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#### Patent reform will pass- its top of the docket

Legal Times, 4-8-2014 [http://www.nationallawjournal.com/legaltimes/id=1202650186068/Time+Dwindles+For+Patent+Litigation+Reform+Bill%3Fmcode=1202615034968&curindex=2&curpage=1](http://www.nationallawjournal.com/legaltimes/id%3D1202650186068/Time%2BDwindles%2BFor%2BPatent%2BLitigation%2BReform%2BBill%3Fmcode%3D1202615034968%26curindex%3D2%26curpage%3D1)

 The Senate Judiciary Committee needs to approve a patent reform bill this week—with broad bipartisan support—to give it a good chance of becoming law during this Congress, a former top intellectual property adviser to the committee said. Congress on April 14 begins a two-week recess and, as the November elections inch closer, legislative activity on Capitol Hill will soon slow down, said Aaron Cooper, a Covington & Burling special counsel who formerly advised Senate Judiciary Chairman Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., on intellectual property issues. "I don't think it absolutely has to be done before this recess but I think time certainly is running out on this Congress," Cooper said. "If it doesn’t come together, it doesn't mean it won't ever come together, it just makes it more difficult." Cooper joined Covington in November after working the past seven years on the committee, including primary responsibility for all aspects of the last big patent reform law, the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, which was adopted in 2011. The Judiciary Committee was set to meet this afternoon to discuss the leading bill, the Patent Transparency and Improvements Act. Leahy in November introduced the measure with co-sponsors Mike Lee, R-Utah; Sheldon Whitehouse, D-R.I.; and Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn. Leahy announced today that the hearing will not happen as scheduled because Republicans have not yet given feedback on a proposal about “a few contentious issues” circulated Monday by Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y. “I hope we can come to a bipartisan agreement by the end of the day so that we can mark up my Patent Transparency and Improvements Act on Thursday morning,” Leahy said in a written statement. “The executive business session noticed for this afternoon will be postponed until Thursday morning.” The committee had hoped to move on the bill last Thursday. But committee members are still working on the language for several key provisions that include pleading requirements and shifting legal fees. "We're not quite there yet," Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, the top Republican on the committee, said last week. "Getting the bill right is just as important as moving it," Grassley said. "I hope that we can come together and produce language that a large majority of us can support." Cooper said such a consensus—and not just a 10-8 vote to get it out of committee—would help give the bill momentum to get to the Senate floor. A close vote in the committee could signal that interest groups are dissatisfied and could try to influence the other 82 senators—potentially stalling the legislation. "As we get closer to the end of a Congress, having a bill that is out of committee and ready to go to the floor, supported in the form it was supported in the committee, shows most of the major issues have been worked out," Cooper said. Committee members have expressed optimism that the bill's language can balance a number of competing interests—without becoming watered down—in the fight against so-called "patent trolls" and allegedly frivolous intellectual property cases.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico is politically divisive

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.

#### GOP leadership will push off patent vote after the vote on the plan- can’t muster political will back to back

Jake Sherman covers Congress for POLITICO. He got his start in journalism in high school at The Stamford Advocate, where he became a pro at taking box scores for the sports section. He majored in journalism at George Washington University in D.C. but more accurately got a degree at The GW Hatchet, where he was the men’s basketball beat writer before becoming sports editor and, subsequently, editor-in-chief.¶ During summers, Jake interned at The Journal News (N.Y.) and in the Washington bureaus of the Minneapolis Star Tribune and Newsweek. After finishing a master’s in journalism at Columbia University, Jake became an intern in the D.C. bureau of The Wall Street Journal and Carrie Budoff Brown started in journalism at the York Daily Record in the summer before her freshman year in college. She worked as an editor at The Daily Targum, the student-run newspaper of Rutgers University, and interned at the Richmond Times Dispatch and the New York Times. She worked as a staff writer at the Hartford Courant and the Philadelphia Inquirer before arriving at POLITICO on the day it launched in 2007.¶ Budoff Brown is now a White House reporter who focuses on the intersection of policy and politics in the administration and on Capitol Hill. She has covered the Senate, the 2008 Obama campaign, the health care overhaul bill, Wall Street reform and various tax cut battles in Congress. Politico, 8-28-2013 http://www.politico.com/story/2013/08/immigration-reform-95980.html#ixzz2dIFeo4Sb

Immigration reform advocates have a new enemy: the congressional calendar.¶ Fall’s fiscal fights have lined up in a way that could delay immigration reform until 2014, multiple senior House Republican leadership aides tell POLITICO, imperiling the effort’s prospects before the midterm elections.¶ The mid-October debt ceiling deadline — an earlier-than-expected target laid out Monday by Treasury Secretary Jack Lew — is changing the House GOP leadership’s plans to pass immigration bills that month.¶ “If we have to deal with the debt limit earlier, it doesn’t change the overall dynamics of the debate, but — just in terms of timing — it might make it harder to find time for immigration bills in October,” one House Republican leadership aide said.¶ That’s not the only scheduling challenge. There are fewer than 40 congressional working days until the end of 2013 — the unofficial deadline for passing immigration reform — and they’ll present some of the most politically challenging votes for lawmakers on both sides of the aisle. It will be difficult to addimmigration reform to the list, senior aides say.¶ Government funding runs dry on Sept. 30. The nine days the House is in session that month will be crowded with the debate over the continuing resolution to keep the government operating. The GOP leadership will have to reconcile the screams from conservatives who want to use the bill to defund Obamacare with their own desire to avoid a government shutdown. Of course, anything the House approves would need to pass the Democratic-controlled Senate, which will ignore attempts to weaken the law.¶ Immigration reform isn’t certain to die if it slips into 2014, some in GOP leadership say. But major progress must be made in 2013 as it would be too difficult for the House to chart a course in 2014, an election year.¶ At a fundraiser in Idaho on Monday, Speaker John Boehner predicted a “whale of a fight” over the debt ceiling. That skirmish will surface in October. The House is in session for 14 days during that month, but there is certain to be a good deal of debate over passing a bill that would extend the nation’s borrowing authority.¶ GOP leadership is mulling its initial negotiating position, which is sure to include some changes to entitlements, energy policy and the health care law. Boehner’s leadership team also seems open to discussing ways to soften the blow of the sequester in October, which would add yet another explosive issue to the mix.¶ The White House refuses to negotiate with Republicans over the debt limit, leaving little clarity on how the standoff gets resolved — and when.¶ “Congress has already authorized funding, committed us to make expenditures,” Lew told CNBC Tuesday. “We’re now in the place where the only question is will we pay the bills that the United States has incurred. The only way to do that is for Congress to act — for it to act quickly.”¶ A senior administration official said Tuesday that the increasingly crowded fall calendar was why Obama pressed the House to deal with immigration before the August recess. But the Republican leaders need to make time for it, the official said, and they should want to do it sooner rather than later because the pressure from the president and others isn’t going to let up.¶ But the scarce legislative days and the fiscal battles will be welcome to some House Republicans squeamish about voting on immigration reform. There is little support for passing the kind of comprehensive bill approved by the Senate. But even the piecemeal approach being pushed by the House leadership has its fair share of skeptics in the GOP conference.¶ November could provide a window for immigration reform — but two dynamics may interfere.¶ The debt-ceiling deadline could slip to November if tax receipts come in stronger than expected. If Congress votes on the debt ceiling during the eight-day November session, the Republican leadership is skeptical that it would be easy to turn around and vote on even a pared-back version of immigration reform.¶ The willjustwon’t be there, some aides say. A similar situation played out earlier this year, when Boehner delayed in January a vote on Hurricane Sandy relief because it came too soon after the tough vote when Congress raised taxes to resolve the fiscal cliff.¶ December will likely bring another government funding debate. The current plan for September is to pass a continuing resolution that lasts until Dec. 15, setting up another year-end spending fight. The House is scheduled to be in session for just eight days in December before leaving for the holidays.¶ Frank Sharry, executive director of America’s Voice, said the new debt limit deadline “is likely to push consideration of immigration to the latter part of October at the earliest.”¶ But Sharry and Angela Kelley, vice president for immigration policy at the Center for American Progress, said the House won’t be able to use the fiscal fights as an excuse.¶ “There are some in leadership who are going to look for any reason not to act,” Kelley said. “There will be a space where this issue is going to have to move. It’s not going to go away because other matters.”

