talk about. Yet, for the last ten years, the subject of nuclear winter has been virtually absent from public discussion. ¶ The end of the Cold War, the fall of the Soviet Union, and **a** highly publicized attempt to discredit the 'theory' of nuclear winter by **groups with a vested interest in preserving nuclear weapons**: these events led to a decade of silence on the subject of nuclear winter. It is imperative that this silence be broken. ¶ More than ten years have passed since the last extensive investigations on nuclear winter were conducted (during the period 1983 - 1989). The composition of American and Russian nuclear arsenals has changed significantly since the 1980's studies, with substantial reductions occurring both in the numbers and yields of strategic weapons. Yet no one has asked: Is nuclear winter still a likely outcome should existing or projected nuclear arsenals be detonated in a major nuclear war? ¶ **This is a question that the nuclear priesthood does not want discussed**. Why? **Because an answer in the affirmative will completely undermine the legitimacy of maintaining thousands of nuclear weapons on high-alert status**. However, the extensive scientific studies of the 1980¹s **leave little doubt**: **nuclear winter is a likely outcome of any nuclear war**. ¶ Perhaps the most important finding of the 1980¹s studies was that ". . . only a few hundred nuclear detonations, or less, seem sufficient to bring about at least a nominal nuclear winter. Only 100 small warheads devoted to petroleum refining and storage facilities would suffice. Indeed, with something like a hundred downtowns burning, or the same number of petroleum facilities, even a substantial nuclear winter seems possible." (from 'A Path No Man Thought', page 203, by Carl Sagan and Richard Turco, 1990, Random House) ¶ The 1983 TTAPS nuclear winter study (from 'Case 14') examined the effects of one thousand 100 kiloton warheads exploded over 100 large cities, creating a 'Class III' nuclear winter. Consider that U.S. Trident subs alone now carry more than three thousand 100 kiloton warheads, which are aimed at 'urban industrial' targets in Russia (targeting and warhead information from the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Jan./Feb. 2000, p, 53).¶ This is a description of a Class III "Nominal" nuclear winter (taken from pages 194-195 of 'A Path No Man Thought'): "It carries in its wake significant cooling and darkening, drought, massive quantities of pyrotoxins generated, widespread radioactive fallout, and other atmospheric perturbations. Average land temperature drops would be about 10 degrees C. At noon, the Sun would have about one-third its usual brightness. Months later, sunlight would return to more than its usual intensity, enhanced in the ultraviolet by depletion of the high-altitude ozone layer.¶ Collapse of agriculture, and famine, could be widespread. Within the warring nations, these effects might generate casualties approaching those from the prompt effects of the war. Crop failure--from lowered temperatures, failure of the monsoons, and other causes--are expected in many noncombatant nations in the first growing season following the conflict. The most likely such failures would be in India, China, some African nations, and perhaps Japan. Worldwide, as many as 1 to 2 billion people could be placed in jeopardy of starvation."¶ The 1983 TTAPS study was followed by the ISCU¹s Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) study, which involved hundreds of scientists from more than a dozen countries working over three years. Meetings were held in Australia, Canada, China, England, France, India, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., and Venezuela.¶ This is a quote from the 1985 SCOPE document, 'Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War'. . . "The total loss of human agricultural and societal support systems **would result in the loss of almost all humans on Earth**, essentially equally among combatant and non-combatant countries alike. . . . this vulnerability is an aspect not currently a part of the understanding of nuclear war; not only are the major combatant countries in danger, but **virtually the entire human population is being held hostage to the large scale use of nuclear weapons** . . ." A review of the SCOPE assessment done by the **U.S. White House Office of Science and Technology Policy confirmed these findings, and actually stated that the SCOPE analysis had been too conservative**.
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## Aids

#### New breakthrough solves

DeNoon, 10 (Daniel J., HIV-Neutralizing Antibodies in Humans Could Play a Key Role in Development of Vaccine,” July 9, WebMD Health News, http://www.webmd.com/hiv-aids/news/20100709/antibodies-discovery-may-pave-way-to-aids-vaccine)

