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\*\*\*Neoliberalism Advantage\*\*\*

No Inherency – Neoliberalism is Dead

Neoliberalism dead now

Bello 3 (Walden Dir - Focus on the Global South, www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/econ/2003/0710bello.htm)JFS

There have been three moments in the deepening crisis of the globalist project. The first was the Asian financial crisis of 1997. This event, which laid low the proud “tigers” of East Asia, revealed that one of the key tenets of the globalization—the liberalization of the capital account to promote freer flows of capital, especially finance or speculative capital -- could be profoundly destabilizing. The Asian financial crisis was, in fact, shown to be merely the latest of at least eight major financial crises since the liberalization of global financial flows began in the late seventies. How profoundly destabilizing capital market liberalization could be was shown when, in just a few weeks’ time, one million people in Thailand and 21 million in Indonesia were pushed below the poverty line. The Asian financial crisis was the “Stalingrad” of the IMF, the prime global agent of liberalized capital flows. Its record in the ambitious enterprise of subjecting some 100 developing and transitional economies to “structural adjustment” was revisited, and facts that had been pointed out by such agencies as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) as early as the late eighties now assumed the status of realities. Structural adjustment programs designed to accelerate deregulation, trade liberalization, and privatization had almost everywhere institutionalized stagnation, worsened poverty, and increased inequality. A paradigm is really in crisis when its best practitioners desert it, as Thomas Kuhn pointed out in his classic The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, and something akin to what happened during the crisis of the Copernican paradigm in physics occurred in neoclassical economics shortly after the Asian financial crisis, with key intellectuals leaving the fold--among them Jeffrey Sachs, noted earlier for his advocacy of “free market” shock treatment in Eastern Europe in the early 1990s; Joseph Stiglitz, former chief economist of the World Bank; Columbia Professor Jagdish Bhagwati, who called for global controls on capital flows; and financier George Soros, who condemned the lack of controls in the global financial system that had enriched him. The second moment of the crisis of the globalist project was the collapse of the third ministerial of the WTO in Seattle in December 1999. Seattle was the fatal intersection of three streams of discontent and conflict that had been building for sometime: - Developing countries resented the inequities of the Uruguay Round agreements that they felt compelled to sign in 1995. - Massive popular opposition to the WTO emerged globally from myriad sectors of global civil society, including farmers, fisherfolk, labor unionists, and environmentalists. By posing a threat to the well being of each sector in many of its agreements, the WTO managed to unite global civil society against it. - There were unresolved trade conflicts between the EU and the US, especially in agriculture, which had been simply been papered over by the Uruguay Round agreement. These three volatile elements combined to create the explosion in Seattle, with the developing countries rebelling against Northern diktat at the Seattle Convention Center, 50,000 people massing militantly in the streets, and differences preventing the EU and US from acting in concert to salvage the ministerial. In a moment of lucidity right after the Seattle debacle, British Secretary of State Stephen Byers captured the essence of the crisis: “[T]he WTO will not be able to continue in its present form. There has to be fundamental and radical change in order for it to meet the needs and aspirations of all 134 of its members.” The third moment of the crisis was the collapse of the stock market and the end of the Clinton boom. This was not just the bursting of the bubble but a rude reassertion of the classical capitalist crisis of overproduction, the main manifestation of which was massive overcapacity. Prior to the crash, corporate profits in the US had not grown since 1997. This was related to overcapacity in the industrial sector, the most glaring example being seen in the troubled telecommunications sector, where only 2.5 per cent of installed capacity globally was being utilized. The stagnation of the real economy led to capital being shifted to the financial sector, resulting in the dizzying rise in share values. But since profitability in the financial sector cannot deviate too far from the profitability of the real economy, a collapse of stock values was inevitable, and this occurred in March 2001, leading to the prolonged stagnation and the onset of deflation.

No Impact – Neoliberalism is Self-Correcting

Neoliberalism is cyclical and self-correcting

Li 8 (Ming Professor of Economics at the University of Utah, April, An Age of Transition: The United States, China, Peak Oil, and the Demise of Neoliberalism, Monthly Review, Vol. 59, Iss. 11)JFS

On February 1, Immanuel Wallerstein, the leading world system theorist, in his biweekly commentaries pronounced the year 2008 to be the year of the "Demise of the Neoliberal Globalization." Wallerstein begins by pointing out that throughout the history of the capitalist worldsystem, the ideas of free market capitalism with minimal government intervention and the ideas of state regulated capitalism with some social protection have been in fashion in alternating cycles. In response to the worldwide profit stagnation in the 1970s, neoliberalism became politically dominant in the advanced capitalist countries, in the periphery, and eventually in the former socialist bloc. However, neoliberalism failed to deliver its promise of economic growth, and as the global inequalities surged, much of the world population suffered from declines in real incomes. After the mid-1990s, neoliberalism met with growing resistance throughout the world and many governments have been under pressure to restore some state regulation and social protection. Confronted with economic crisis, the Bush administration has simultaneously pursued a further widening of inequality at home and unilateral imperialism abroad. These policies have by now failed decisively. As the United States can no longer finance its economy and imperialist adventure with increasingly larger foreign debt, the U.S. dollar, Wallerstein believes, faces the prospect of a free fall and will cease to be the world's reserve currency. Wallerstein concludes: "The political balance is swinging back....The real question is not whether this phase is over but whether the swing back will be able, as in the past, to restore a state of relative equilibrium in the world-system. Or has too much damage been done? And are we now in for more violent chaos in the world-economy and therefore in the world-system as a whole?"9 Following Wallerstein's arguments, in the coming years we are likely to witness a major realignment of global political and economic forces. There will be an upsurge in die global class struggle over the direction of the global social transformation. If we are in one of the normal cycles of the capitalist world-system, then toward the end of the current period of instability and crisis, we probably will observe a return to the dominance of Keynesian or state capitalist policies and institutions throughout the world.