#### Solves innovation but now is key

Mark Chandler is senior vice president, general counsel and secretary, and chief compliance officer of Cisco. And Mike Dillon is senior vice president, general counsel, and corporate secretary of Adobe Systems Incorporated. 3-3-2014 http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/199566-window-of-opportunity-for-action-on-patent-reform

For more than 200 years, America’s patent system has safeguarded the rights of inventors and innovators – the individuals and businesses that push the technological envelope and provide the foundation of the amazing products that have changed our world. The patent system traditionally also recognized the limits of patents, so that the patent grant didn’t become a basis for blocking legitimate entrepreneurs. But over the past decade, the patent system has been under assault from patent assertion entities that use and abuse the legal system with intimidation tactics to rake in financial settlements. Just last week, the White House announced executive action to improve patent quality and to help stop these patent assertion entities from their pattern and practice of rent-seeking behavior. But as Secretary of Commerce Penny Pritzker and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling pointed out, ultimately Congress must step in and overhaul our patent system to make a meaningful impact. At a time when Congress is tied up in knots on a range of issues, patent reform is one area where legislation is not only possible, but achievable in short order. The U.S. House of Representatives has acted, approving a patent overhaul by a broad, bipartisan majority. The Obama Administration supported that legislation. Can you think of many other issues where Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-Ohio), House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and President Obama are on the exact same page? Now it’s up to our leaders in the Senate Judiciary Committee to pass companion legislation in the Senate. We hope that they can find common ground, just as their colleagues in the House have done. The patent problem is becoming worse. What began as a cottage industry of abusive patent litigation and threatening demand letters has become a full-scale flood, a veritable business model predicated upon abuse. Patent assertion entities target businesses, large and small, from whom they believe they can extract financial settlements, no matter the merits of the case. Nearly 60 percent of new patent lawsuits are being filed by patent assertion entities, up from 25 percent in 2007. And a new study by Professor Robin Feldman of the University of California Hastings College of the Law has found that no industry will be immune. What started in the technology industry, has moved to main street, and the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries may be next as patent aggregators stockpile patents hoping that they can make a case that those industries too are somehow copying earlier inventions. Sometimes the targets of abusive tactics are product manufacturers like our companies that have the means and ability to defend ourselves – and many times we do so, even though it’s much less expensive to settle. Other times, it’s small businesses who get a threat letter in the mail. The logic in both instances is extortionist – send us money now or we will cause you considerable pain in the form of huge legal bills later. The merits of the case are secondary, at the very least. This is what Congress must address. We need a patent system that ends the patent assertion entity’s business model. This requires a balanced approach, where legitimate claims will go forward, much as they do today. But plaintiffs should be required to state what their underlying legal claims are; expensive, document-intensive fishing expeditions should be limited; and in frivolous or abusive cases where a court finds no reasonable basis for the positions taken, fee-shifting should be the rule. This creates a measure of accountability and transparency that does not exist today. All these reforms were in the House-passed measure. Bottom line: The Senate should push ahead with reform that will keep American businesses growing and investing in innovation. In doing so, the Senate will send a message to the American people that they are on the side of innovation that drives economic growth and job creation. The solution is before us. There is a window of opportunity to act. We ask the Senate to make meaningful reforms to the patent system soon and take a step toward a patent system that meets the Founders’ goal of truly, “promoting progress in science and useful arts.”

#### Key to avoid resource wars

Klarevas 9 – Professor of Global Affairs

Louis, Professor at the Center for Global Affairs – New York University, “[Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy_b_393223.html)”, Huffington Post, 12-15, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy_b_393223.html>

By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to **secure its global primacy** for the next few generations to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to **outmaneuver potential great power rivals** seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and **global stability**. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. Climate change leaves no alternative. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually have no choice but to adopt such technologies. And this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom, while simultaneously **providing it with** means of **leverage that can** be employed to **keep potential foes in check.**

#### Resource scarcity leads to extinction

**Luger, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 00**

(Richard, US Senator from Indiana, and a member and former chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, 2000, “Plant power”, http://www.ourplanet.com/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. **At stake is** not only **preventing starvation and saving the environment,** but **also world peace and security**. History tells us that **states may go to war over access** to resources, **and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction**. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today **to 9 billion** by mid-century, the **demand** for affordable food will increase **well beyond** current international **production levels**. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears**, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe**. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. **The U**nited **S**tates **can take a leading position** in a productivity revolution. And **our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.**
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#### Implementation of energy reform will pass but it is bogged down by controversy

Gabriel Stargardter and David Alire Garcia 4/1 (April 4, 2014. Mexico national content debate risks turning off oil majors. Reuters Africa)

http://af.reuters.com/article/energyOilNews/idAFL2N0MB23020140401?pageNumber=2&virtualBrandChannel=0 Mia

Late last year, Mexico's Congress approved a constitutional reform pushed by President Enrique Pena Nieto that ends state oil giant Pemex's 75-year monopoly, and aims to lure new investment into the sickly energy industry. Secondary legislation that will flesh out the details of the reform are due any day, but one of the main sticking points has been the issue of local content purchasing rules. Lawmakers are deciding whether to follow the example of Brazil, which opted for high levels when it liberalized its oil industry, or copy Norway and Colombia, which both rejected set percentages. Pena Nieto says the energy reform could help drive economic growth to as much as 6 percent a year in Latin America's No.2 economy, which has long lagged regional peers. A key aim of the overhaul is to attract oil majors to boost declining crude output, so policymakers must tread carefully or risk scaring off the same companies that have balked at Brazil's local content requirements. "We are not in favor of prescriptive percentages," Alberto De La Fuente, Shell's top executive in Mexico, said at a recent energy forum in Mexico City. The constitutional reform passed in December says the law should establish "minimum national content percentages" as a way to promote domestic supply chains, but gives no further detail. Javier Trevino, a lawmaker with the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) on the lower house energy committee, left the door open for specific percentage content targets but also acknowledged tensions over which content path to take. "It's the most controversial issue," he said referring to the debate over the energy reform's enabling legislation.