July 9, 2010 -- National Institutes of Health (NIH) scientists now have "proof" that the search for an [AIDS](http://www.webmd.com/hiv-aids/default.htm) vaccine can succeed. In the [blood](http://www.webmd.com/heart/anatomy-picture-of-blood) of an HIV infected person, the researchers discovered two powerful antibodies that neutralize 91% of HIV strains. "The discoveries we have made may overcome the limitations that have long stymied antibody-based HIV vaccine design," Peter D. Kwong, PhD, chief of structural biology at the NIH Vaccine Research Center, says in a news release. The finding has implications far beyond HIV and AIDS. The new techniques used to find the anti-HIV antibodies can be used to spur research into vaccines against other diseases that have long stymied researchers. It's major news that humans are capable of making antibodies that neutralize the AIDS virus. But finding antibodies -- even such powerful antibodies as these -- is not the same as finding a vaccine capable of eliciting the antibodies. It will be years, at least, before the discovery leads to a vaccine that can be tested in people. Even so, the discovery of the antibodies was a major scientific feat. The researchers, led by Kwong, Vaccine Research Center Director Gary J. Nabel, MD, PhD, and Vaccine Research Center Deputy Director John R. Mascola, MD, used newly developed molecular techniques to build "resurfaced" protein probes to trap the antibodies. It seems surprising that a person with HIV infection can carry powerful anti-HIV antibodies and not be cured. But other recent studies suggest that as many as one in four people with HIV infection may carry such antibodies. The problem is that the antibodies appear naturally only long after HIV has established a death grip on the body. Because the virus replicates often and mutates quickly, people don't just carry a single strain of HIV -- their blood swarms with a vast number of HIV "quasi-species." By the time a person develops neutralizing antibodies, the virus has had time to evolve escape variants. But if a vaccine were able to elicit neutralizing antibodies before a person was exposed to HIV, it's very likely the antibodies would keep the virus from taking root.

#### Vaccine development now solving

Koff and Berkley, 2010 (Wayne C., Ph.D., Seth F., M.D., “The Renaissance in HIV vaccine development – Future Directions,” New England Journal of Medicine, July 14, http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC)

Among the most exciting developments the delegates will hear about this year are a series of recent advances that collectively represent a renaissance in HIV vaccine development. These include the first demonstration of protection — albeit modest protection — against HIV infection in humans through immunization, with a vaccine regimen consisting of a canary-pox–vector prime plus a protein-subunit boost in the RV144 trial in Thailand,[1](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R1) new vaccine approaches that have significantly improved control of simian immunodeficiency virus (SIV) infection in rhesus monkeys and are now advancing to clinical trials, and the identification of novel potent and broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibodies against HIV that have revealed vulnerable targets on the virus that are now being exploited for vaccine design.[2](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R2),[3](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R3) In fact, just last week, a team of scientists from the Vaccine Research Center at the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases published new findings that identified the latest of these broadly neutralizing antibodies and the structural basis for its broad and potent neutralization of HIV.[3](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R3) Building on this progress, HIV vaccine developers in the coming era will pursue three tracks. In the short term, efforts will focus on broadening the limited protection observed in the RV144 efficacy trial, including studies aimed at elucidating the immune correlates of protection. By 2013, trials should be under way to evaluate vaccine candidates related to the RV144 vaccine. Data should also be emerging from an ongoing phase 2B test-of-concept trial assessing a regimen consisting of a DNA prime plus an adenovirus serotype 5 vector boost. By then, heterologous prime–boost regimens of different adenovirus vectors containing mosaic antigens aimed at overcoming HIV's genetic diversity will also have advanced to clinical trials, and they will reach phase 2B trials if warranted by the initial data on safety and immunogenicity. In the midterm, efforts in clinical trials will focus on prioritizing and advancing novel vaccine candidates based on replicating viral vectors and additional regimens consisting of heterologous vector primes and vector or subunit boosts. Developers of these vaccine candidates will attempt to achieve the robust efficacy demonstrated by live attenuated SIV vaccines in nonhuman primates (in which infection has been either prevented or controlled with viral loads suppressed to undetectable levels), while making their vaccines safe enough for human use. For the long term, many researchers are focused on designing vaccine candidates that can elicit broadly neutralizing antibodies against HIV to maximize the potential for prevention of infection. Preclinical studies of broadly neutralizing monoclonal antibodies in nonhuman primates have provided proof of the principle that such antibodies are capable of conferring protection.[4](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R4) Moreover, analysis of HIV isolates susceptible to neutralization by these antibodies suggests that a combination of two of these new and more potent antibodies that target complementary sites on the HIV spike protein would be expected to neutralize more than 95% of globally diverse isolates of HIV. Large-scale efforts are now focused on dissecting these antibodies' binding sites on HIV and then reverse-engineering immunogens capable of eliciting antibodies with similar potency and breadth of neutralization. Recently, a team of researchers at Merck provided proof of the underlying principle by showing that they could identify an immunogen starting from an HIV-specific antibody.[5](http://content.nejm.org/cgi/content/full/NEJMp1007629?query=TOC#R5) These recent advances indicate that the increased investments in AIDS vaccine research over the past decade are now paying off. Unfortunately, the global financial crisis has resulted in a decrease of approximately 10% in investments in HIV vaccine research and development, according to the HIV Vaccines and Microbicides Resource Tracking Working Group. But this is not the time to slow the effort. Creating an effective HIV vaccine will require continued scientific innovation on the part of both academia and the biotechnology industry, long-term commitments of stable and flexible funding from donors, contributions from the best and brightest young scientists, continued engagement of communities in the developing world where efficacy trials will be undertaken, and partnership with the vaccine industry for advanced development and deployment of a vaccine. Fully capitalizing on the recent developments in the HIV vaccine field will help to ensure that we have the requisite tools for prevention, making it possible for discussions at future international AIDS conferences to focus on how we are winning the war against HIV.
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## Solvency