No Inherency – Challenges to Neoliberalism Now

Major challenges to neoliberalism in the status quo

Berger 99 (Mark, School of Modern Lang Studies – U New South Wales, April, Third World Quarterly 20.2 “Up from neoliberalism”)JFS

From the vantage point of the next millennium, the final decades of this century will no doubt be remembered for the dramatic rekindling of the Cold War at the end of the 1970s and its denouement 10 years later. Twenty-first century observers will also draw attention to the way in which the unravelling of the cold war struggle was followed in less than a decade by the East Asian crisis, which undermined the previously widespread expectation that the rising capitalist 'miracles' of Northeast and Southeast Asia were about to usher in a Pacific Century. Both the collapse of state-socialism and the less definitive, but still precipitous reversal of fortune for the developmental states of East Asia, produced triumphant responses on the part of many proponents of neoliberalism and globalisation.(n1) However, it is now clear that the crisis in East Asia heralded the onset of a global economic crisis which not only represents a serious threat to the East Asian miracle, but also embodies a major challenge to the free-market mythologies which have become a constitutive element of the wider international political economy. The Commanding Heights, by Daniel Yergin and Joseph Stanislaw is an exemplar of the dominant neoliberal narrative which has emerged to legitimate the dramatic reconfiguration of international power relations and economic linkages over the past two decades. This particularly celebratory contribution to the now compendious literature on neoliberalism and globalisation reflects the wider weaknesses of neoliberalism: weaknesses which are playing an important role in the coming crisis of global capitalism.

No Solvency – Localism is Key

Neoliberalism is best challenged at the local level

Robinson 6 (Nick, Yale Law School, J.DD., Fox Fellow at Jawaharal Nehru University, 40 Akron L. Rev. 647)JFS

Although fewer people vote in local elections than in national elections (in part because local elections tend to be more lop-sided affairs), more people try to influence local politics than national politics.180 State and local politicians are usually more accessible than national ones. It is also often easier to create local and state constituencies. Sometimes these state or local constituencies are connected with or develop into national constituencies, but it is the chance to participate locally and impact the governance of one’s locality that often mobilizes those involved. The idea that local action may then turn into a national movement can create synergetic inspiration. State and local democracy leads to large reservoirs of engaged and committed citizens participating in a diverse array of political communities. Not every citizen will take the opportunity to engage with the governments of their localities, but many will. Local political communities’ involvement in questions of foreign relations ensures that debates around these topics will occur at multiple levels of government and in multiple forums. With pools of active and committed citizens, it is then more likely these citizens can and will check an overzealous Congress or executive. The involvement of engaged political classes in localities who also participate in national politics makes it more likely that the potential for tyranny in the federal government’s policies will be checked both here and abroad.

No Solvency – Can’t Work Within The State

Resistance to the neoliberal order must come from outside the state – Indian movements

Gavin 9 [Raders, “Combating the Privatization of Life in a Neo-Liberal Regime: The Fight for Water Democracies in India”, Berkeley Undergraduate Journal 22(1)]JFS

The people of Plachimada, facing the lawlessness of Coca-Cola and the corrupt complicity of the state, initiated one of the most celebrated and inspiring local resistance movements in 21st century India in a heroic effort to remove one of the largest and most powerful corporations in the world from their tiny village. With a massive demonstration on April 22, 2002, a permanent dharna (non- violent vigil) was inaugurated across the road from the factory’s gates, without the support of a single political party in Kerala. The dharna carried on in spite of police intimidation and violent state repression for more than four years: twenty- four hours a day and seven days a week. Under the leadership of Mylamma, sympathetic families from the area would often send one family member a day to partake in the *dharna* while the other members would work the rice fields. From the beginning, one of the foremost tactics incorporated by the protestors in Plachimada was the formation of national and international alliances with a diverse array of civil-society groups. The Plachimada Solidarity Committee, comprising more than 40 civil-society groups from across India, has become a shining example of the power of counter-hegemonic globalization as an antidote in the fight against corporate globalization. Heavily theorized by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, this form of “globalization from below” is constituted by a series of initiatives, movements and organizations that fight against neo-liberal globalization through local/global linkages, networks and alliances (Santos 2005: ix). Santos celebrates this “insurgent cosmopolitanism” as an actualization of a new political fact that is focused on the idea that the current phase of capitalism requires new forms of resistance from both inside and outside the state (Santos 2005). Yet despite the transnational scope and trans-local qualities of “insurgent cosmopolitanism,” Santos cautions that we should not forget that these movements develop out of local initiatives, that resistance to oppression is a daily task undertaken by anonymous people away from the gaze of the media, and that without this resistance, transnational democratic movements could not be sustained (Santos 2005, xxvi).