#### Plan triggers backlash- kills agenda

Archibold et al. 13, the New York Times bureau chief for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, based in Mexico City; graduate at Rutgers University; studied history and Spanish in Panama (Randall C. Archibold, Damien Cave, and Ginger Thomson, April 30th 2013, The New York Time “Mexico’s Curbs on U.S. Role in Drug Fight Spark Friction” http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/01/world/americas/friction-between-us-and-mexico-threatens-efforts-on-drugs.html?pagewanted=all

But shortly after Mexico’s new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December, American agents got a clear message that the dynamics, with Washington holding the clear upper hand, were about to change. “So do we get to polygraph you?” one incoming Mexican official asked his American counterparts, alarming United States security officials who consider the vetting of the Mexicans central to tracking down drug kingpins. The Mexican government briefly stopped its vetted officials from cooperating in sensitive investigations. The Americans are waiting to see if Mexico allows polygraphs when assigning new members to units, a senior Obama administration official said. In another clash, American security officials were recently asked to leave an important intelligence center in Monterrey, where they had worked side by side with an array of Mexican military and police commanders collecting and analyzing tips and intelligence on drug gangs. The Mexicans, scoffing at the notion of Americans’ having so much contact with different agencies, questioned the value of the center and made clear that they would put tighter reins on the sharing of drug intelligence. There have long been political sensitivities in Mexico over allowing too much American involvement. But the recent policy changes have rattled American officials used to far fewer restrictions than they have faced in years.

#### Nieto has just enough PC for secondary reforms, can’t risk emboldening anti-US sentiment

Politics and Policy 3/31 Politics & Policy (P&P) is a non-partisan student publication seeking to encourage informed political conversation on college campuses around the country. Made up of students of many majors and backgrounds, P&P is a community of individuals interested in why world shaping events occur and what impact these events have on our lives. We publish non-partisan analysis of current events -- local, national and international. We layer the opinions and leverage the minds of many to produce quality, objective analysis. Sam Houskeeper, Valerie Zuckerman, and Alexi Stocker, March 31, 2014,

“Enrique Peña Nieto's Bold Reforms: Striving to Rebuild the Mexican Government,” <http://politicsandpolicy.org/article/enrique-pe%C3%B1a-nietos-bold-reforms-striving-rebuild-mexican-government> Ben

The year 2013 was a period of momentous reform for Mexico. Thanks to the Pact for Mexico, an explicit agreement between parties, Peña Nieto passed numerous reforms that noone would have thought possible a year earlier. If the reforms bear fruit, Mexican telecoms, energy, education, political, education, and other sectors would be radically changed. The passage of 2013’s reforms does not, however, mean that these reforms will be successful. Each reform rests on the passage of secondary laws and regulations to enforce or ensure the implementation of the reforms. The Pact for Mexico broke up at the end of 2013 during the passage of energy reform, one of the most contentious of the debated reforms. Peña Nieto, whose domestic popularity has fallen significantly, now faces an uphill battle to make good on his reforms and kickstart Mexico’s economy, which grew at just above 1% last year, far below Peña Nieto’s promised 4%. Skeptics abound. Meanwhile, Peña Nieto is popular abroad and praised for his level headed reforms. The confidence spurred by his agenda has led to dramatic increases in foreign investment in the country. When Peña Nieto ran for office he also promised a drastic change to Mexico’s drug policy. His predecessor, Felipe Calderon, modeled his approach after anti-insurgency tactics used by Americans in Iraq and focused on a list of the 37 most-wanted cartel operatives. Although this strategy was popular at first, it quickly became unfavorable due to an escalation in violence. Further, it did not target the social conditions that allowed the cartels to flourish in the first place. Peña Nieto promised to create peace agreements with the cartels that would allow them to operate without fear of persecution in exchange for an end to the violence. But, two years into his presidency drug lord Joaquin "Shorty" Guzman and Miguel Angel Treviño Morales, the leader of the Zetas have been apprehended and there is little change to the rates of murder, extortion and kidnapping. Some critics blame the federal government for lacking a unified strategy against organized crime, while others believe pressure from the United States to capture high profile criminals may have influenced strategy. Though Peña Nieto has so far failed to make good on his promises to improve the economy and end the drug war, he has been successful in other areas. In December 2013, Mexico’s Congress approved a piece of legislation that ended Pemex’s seventy-five year monopoly on crude oil production. Although the legal fine print will not be finalized until mid-March, the reforms are a radical step towards liberalizing hydrocarbons in Mexico. Under the new regulations, foreign firms will be free to invest in and exploit Mexico’s oil resources. As legal stipulations released to the public in mid-February reveal, Pemex will not even be required to hold a minority share in any future oil exploitation or production contracts. Further details, due in mid-March, will spell out national content requirements, or how many Mexican energy or service firms must be engaged in the project, for oil exploitation and production contracts. In the case of deepwater offshore fields, national content requirements may be zero. To hardline supporters of the status quo ante, a zero national content requirement smacks of foreign “theft” of Mexico’s natural resources. To President Peña Nieto’s supporters, these reforms open Mexico’s deepwater oil resources to firms armed with the technology, capital, and expertise that Pemex lacks. Dismantling Pemex’s monopoly required a constitutional amendment and damaged the President’s cross-party alliance, the Pact for Mexico; the left-leaning Party of the Democratic Revolution emerged from the wreckage of Peña Nieto’s pact as a committed opponent of energy reform. Nonetheless, the energy reforms passed the Senate, House of Representatives, and cleared the State Assemblies. Peña Nieto waged a successful fight for energy reform, but it cost him politically. On the telecommunications front, President Peña Nieto faces much more powerful, well-connected, and organized opposition. His telecommunications reform bill required a constitutional amendment just like the energy reform bill, but passed the Senate, House of Representatives, and State Assemblies in 2013. The bill created the Federal Telecommunications Institute (ITF), a regulatory body meant to break down Mexico’s powerful telecommunications giants and level the playing fields. Mexican broadband service is both scarce and expensive, resulting in a lucrative, highly profitable industry (Carlos Slim, of América Móvil, is one of the wealthiest men in the world).The ITF recently announced that it had determined which telecommunications firms are “dominant.” Although the agency did not name the firms, it is understood that one of them must be Slim’s América Móvil, which controls roughly eighty percent of Mexico’s fixed line telephone service and seventy percent of its mobile service. Televisa, which controls more than sixty percent of the television market, is also a likely ITF target. The problem, however, is that the ITF has no clear direction from here. Although the agency has identified the “dominant” players in the market, it must wait until the secondary laws of the telecommunications reform bill are worked out. The secondary laws are, however, already two months overdue. Political and corporate pressure makes telecommunications reform less likely to proceed over the next few months. The ITF may be left with little more than a “dominant” ruling. President Peña Nieto’s next steps are anything but certain. Fights for energy and telecommunications reforms have cost him dearly, and his transparency and electoral reforms, which also require constitutional amendments, have yet to pass the State Assemblies. President Peña Nieto must strike a careful balance between expediency and caution, lest he waste or destroy the political goodwill he still has.