#### DoD can solve for Nanotechnology – highly adaptive and multidisciplinary teams

Shaffer 7 [Alan, Department of Defense Director of Defense Research and Engineering, April 26 2007, “Defense Nanotechnology Research and Development”Program http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/dod/nano2007.pdf.]

The DoD nanotechnology program is a direct result of sustained support for highly adaptive and innovative research and development programs within the department of defense. These sustained research and development programs (which include basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development efforts) led to the establishment of nanotechnology as a major research thrust internationally. Furthermore, the DoD nanotechnology research and development program is defined as the assembly of individual efforts within the overall DoD research and development program that are categorized as nanotechnology (i.e., according to the objectives defined previously in this report). Nanotechnology research and development efforts are carried out both within the DoD laboratories, and in extramural research institutions. In both contexts, nanotechnology efforts may be directed by single investigators, multidisciplinary teams, or research centers. Single investigator research represents a critical component of the DoD research program and is critical to the continued inception and maturation of high risk innovative scientific concepts that will lead to breakthroughs in science and engineering (including nanotechnology). Multidisciplinary teams at the intersections of traditional disciplines provide an optimal means of developing the necessary understanding of nanoscale phenomena and identifying promising applications. Research centers provide sustained support and a broad range of expertise focused on key opportunities emerging from nanotechnology research.

#### That is key to regulate nanotechnology

Karkkainen 11 , University of Minnesota professor,

Bradley C. Karkkainen, University of Minnesota faculty in January 2004 at the rank of Professor. He held the Julius E. Davis Chair in Law in 2004, former Associate Professor at Columbia Law School, 1-11-11, [“Does nanobiotechnology oversight present a uniquely complex challenge to interagency cooperation?,” SPECIAL FOCUS: GOVERNANCE OF NANOBIOTECHNOLOGY, www.springerlink.com/index/R6178257PJ106721.pdf] E. Li