#### New Pemex reforms are key to boost renewable energy investment

Phillips 2-25 [Mexico Building Latin America’s Largest Solar Farm To Replace Old, Dirty Oil-Power Plant, ARI PHILLIPS, reporter for think progress, ON FEBRUARY 25, 2014, http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/02/25/3328651/mexico-large-solar-plant-paz/]

However, Mexico also has some major energy changes in the pipeline, and after decades of state-run oil company PEMEX having sole purview over fossil fuel extraction, international investment and companies will now be let into the mix after recent constitutional reforms. This will increase oil flows from America’s southern neighbor into those same Gulf refineries as Keystone XL might. At the same time renewable energy has started to take off in Mexico, with construction of the biggest solar power plant in Latin America, Aura Solar I — a 30-megawatt solar farm in La Paz, Mexico — the latest signal. If Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto’s recent summit with North American leaders is an indication of the significance of the trio’s relationship, then his expected upcoming visit to the Aura I solar farm can be seen as a benchmark on the country’s path to a more renewable future. Mexico is poised to be Latin America’s solar hotbed according to Greentech Media, with the solar market’s installed base expected to quadruple from 60 megawatts to 240 megawatts by the end of this year. Mexico’s energy ministry has set a target for 35 percent of power generation to come from non-fossil fuel sources by 2024.¶ “The current reform provides a real opportunity, particularly in the electricity reform, to increase investment in renewable energy generation in Mexico by opening up the sector and making other institutional changes,” Christina McCain, Senior Manager for the Latin American Climate Initiative at the Environmental Defense Fund, told ClimateProgress in an email. “Some in Mexico have criticized that the energy reform is missing an opportunity to provide more direct incentives to renewable energy. While the focus of the reform seems to have largely been on the major overhauls we hear most about, there is still opportunity to provide more direct incentives to renewables, as well as leverage existing laws designed to increase renewable sources in Mexico’s energy mix.”¶ In La Paz, where pollution from a dirty thermoelectric plant creates noxious air impacting resident’s lifestyles and well being, the solar plant is a welcomed clean development. The $100 million project, which includes 132,000 solar panel-modules, is the first Mexican private enterprise of such a size to get a development bank loan and an agreement to sell its electricity to the grid. According to the Thomson Reuters Foundation, the International Finance Corporation, a member of the World Bank, gave the project a $25 million credit line and also helped set up another $50 million in loans from the Mexican development bank Nacional Financiera (Nafin).

#### Successful shift to renewables in Mexico will be modeled globally, solves warming

Gibbs, White House press secretary, 9

(Robert, 4/16/9, The White House Office of the Press Secretary, ”U.S.-MEXICO  ANNOUNCE BILATERAL FRAMEWORK ON CLEAN ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE,” http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/us-mexico-announce-bilateral-framework-clean-energy-and-climate-change)

During their discussions in Mexico City today, the two leaders agreed on the importance of promoting clean energy and combating climate change and the value of joint and practical collaboration in achieving these goals. The Bilateral Framework establishes a mechanism for political and technical cooperation and information exchange, and to facilitate common efforts to develop clean energy economies. It will also complement and reinforce existing work between the two countries.¶ The Bilateral Framework will focus on: renewable energy, energy efficiency, adaptation, market mechanisms, forestry and land use, green jobs, low carbon energy technology development and capacity building. The framework will also build upon cooperation in the border region promoting efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to adapt to the local impacts of climate change in the region,, as well as to strengthen the reliability and flow of cross border electricity grids and by facilitating the ability of neighboring border states to work together to strengthen energy trade.¶ Senior officials from both countries will be working over the coming weeks to further elaborate the framework. Specific areas of joint cooperation under the Bilateral Framework may include:¶ · Collaborating on training/workshops and information exchanges for government officials to explore possible cooperation on greenhouse gas inventories, various greenhouse gas reduction strategies, and market mechanisms;¶ · Through our collaboration in the Border 2012 program, working with our respective border states to provide opportunities for information exchange and joint work on renewable energy, such as wind and solar, that could include technical and economic project feasibility studies, project development, and capacity building in the border region. Other border work could include a bilateral border crossing planning group to develop strategies to reduce emissions from idling vehicles, among other initiatives that may be deemed appropriate;¶ · Expanding our extensive bilateral collaboration on clean energy technologies to facilitate renewable power generation including by addressing transmission and distribution obstacles between our countries; fostering Energy Service Company market development; and highlighting existing and proposed areas for cooperation on clean energy and energy efficiency under the North American Energy Working Group;¶ · Promoting academic and scientific exchanges on renewable energy;¶ · Pursuing projects on adapting to climate change, including coastal or disaster risk reduction activities as well as adaptation in key sectors; and¶ · Working jointly with other countries to take advantage of growing Mexican expertise on greenhouse gas inventories, adaptation and project planning. This work could also possibly include a shared US/Mexican initiative to help developing countries in the Americas create low carbon development strategies plans for adaptation to climate change, and monitoring and accounting for the results.¶ Both countries stressed that a financial architecture to mobilize investment in climate-friendly technologies is crucial to a successful agreed outcome in Copenhagen. Several countries have made specific proposals on financial mechanisms, including Mexico. Recognizing Mexico’s leadership on climate change, the United States announced its support for Mexico to host the Sixteenth United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 16) in 2010. The United States was also pleased that Mexico will host a meeting of the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate (MEF) in preparation for a Leaders meeting to take place in July after the G-8 meeting in Italy.

#### Failure to solve warming causes extinction – geological history proves

**Bushnell, NASA Langley Research Center chief scientist, 10**

(Dennis M. has a MS in mechanical engineering, won the Lawrence A. Sperry Award, AIAA Fluid and Plasma Dynamics Award, the AIAA Dryden Lectureship, and is the recipient of many NASA Medals for outstanding Scientific Achievement and Leadership, "Conquering Climate Change," The Futurist 44. 3, May/Jun 2010, ProQuest)

Unless we act, the next century could see increases in species extinction, disease, and floods affecting one-third of human population. But the tools for preventing this scenario are in our hands. Carbon-dioxide levels are now greater than at any time in the past 650,000 years, according to data gathered from examining ice cores. These increases in CO2 correspond to estimates of man-made uses of fossil carbon fuels such as coal, petroleum, and natural gas. The global climate computations, as reported by the ongoing Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) studies, indicate that such man-made CO2 sources could be responsible for observed climate changes such as temperature increases, loss of ice coverage, and ocean acidification. Admittedly, the less than satisfactory state of knowledge regarding the effects of aerosol and other issues make the global climate computations less than fully accurate, but we must take this issue very seriously. I believe we should act in accordance with the precautionary principle: When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures become obligatory, even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. As paleontologist Peter Ward discussed in his book Under a Green Sky, several "warming events" have radically altered the life on this planet throughout geologic history. **Among the most significant** of these **was the Permian extinction**, which took place some 250 million years ago. **This event resulted in a decimation of animal life**, **leading many scientists to refer to it as the Great Dying**. The Permian extinction is thought to have been caused by a sudden increase in CO2 from Siberian volcanoes. **The amount of CO2 we're releasing** into the atmosphere **today**, through human activity, **is 100 times greater than what came out of those volcanoes**. **During the Permian extinction**, a number of chain reaction events, or "**positive feedbacks**," **resulted in oxygen-depleted oceans**, **enabling overgrowth of** certain **bacteria**, **producing** copious amounts of **hydrogen sulfide, making the atmosphere toxic, and decimating the ozone layer**, **all producing species die-off**. The positive feedbacks not yet fully included in the IPCC projections include the release of the massive amounts of fossil methane, some 20 times worse than CO2 as an accelerator of warming, fossil CO2 from the tundra and oceans, reduced oceanic CO2 uptake due to higher temperatures, acidification and algae changes, changes in the earth's ability to reflect the sun's light back into space due to loss of glacier ice, changes in land use, and extensive water evaporation (a greenhouse gas) from temperature increases. The additional effects of **these feedbacks increase the projections** from a 4°C-6°C temperature rise by 2100 **to a 10°C**-12°C **rise**, according to some estimates. At those temperatures, beyond 2100, essentially all the ice would melt and the ocean would rise by as much as 75 meters, flooding the homes of one-third of the global population. Between now and then, ocean methane hydrate release could cause major tidal waves, and glacier melting could affect major rivers upon which a large percentage of the population depends. We'll see increases in flooding, storms, disease, droughts, species extinctions, ocean acidification, and a litany of other impacts, all as a consequence of man-made climate change. Arctic ice melting, CO2 increases, and ocean warming are all occurring much faster than previous IPCC forecasts, so, as dire as the forecasts sound, they're actually conservative.

### **1NC**

#### Text: The United States federal government should not restrict the immigration or travel of people from the United Mexican States to the United States. The United States federal government should not police or regulate points of entry to the United States.

#### The CP solves better than the aff for two reasons:

#### Not restricting immigration or travel and not policing points of entry are enough to solve the aff -- That’s 1AC Johnson

#### US-Mexico border discourse re-entrenches a “first world” vs “third world” mindset – this perpetuates the “us” vs “them” binary.

Cadaval 93 [Olivia Cadaval is curator of the Festival's United States Alexiro Borderlands program. She has conducted research and collaborated in public programming with the Washington, D.C., Latino, Latin American, and Caribbean communities for more than a decade. She received her Ph.D. from George Washington University, <http://smithsonianeducation.org/migrations/bord/intro.html>, Published in 1993]

Borderlands have often been the locale of major folk cultural achievements, from the outlaw ballads of the Scottish-English border to the heroic "corridos" of south Texas. Energized by the lives of heroes and others, borderlands continue to spark themes of frontier lawlessness, national pride, rebellion against injustice, and a community hero's stand against all odds. What is it about a border that triggers these and other cultural forms, such as souvenirs, duty-free liquors, retaining walls made of automobile tires, and "maquiladora" assembly plants? Is the border a particular kind of region or social environment? If so, does the border tend to produce a particular kind of culture? And what is the relationship between this environment and its culture?¶ A line drawn in various ways, a border marks the place where adjacent jurisdictions meet. This combined conjunction and separation of national laws and customs creates a zone in which movements of people and goods are greatly regulated, examined, discussed, and hidden. Commerce attains a higher importance in border society as does dialogue about the identities of its peoples. Smuggling, the myriad signs in border towns, legal and illegal immigration, and the use of unneighborly names between neighbors are parts of this picture of accentuated concern with the trade in goods and the flow of people.¶ The border is an environment of opportunity. Individuals find work enforcing or avoiding the laws that regulate movement. Companies use national differences in labor and environmental regulations to pursue their advantage. Border society thrives on difference, and people and institutions come there to exploit niches in its environment.¶ Borders are artifacts of history and are subject to change over time. When borders shift, lands and peoples are subjected to different sets of rules; this creates opportunities for exploitation, conditions of hardship, and motivations for revolt.¶ An approach to describing a society constructed by difference is necessarily many-voiced. Rather than a central, authoritative perspective, we strive for a de-centered point of view, one with many authoritative speakers. Of course, this is more easily achieved in the Festival of American Folklife program, where citizens of the border region speak and perform for themselves and their communities. But even in this printed medium, through translation and transcription, a variety of authorities are represented.¶ Border society is an abstract concept compounded of ideas about the sovereignty of nation-states, the intensification of commerce and social discourse, and strategies of cultural representation. The U.S.-Mexico border can be understood in those terms; and in this it is similar to borders like those between the United States and Canada, East and West Germany, or Kenya and Tanzania. But a particular history of the U.S.-Mexico border is expressed in the images, sounds, discourse genres, and social formations discussed within this and other essays. This particular historical development has made the border the planet's longest between a country characterized by economic practices and achievements sometimes known as "first-world" and a country whose economy is sometimes characterized as "'third-world." The growth of a capitalist world economy provided the context for the development not only of U.S.-Mexico border culture, but also of other types of cultural processes that incorporate difference: acculturation, creolization, and the growth of various cultural diasporas.¶ Cultural processes which may be opaque and elusive elsewhere become clear at the border. This is the case, as Dr. Valenzuela points out, in the formation of cultural identity. The border offers a stark context of cultural difference, social inequality, and ever present reminders of governmental power to limit individual opportunity by ascribing national identity. The dominant discourse that assigns low social value to particular sectors of the population is answered by a creative flood of expressions of identity in music, graphic arts, poetry, and styles of clothing and self-presentation.¶

#### **The “Us vs Them” mentality** makes conflict inevitable and destroys value to life

Talbot 8[Steven, 'Us' and 'Them': Terrorism, Conflict and (O)ther Discursive Formations http://www.socresonline.org.uk/13/1/17.html]