Apart from the particular problems of the TSCA statutory scheme, however, the difficulty of regulating toxic or potentially toxic substances has proven to be pervasive across the span of U.S. environmental law. The Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, for example, have long included provisions addressing toxic pollutants. Originally these statutes employed a health-based approach, instructing EPA to set regulatory standards strictly on the basis of health effects. But the information demands of this approach proved insurmountable, as the agency was able to assemble sufficiently detailed and comprehensive health effects information for only a small handful of toxic pollutants. In frustration, Congress abandoned the health-based approach and ordered EPA to adopt technology-based regulations for toxic pollutants, something the agency had proven more adept at doing (Farber 2000). While some have criticized what they perceive to be agency foot-dragging, the more fundamental problem is that toxicological science is often incomplete and frustratingly slow to develop, leaving huge uncertainties. The authors may be reasonably confident that a pollutant is toxic at some level of exposure, but the detailed data required to establish and defend a regulatory standard at any particular level may take substantial investments of time and money to produce (Lyndon 1989). In short, uncertainties and data gaps abound, and regulatory agencies are quickly overwhelmed by the information production burden they face. These problems are compounded by the fragmented nature of the present regulatory system. The Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) bears primary responsibility for regulating toxic substances in the workplace; the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulates potentially toxic food additives, drugs, and cosmetic products; the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) regulates toxic substances in most other consumer products; and the EPA regulates toxic air and water pollutants, hazardous waste disposal and clean-up, toxic spills, pesticides, and toxic contaminants of public water supplies. Even within EPA, however, separate offices administer the various statutes addressing particular aspects of toxic substances, each office applying a unique set of statutory standards and definitions. There is generally little coordination among these various programs within EPA, and almost no coordination across the span of federal agencies responsible for parts of the toxic substances puzzle. Research compiled for purposes of setting discharge standards for a toxic water pollutant, for example, will probably have little or no relevance for purposes of setting workplace exposure limits or product safety rules. The statutes use different definitions and require agencies to consider different factors and to regulate, if at all, under different circumstances and in different ways. Thus, the difficulty that any particular agency or program office faces in setting regulatory standards for toxic substances is compounded by a vast redundancy of effort across the federal bureaucracy. Under these arrangements, relatively few toxic substances get regulated, but those that do may be regulated six or eight times under six or eight unique regulatory programs, each designed with a narrow purpose in mind, with no thought given to how the pieces interact so as to form a coherent whole. The regulatory system described here is characterized by uncertainty, complexity, regulatory gaps, multiple regulatory authorities, and lack of interagency and inter-program coordination. If those features sound strikingly similar to the situation described by commentators on nanobiotechnology governance and oversight, it is no accident. Indeed, a case can be made that the problems of nano-bio governance and oversight are simply the problems of toxic regulation writ small, but on a ‘‘nano’’ scale. Scale does add some unique features. Nanoparticles are more difficult to detect, and releases of and exposures to nanoparticles are likely to be in extremely small volumes. Those complications aside, however, the fundamental characteristics of uncertainty, complexity, regulatory gaps, and lack of interagency and inter-program coordination apply with equal force to nano-scale as they do to largerscale toxic substances. If the thesis of this article—that regulation of nanobiotechnology is essentially just the problem of regulating potentially toxic substances on a smaller scale—is correct, then we should be able to apply some useful lessons from the last several decades of toxics regulation to nanobiotechnology regulation. Unfortunately, however, the system of toxics regulation has been only modestly and sporadically successful. It is beyond the scope of this article to offer a comprehensive assessment, but three important developments are worth noting briefly.

## Perm – Do CP

#### United States federal government has 3 branches

US Legal ’13

United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition. <http://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/>. Retrieved: July 1, 2013

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

#### Severs “United States” – means all 3 branches have to act

Princeton University WordNet 1997, http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=united%20states, accessed May 25, 2001

united states: 2: the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the US
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### 2NC Latin Nano Fails

#### Latin American nanotech programs fail—structural barriers and resource constraints decimate effectiveness

Foladori et al 05

Professor at Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas; Invernizzi-Senior associate at the Wilson Center (Guillermo, Noela, “Nanotechnology and the Developing World:¶ Will Nanotechnology Overcome Poverty or¶ Widen Disparities?”, 2005, Vol. 2, Issue 3, Article 11, <http://estudiosdeldesarrollo.net/administracion/docentes/documentos_personales/11947LBJ.pdf>//VS)