**4.12** **Using simple dichotomies like ‘Us’ and ‘Them’ or ‘friend’ or ‘foe’ ignore the multidimensionality of identity and fail to recognise the interconnectedness and complexity of modern life**. The use of such terms also highlights the emotional underpinnings for issues of security. **With their use of an enemy discourse which incorporates notions of religiosity, good versus evil, and right and wrong, both the Taliban and US led ‘coalition of the willing’ appeal to beliefs over** empiricism (what is knowable, measurable and debatable) – belief systems grounded in notions of faith where it is important to *believe* things to be true, rather than actually being true ([Berry, 2006](#berry2006), p.5). Similarly, **claim making of this nature appeals to emotions (like hatred, revenge and fear) in contrast to logic in the sense that they encourage communities to** *feel* **in particular ways which are less likely to be challenged than appeals to** *think* **in particular ways** ([Loseke, 2003](#loseke2003), p.76). Hence, Berry ([2006](#berry2006)) contends, that because definitions of enemies are often not empirically based, they can fluctuate according to the needs of the definers. 4.13 **With the creation of ‘identifiable’ enemies, defining ‘Us’ automatically entails defining ‘Them,**’ **with ‘Them’ being the social foe or ‘evil’** ([Huntington, 1996](#huntington1996)). As Burman and MacLure ([2005](#burmanmaclure2005)) remind us, ‘**there is always a hierarchy in these oppositions’ for there is an essence of a higher principle or ideal articulated in one, and something lesser, or subordinate in the other** (p.284). Thus, **within this hierarchical value system of prioritised logic, good is seen as coming before evil, positive before negative, Us before Them,** and real over the written. Moreover, **to label a population as evil is to render the other ‘sub-human**.’ **We are told of the ‘Evil doers,’ Axis of evil**,’ **Osama Bin Laden the evil, America the evil,** capitalism the evil, and terrorism the evil, and evil acts ([Davetian, 2001](#davetian2001)). **The ensuing pursuit and eradication of this evil within the context of calls for jihad and a corresponding ‘war on terror’ also implies a ‘promotion of war more willingly than accommodation’** ([Armitage, 2003](#armitage2003), p.202). However, as is the case with dichotomous logic, good and evil are two sides of the same coin, or mutually sustaining concepts. Thus, to speak of eradicating evil in this context is a nonsensical pursuit. As Baudrillard explains: ‘We believe naively that the progress of the Good, its advance in all fields (the sciences, technology, democracy, human rights), corresponds to a defeat of Evil. No one seems to have understood that Good and Evil advance together, as part of the same movement…Good does not conquer Evil, nor indeed does the reverse happen: they are once both irreducible to each other and inextricably interrelated’ ([2002](#baudrilard2002), p.13).

### 1NC

#### Interpretation—economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a quid pro quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Plan isn’t --- voting issue

#### Limits --- our interp functionally narrows the topic because few cases can defend conditioning --- the alternative is hundreds of single import or export cases that explode the Neg’s research burden

#### Ground --- QPQ locks in core generics like soft power and foreign politics DAs, counterplans to add or remove a condition, and “say no” and backlash arguments

### Contention 1:

#### Without denying the value of poetry, our argument is that their method makes for bad DEBATES - Aff authors concede that poetry cannot be JUDGED OR EVALUATED, each of which are necessary in the context of a competitive debate activity

Bleiker 2k (Roland, Senior lecturer - U of Queensland, POPULAR DISSENT, HUMAN AGENCY AND GLOBAL POLITICS, p. 271)

But how can something as inaudible us transversal poetic dissent possibly be evaluated? How can a form of resistance that engages linguistic and discursive practices be judged or merely be understood, by the very nexus of power and knowledge it seeks to distance itself from? These difficult questions beg for complex answers. I do not claim to have solved them here, nor do I believe that they can actually be solved, at least not in an absolute and definitive way. The impact of discursive dissent on transversal social and political dynamics is mediated through tactical and temporal processes. A poem, for instance, does not directly cause particular events, it does not visualize an opponent in space and time. A linguistic expression of dissent works by insinuating itself into its target - the population at large -without taking it over, but also without being separated from it. Even the agent becomes gradually blurred. The effect of a poem cannot be reduced to its author or even to the poem itself. Those who have read it may have passed altered knowledge on to other people, and thus influenced the transversal constitution of societal values.

#### **The affs call for open borders would collapse society by lowering living conditions, sparking xenophobic violence and government driven population purification campaigns turning the alt**

Weiner, 96(Myron, former professor of Political Science @ MIT, Ethics, national sovereignty and the control of immigration, The International Migration Review, Spring 30.1)

To most citizens, however, the argument in favor of national sovereignty with respect to control over migration appears to be commonsensical. Let us **consider** what **the consequences might be if a country had completely open borders to anyone who wished to enter**. While this approach seems to take the moral high ground by avoiding coercion**, it clearly jeopardizes the well-being of the host population and threatens politicide**. **A** safe and prosperous **country that declares its borders open risks being overwhelmed by a massive influx of** immigrants from poor and/or violent countries. If the country then provides these immigrants with the same benefits it offers its own citizens (education for children, healthcare, unemployment benefits, etc.), **its social services and welfare services may be stretched to the limit.** **The country's own poor may find themselves pushed aside by migrants prepared to work at lower wages**. If the number of migrants is large enough, the local population may find itself outnumbered by people who speak another language, belong to another culture, and perhaps seek to change the political system. **As the number of migrants grows, the local population may become xenophobic, resulting in the growth of antimigrant political organizations, violence, and social disorder**. Poor countries might also be at risk if their borders are open. Peasants from densely populated neighboring countries might freely enter in search of land and employment, thereby putting pressure on the local population. Refugees from civil conflict might cross the border and damage the local ecology by cutting firewood, consuming water, generating waste, and destroying grasslands. The indigenous population might become acutely afraid of domination by the intruding ethnic group, especially if the community is one with which it has a history of enmity. **Any country, rich or poor, that opened its borders might soon find other states taking advantage of its beneficent policy. A neighboring country whose elite wanted a more homogeneous society could now readily expel its minorities.** **A government that wanted a more egalitarian society could dump its unemployed and its poor. An authoritarian regime could rid itself of its opponents; a country could empty its jails, mental institutions, and homes for the aged**. In an extreme case, **an overcrowded populous country could take over a** hypothetically generous **country simply by "transferring" a large part of its population, and an aggressive country would no longer need tanks and missiles for an invasion**. Notwithstanding these objections, some political theorists argue that liberal democratic societies ought to have open borders, or that, short of open borders, a liberal democratic country should take in as many migrants and refugees as its citizenry will allow. The primary criterion for admission, these theorists insist, should not be the needs of the host country but the plight of those who seek admission.

#### The aff devolves into a nightmare as the loss of borders leads to thousands of xenophobic fortresses on the local level only locking in the socio-economic advantages of elites.

**Weiner, 96**(Myron, former professor of Political Science @ MIT, Ethics, national sovereignty and the control of immigration, The International Migration Review, Spring 30.1)

Walzer further argues that **people who belong to a community will defend their local politics and culture against strangers, and that if the state did not take on this responsibility, we would not have a world without walls but rather we would "create a thousand petty fortresses**.... **The distinctiveness of cultures and groups depends upon closure and, without it, cannot be conceived as a stable feature of human life. If this distinctiveness is valued, as most people seem to believe, then closure must be permitted somewhat**" (p. 39). Walzer therefore finds **value** in **the sovereign state** **not because it is exclusive, but because it provides for greater inclusiveness than would be possible if it did not exist**. Building upon Walzer, then, the debate over open borders and the broader issue of whether governments have greater obligations to their own citizens than to others has grown to involve the philosophers who call themselves "communitarians." The issue is whether "community" is valued and, therefore, whether members of a community have rights and obligations toward one another that transcend those toward individuals who do not belong to the community. For our purposes, "community" can be defined as coterminous with nationality and "nationals" can be defined as citizens of a political institution known as the state. Global egalitarians dismiss the idea of community as an impediment to a just world. "The socialist tradition," explains David Miller, "has been overwhelmingly hostile to nationality as a source of identity usually regarding it merely as an artificially created impediment to the brotherhood of man" (1992:87). Like the socialists, the globalists (and many with this view would regard themselves as socialists) place the highest value on egalitarianism. Consequently, those who subscribe to the ideals of global justice put aside notions of community and the value which a community places upon itself which may be liberty a sense of common identity and mutual obligation to one another. The global egalitarian position is thus in opposition to those who want to improve the well-being of the population within their own country and who, therefore, weigh proposals for immigration against such considerations as its impact on the welfare system, employment, the delivery of educational benefits and healthcare, the environment, and intergroup relations. From this perspective, migration should be permitted only when it best serves the interests of the country and its citizens rather than serving the interests of the migrants. Many global egalitarians advocating immigration seek to avoid this conundrum by stressing the compatibility of migration with national well-being, for example by pointing to the contribution migrants make to economic growth, the taxes they pay in return for social benefits, and the benefits of cultural diversity However, those who take this latter position in effect have conceded the argument that whether a country should or should not have migrants needs to be based upon an empirical consideration of costs and benefits, rather than a philosophical position in favor of global equality. For globalists, the highest moral value is distributive justice. The preservation of a nation's existence, its political order, political institutions, and cultural identity, and of the well-being and interests of its citizens are subordinate to the goal of global distributive justice.2 Global redistribution - through open borders or foreign aid - is regarded not as a humanitarian act, but as a moral imperative. **Globalists thus pay little attention to whether the adoption of their principles in a world comprised of sovereign states would lead to an improvement or a worsening of the human condition in any specific country**. The adoption, for example, of a globalist position on migration by a single country puts that country at risk when other countries choose not to open their borders. As we suggested earlier, **migration can then become an act of aggression against the country with open borders as one country disposes of its unwanted upon another**. Under such circumstances, **an open door to migrants might very well do more harm than good to large numbers of people**. Moreover, if a state chooses not to give preference to the well-being of its own citizens over the well-being of citizens of other countries, then, as Walzer suggests**, local communities and regions within the country might protect themselves by imposing restrictions upon entry or discriminating against foreign residents, generating the very opposite result from what the globalists intend** (for a forceful statement of this view, see King, 1983:525-536). There are, of course, many sensible reasons why governments might welcome immigrants: they may meet labor-force needs in industry, the service sector, or agriculture; they may bring cultural diversity and cosmopolitanism to countries whose citizens would like to be less parochial; they may provide entrepreneurship and other needed skills and talents; the country may regard itself as a "home" to people with whom its citizens have historic, cultural or religious ties; and families of immigrant origin may want to bring in their relatives and other members of their ethnic community. A government may also choose to open its borders to one or more neighboring countries with which it shares free trade and similar living standards. But these policies fall within the normal framework of a state's domestic and foreign policies. None implies moral obligation. In addition, there may be ideological reasons for a country to encourage migration. For traditional immigrant countries such as the United States, Canada and Australia, there is a popular ideological presumption in favor of continued migration. Many Americans, for example, see immigration as away of reasserting the image of America as a land of opportunity, still capable of offering success and fortune to those admitted. For Israel, the admission of Jews from anywhere in the world is essential to the Zionist conception of the state as a haven for world Jewry. The costs of absorption, the availability of housing and employment, the potential social dislocations are not relevant considerations in deciding whether Jews should be admitted. However, though there are numerous reasons a country might support and encourage immigration, many governments choose to severely limit or even close their borders to migration. **The reasons given for restricting migration**, as previously noted, **are numerous**. In some countries local inhabitants are fearful that a large influx of immigrants will overwhelm them, reducing them to a demographic minority and threatening their cultural and political dominance. Other countries fear that migration will exacerbate problems of overcrowding, poverty, unemployment, and xenophobia. And in some countries citizens have such a strong sense of an exclusive cultural identity that the incorporation into citizenship of even a small number of outsiders is unacceptable. **The moral stance that global justice can be served by a world of open borders in which individuals are free to move wherever they wish presumes a world without borders, without states, without repressive regimes, without vast differences in the health, education and welfare services offered by governing authorities, and without vast differences in incomes and employment. In the absence of these conditions the noble vision becomes a nightmare**, for the consequences of opening the borders of a country in extreme situations can be the erosion of the institutions and values that liberal societies have created for themselves and which make them attractive to outsiders. In the real world of states, governments are morally responsible to their own citizens and to those who legally reside within their territory.

#### Abolishing borders would be destabilizing and lead to mass violence turning the aff- controlling the borders works and must be maintained

Weiner, 96(Myron, former professor of Political Science @ MIT, Ethics, national sovereignty and the control of immigration, The International Migration Review, Spring 30.1)