Third, nanotechnology’s development in much of the world will do little to help the developing ¶ world due to the difficulty in finding qualified workers. A country’s ability to foster and support ¶ technological careers requires a social context that supplies the necessary equipment and human capital in ¶ the long term. It will be difficult for many Third World countries to find the staff necessary to work interdisciplinarily in nanotechnology. Mexico, for instance, the thirteenth largest exporting power in the ¶ world, only has eleven research teams in three universities and two research centers in nanotechnology, ¶ with a total of ninety researchers and no official support program for field research.35 Brazil, which ¶ launched a pioneer program for research and development in nanotechnology in Latin America ¶ (considering that it was in the same year as the U.S. initiative—2000) had between fifty and one hundred ¶ ¶ ¶ researchers in 2002 and proably around 300 in 2004.36 Despite these seemingly impressive numbers in ¶ Brazil, challenging barriers remain which will continue to plague the ability of nanotechnology scientists ¶ in developing countries to produce benefits for the poor. Many nanotechnologists in developing countries ¶ may be enticed by higher wages out of poorer countries and into richer ones. The reason that this ¶ potenti ality must be addressed now is as follows. Some estimate that nanotechnology will mean ¶ restructuring all learning to break down the traditional disciplinary frontiers, which, in practice, ¶ nanotechnology has already overcome. It is possible that changes in study plans would have to take place ¶ starting at primary education.37 This means that multi-sector efforts are gambled on these changes, and ¶ elevated social demands are required. In many instances, poorer nations lack the resources, infrastructure ¶ and facilities for such interdisciplinary efforts as nanotechnology—particularly, where transformations ¶ must take place at so fundamental a level. Given the higher stakes and more interdisciplinary nature of ¶ nanotechnology, therefore, it is possible that the race for qualified scientists will heat up and increase the ¶ brain drain from the Third World into more advanced countries. This polarization of the labor market ¶ will punish poorer countries with less qualified labor. It is unlikely that the vast majority of developing ¶ countries will have the wherewithal, infrastructure and labor force to be able to join the nanotechnology ¶ wave and capitalize on its potentials to transform society and industry.

#### Nanotechnology empirically fails in developing countries—widens the wealth gap

Foladori et al 05

Professor at Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas; Invernizzi-Senior associate at the Wilson Center (Guillermo, Noela, “Nanotechnology and the Developing World:¶ Will Nanotechnology Overcome Poverty or¶ Widen Disparities?”, 2005, Vol. 2, Issue 3, Article 11, <http://estudiosdeldesarrollo.net/administracion/docentes/documentos_personales/11947LBJ.pdf>//VS)

Salamanca-Buentello and his colleagues identify nanotechnology as the solution to five of the eight ¶ Millennium Development Goals of the United Nations. Among these supposed solutions are nanosensors ¶ and nanocomponents to improve the dosage of water and fertilization of plants. With this technology, it ¶ would be possible to reduce poverty and hunger in the world. Simply identifying a potentially useful ¶ application, however, overlooks the clear historical experience of poorer countries. Not so long ago, in ¶ the 1980s, genetically modified organisms were hailed as the solution that would put an end to hunger ¶ and poverty. However, genetically modified organisms ended up being used mainly in developed ¶ countries; and three out of four patents are today in the hands of four large multinational companies. ¶ There has been no improvement for Third World countries; quite the contrary, transgenics turned up ¶ where they were not wanted or expected, as was the case of the contamination of corn in Oaxaca, Mexico. ¶ In the case of genetically modified organisms, commercial and technological dependence was increased, ¶ not reduced.14 This historical example could well foreshadow the path that nanotechnology takes in ¶ worsening existing gaps between the developed and less developed world unless steps are taken now to ¶ avert a repeat of history. Finally, even if large developing countries that could join the nanotechnology wave (such as China, ¶ India and Brazil, for example) can produce nanoproducts that could eventually result in clean and cheap ¶ energy options, in clean drinking water or in greater agricultural yields, this does not mean that the poor ¶ majority will benefit. For them socio-economic structure is a much more difficult barrier than ¶ technological innovation. Nanotechnology, even where fully integrated in developing countries, does ¶ nothing to change these socio-economic structures; instead, it could serve to exacerbate existing gaps and ¶ further the technological and socio-economic isolation of the poor.

### 1nc

#### Nuclear war must be prohibited absolutely

Kateb, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, ‘92 (George, “The Inner Ocean” p 111-112)

Schell's work attempts to force on us an acknowledgment that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgment hat the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons, no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the "matter" of extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility-a genuine possibility-as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use is based on the possibility of extinction. Schell's perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain: the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth's uninhabitability, to "nuclear winter," or to Schell's "republic of insects and grass." But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or "theater" use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely, because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences: the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, thus increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined, no matter how small the explosive power: each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual (present and future), not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices. John Locke, a principal individualist political theorist, says that in a state of nature every individual retains the right to punish transgressors or assist in the effort to punish them, whether or not one is a direct victim. Transgressors convert an otherwise tolerable condition into a state of nature which is a state of war in which all are threatened. Analogously, the use of nuclear weapons, by containing in an immediate or delayed manner the possibility of extinction, is in Locke's phrase "a trespass against the whole species" and places the users in a state of war with all people. And people, the accumulation of individuals, must be understood as of course always indefeasibly retaining the right of selfpreservation, and hence as morally allowed, perhaps enjoined, to take the appropriate preserving steps.