The argument of the global egalitarians and the neoclassical economists thus converges on matters of migration, both **arguing in favor of increasingly open borders** as an instrument for achieving greater worldwide economic equality The question of what drives migration flows and to what extent they are beneficial to receiving countries is, of course, central to the argument of the neoclassical economists. **It is first necessary to note that the consequences of the free movement of labor across international borders are not the same as the consequences of the free movement of capital and goods across these same borders.** The logic of free trade between countries is that it finds its own equilibrium - a country that bought more than it sold would see the value of its currency decline, the cost of imports go up, and the price of its exports go down until a trade balance was established. No such simple mechanism operates with respect to the free movement of people across national boundaries. **A world without borders** **might indeed be one in which the free movement of people and the free movement of capital and goods would benefit all; but in a world in which states and boundaries do exist, the free movement of people, unlike the free movement of capital and goods, would damage those countries that chose to have unregulated borders**. Indeed, much the same argument is used by those who advocate some form of managed trade in conditions in which there is no free movement of the factors of production since governments provide subsidies or impose costs upon their own producers and place a variety of tariff and nontariff restrictions on imports. A relatively free international labor market is not without its costs. **Migrants can displace some local labor; a large-scale influx can put a burden on housing, education, and social services and depress wages. Refugees can impose heavy costs upon the government and upon local people, push up food prices, crowd urban settlements, and damage the local ecology**; some - though by no means all societies are threatened if there are large numbers of immigrants from another culture. **And ethnic conflicts between migrants and locals, especially between migrants and indigenous minorities and among different migrant communities, can be politically destabilizing and violent and hence injurious to economic growth**. There are also opportunity costs. In a tight labor market employers have an incentive to seek ways to make labor more productive. Technological and managerial innovations are more likely to occur when labor costs go up. Unemployment will decline. Previously excluded or restricted groups - the disabled, women, minorities - are likely to be pulled into the labor force. Demographers have argued against a widely held view that declining fertility rates and aging population will create a need for importing labor. For one thing, fertility rates have not been declining in all advanced industrial countries; since the mid-1980s fertility rates have risen in Germany, the United States, and Canada. More significantly, unemployment rates are high - over 10 percent in Western Europe and about 6 percent in the United States. Workers have been losing jobs in rust belt industries, and in many sectors of the economy the demand for low-skilled labor has declined. If there is an unmet demand for low-skilled workers in sectors of the economy it is because the welfare system removes some low-skilled workers from the labor force and many young people are unwilling to do manual work that is considered dirty, socially undesirable, and pays low wages. It seems unlikely that the labor market in developed countries, especially for low-skilled workers, will be tight during the next ten or twenty years, given the growth of labor-displacing technologies, the movement of low-cost labor-intensive industries from developed to developing countries, the growing capacity of the service sector to transfer computer and telecommunication functions from high-wage to low-wage economies, increased opportunities for female participation in the labor force, and the continued availability of young people in a labor force that has a persistent high level of unemployment (Coleman, 1985:413-461). Particularly telling is the growth in international migration to developed countries even in the midst of a recession and high unemployment, suggesting that either supply is creating its own demand or that ease of access rather than the structure of the labor market is shaping the flow. The large increase in the number of migrants to Germany - the stock of foreigners increased from 4.5 million in 1988 to an estimated 6.5 million by 1994 - had little to do with a growth in demand for labor. During this same period, the United Kingdom experienced no significant increase in the size of its foreign population. The difference clearly has to do with ease of access. The United Kingdom's insular position enabled it to keep down the flow of illegal migrants, while Germany's location on the borders of Eastern Europe made it more vulnerable than Britain to claimants for asylum. Moreover, Britain adopted a more restrictive asylum policy than Germany. Similarly, the presumed globalization of the labor market did not prevent Japan from choosing not to have a guestworker program when Western Europe did, nor has it prevented Japan from keeping down the number of asylum seekers and illegal migrants by imposing tighter controls than have most Western governments. The comparative evidence suggests that states have been able to control entry, though never completely. Germany does not have an illegal alien problem of the magnitude of the United States. But, then, Germany requires all citizens and aliens to register when they take up a new residence; a Central Aliens Register compiles information on foreigners living in Germany, and all residents carry national identification documents which they must produce when they seek employment. Similar identification systems exist in most of the Scandinavian countries with the result that these countries have relatively few illegal residents compared with the United States. A national ID card may be politically unacceptable in the United States, where it is regarded as an infringement on civil liberties, but its use elsewhere suggests that control over migration is possible. **A variety** of other types **of controls have been used to prevent unwanted migration and to reduce the number of claimants for asylum**. Australia requires that all visitors (except those from New Zealand) apply for visas. **The government keeps records of which country's nationals fail to leave and then tightens visa controls on the countries that produce visa overstayers**. Germany, the Czech Republic, and Poland have established **cooperative policing of borders, and** in many other countries, including the United States, **more resources are being allocated to improve border controls**. European governments have devised policies aimed at reducing the number of asylum claimants: sanctions against carriers of individuals without papers, accelerated asylum reviews, restrictions on entry of asylum claimants from third countries, the preparation of lists of "safe" countries whose citizens cannot claim asylum, the establishment of safe havens in third countries, and deportations of individuals whose asylum claims have been rejected. Critics correctly note that some of these policies as presently implemented are violations of the U.N. Refugee Convention. The point, however, is that **governments have successfully controlled migration notwithstanding the demand for low-wage labor by many of their own employers** and the growth of global communication, global transportation, and global markets - all of which facilitate international migration. Indeed, in the absence of such controls it seems likely that international migration would be far higher than it is. According to U.N. estimates, the annual flow of migrants across international boundaries is approximately 4 million persons, plus episodic refugee movements - a small number in a world of 5.7 billion people, with an annual worldwide population increase of 90 to 100 million**. The inability of states to have total control over who enters and who overstays their visas is no more an argument against control than the persistence of crime is an argument for ending the enforcement of criminal law.**

#### The aff collapses on itself -- causes more violence and kills any chance for democracy

Weiner, 96(Myron, former professor of Political Science @ MIT, Ethics, national sovereignty and the control of immigration, The International Migration Review, Spring 30.1)

Yet, if the proposed policies are morally unjust then they should not be adopted, no matter how strong public sentiment may be, even in a democracy **Consequently, a complex balance must be struck between catering to the wishes of a citizenry and protecting the rights of migrants and refugees**. **Antimigrant, antirefugee sentiment may come from a relatively small though vociferous group of citizens.** It is generally within the power of a government to seek public support for existing policies if it is clear that these policies are sensible ones. The Swiss government was able to resist a widespread popular demand that its guestworkers be expelled by demonstrating that workers were engaged in occupations for which Swiss workers were not available and that the country's economy would suffer if the guestworkers were expelled. The Australian government was ahead of Australian public opinion in its support for a nondiscriminatory immigrant admissions policy. The French government has successfully resisted demands that locally born children of migrants could not readily acquire citizenship. There are times, too, when a public has been willing to accept extraordinarily large numbers of refugees, as was the case of the Pakistani willingness to accommodate millions of Afghans, and the American and French willingness to take in many Indochinese. **When there is public opposition, moreover, it may be for good reasons. The concerns expressed by many Americans** and Europeans that their governments should take steps to halt illegal migration, establish more rigorous procedures to prevent foreigners from entering under false asylum claims, repatriate rejected asylum seekers, and reduce immigration during a period of recession, **should not be dismissed - no matter how unsavory some of the antimigrant rhetoric**. For a country to have an acceptable immigration policy, it must be able to effectively control illegal immigration. For a country to have an acceptable refugee policy, it must be able to prevent large numbers of immigrants from entering and remaining on the basis of unjustifiable asylum claims. **The unwillingness of governments to take steps to halt an unwanted influx of foreigners can erode immigration and refugee policies, strengthen right-wing parties, and generate xenophobic fears and violent behavior that may put democratic societies at risk.**

### **Framing**

#### Hold them to their consequences

Issac, 02—Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, 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 intentions does not ensure the achievement of what one intends**.** Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally comprised 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**.** 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 thisjudgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

**Maximizing all lives is the only way to affirm equality**

**Cummiskey 90** – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical considerat

ion to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

**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.

#### Life is a pre-requisite to everything

**Seeley, ‘86**

(Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70)

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however**,** human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinction of the race, for in order to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible **under any sane moral code.**

#### Their expansion of structural violence to an all-pervasive force makes preventing war impossible and renders the concept meaningless

Boulding**, Center for Research on Conflict Resolution,** 1978

(Ken, “Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies”, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 22.2, SAGE)

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