#### Ethical policymaking requires calculation of consequences

**Gvosdev 5** – Rhodes scholar, PhD from St. Antony’s College, executive editor of The National Interest (Nikolas, The Value(s) of Realism, SAIS Review 25.1, pmuse)

As the name implies, realists focus on promoting policies that are achievable and sustainable. In turn, the morality of a foreign policy action is judged by its results, not by the intentions of its framers. A foreign policymaker must weigh the consequences of any course of action and assess the resources at hand to carry out the proposed task. As Lippmann warned, Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purposes, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign affairs.8 Commenting on this maxim, Owen Harries, founding editor of The National Interest, noted, "This is a truth of which Americans—more apt to focus on ends rather than means when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world—need always to be reminded."9 In fact, Morgenthau noted that "there can be no political morality without prudence."10 This virtue of prudence—which Morgenthau identified as the cornerstone of realism—should not be confused with expediency. Rather, it takes as its starting point that it is more moral to fulfill one's commitments than to make "empty" promises, and to seek solutions that minimize harm and produce sustainable results. Morgenthau concluded: [End Page 18] Political realism does not require, nor does it condone, indifference to political ideals and moral principles, but it requires indeed a sharp distinction between the desirable and the possible, between what is desirable everywhere and at all times and what is possible under the concrete circumstances of time and place.11 This is why, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the former Yugoslavia, U.S. and European realists urged that Bosnia be decentralized and partitioned into ethnically based cantons as a way to head off a destructive civil war. Realists felt this would be the best course of action, especially after the country's first free and fair elections had brought nationalist candidates to power at the expense of those calling for inter-ethnic cooperation. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that the United States and Western Europe would be unwilling to invest the blood and treasure that would be required to craft a unitary Bosnian state and give it the wherewithal to function. Indeed, at a diplomatic conference in Lisbon in March 1992, the various factions in Bosnia had, reluctantly, endorsed the broad outlines of such a settlement. For the purveyors of moralpolitik, this was unacceptable. After all, for this plan to work, populations on the "wrong side" of the line would have to be transferred and resettled. Such a plan struck directly at the heart of the concept of multi-ethnicity—that different ethnic and religious groups could find a common political identity and work in common institutions. When the United States signaled it would not accept such a settlement, the fragile consensus collapsed. The United States, of course, cannot be held responsible for the war; this lies squarely on the shoulders of Bosnia's political leaders. Yet Washington fell victim to what Jonathan Clarke called "faux Wilsonianism," the belief that "high-flown words matter more than rational calculation" in formulating effective policy, which led U.S. policymakers to dispense with the equation of "balancing commitments and resources."12 Indeed, as he notes, the Clinton administration had criticized peace plans calling for decentralized partition in Bosnia "with lofty rhetoric without proposing a practical alternative." The subsequent war led to the deaths of tens of thousands and left more than a million people homeless. After three years of war, the Dayton Accords—hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy—created a complicated arrangement by which the federal union of two ethnic units, the Muslim-Croat Federation, was itself federated to a Bosnian Serb republic. Today, Bosnia requires thousands of foreign troops to patrol its internal borders and billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep its government and economy functioning. Was the aim of U.S. policymakers, academics and journalists—creating a multi-ethnic democracy in Bosnia—not worth pursuing? No, not at all, and this is not what the argument suggests. But aspirations were not matched with capabilities. As a result of holding out for the "most moral" outcome and encouraging the Muslim-led government in Sarajevo to pursue maximalist aims rather than finding a workable compromise that could have avoided bloodshed and produced more stable conditions, the peoples of Bosnia suffered greatly. In the end, the final settlement was very close [End Page 19] to the one that realists had initially proposed—and the one that had also been roundly condemned on moral grounds.
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#### **There’s a distinction between public and personal policy – Governments must make utilitarian calculations**

Goodin 95 – Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (Robert E., Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, at relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.