Impact Turn - Hegemony

A. Neoliberalism is key to hegemony

Cafruny 8 (IR prof, Henry Platt Bristol Professor of International Affairs. Ph.D, Alan, 25 March 2008, <http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/5/2/1/0/pages252105/p252105-3.php>, AMiles)

The role played by U.S. structural financial power in the construction of Europe’s neoliberal project has been analyzed by many scholars (Helleiner, 1994; Gowan, 1999; Seabrooke, 2001; Baker, 2003); Panitch and Gindin, 2005; Cafruny and Ryner, 2007a; Ryner, 2007). However, the relationship between neoliberalism and geopolitics has received less attention. In the first part of this chapter I discuss the role of U.S. military power as it has served, in tandem with U.S. structural financial power, to consolidate the turn to neoliberalism in Europe. Beginning in the mid-1990s the United States transformed NATO from a containment-oriented and defensive alliance to an instrument designed to promote the forward expansion of American power across the European continent and into central Asia. This reinforced Europe’s geopolitical dependence on the United States and buttressed neoliberal social forces across the continent. In the second part of the chapter I consider the long-range possibilities for the United States and Europe in view of growing challenges to U.S. power in both its geoeconomic and geopolitical dimensions. The uncertain status of the dollar is the natural accompaniment to relative industrial decline and the transnationalization of production even as U.S. hegemony has been prolonged through financial deregulation and a resultant series of bubbles. In this context the Bush administration’s policy of geopolitical advance and militarization, designed in part to maintain its hold over global energy resources, is a compensatory strategy (Harvey, 2003) that has, however, encountered substantial costs and risks. Notwithstanding the deepening crisis of the U.S. imperium, the possibilities for a European challenge are sharply circumscribed by its subordinate participation within a U.S.-led neoliberal transnational financial order and its related inability to develop an autonomous regional security structure. U.S. power in both its structural financial and military dimensions has been central to the construction and consolidation of a European neoliberalism. It has not, however, led to transnational class formation or the suppression of inter-imperialist rivalry either at the Atlantic level or within the European Union. Neoliberal ideology cements national capitalist classes together in an organic alliance under a declining but still minimally hegemonic U.S. superpower. From within the framework of this intersubjective agreement the United States continues to provide collective goods in the form of liquidity, trade openness, and military security, albeit very much on its own terms as it externalizes its own problems and social contradictions into the international system. In the eurozone mercantilist rivalry has been displaced from the sphere of national monetary policy to “structural labor reform” and, intermittently, fiscal policy.

B. Hegemony prevents nuclear war

**Khalizhad** **95** (Zalmay, RAND Analyst, "Losing the Moment?”, Washington Quarterly, spring, 19 p. ln)JFS

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Impact Turn – EU Relations

A. Neoliberalism is key to US/EU relations

Cafruny 8 (IR prof, Henry Platt Bristol Professor of International Affairs. Ph.D, Alan, 25 March 2008, <http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/5/2/1/0/pages252105/p252105-3.php>, AMiles)

By proclaiming the limited utility of military force and the advantages of “soft power” in the contemporary era proponents of this concept seek to rescue the thesis of a “European challenge.” (Nye, 2003, 2004; McCormick, 2007). Yet, the dual track enlargements of NATO and the EU have entrenched the position of political elites and transnational business interests across Europe linked to the United States and to neoliberalism. Indeed, even if one grants the limited utility arising from “soft power,” the bargaining position that might, in principle, derive from the sheer weight of the European economy is compromised by the neoliberal context in which a (self-limiting) socio-economic project demands adherence to Washington and Wall Street. Europe’s geopolitical predicament precludes attempts to establish an autonomous EU power and marginalizes forces in “core Europe” that favor alternatives to U.S.-led neoliberalism.

B. That’s key to solve every regional conflict

Hamilton 3 (Daniel, Director of the Center for Transatlantic Relations @ Johns Hopkins University, 6/11/2003 FDCH Congressional Testimony) p. lexis

If our efforts in these areas are ultimately to be successful, however, they must be part of more comprehensive transatlantic strategies aimed at the modernization and transformation of the Greater Middle East itself. A circle—with its center in Tehran—that has a diameter roughly matching the length of the continental United States covers a region that encompasses 75 percent of the world’s population, 60 percent of its GNP, and 75 percent of its energy resources. The Greater Middle East is the region of the world where unsettled relationships, religious and territorial conflicts, fragile and failed regimes, and deadly combinations of technology and terror brew and bubble on top of one vast, relatively contiguous energy field upon which Western prosperity depends. Transformation of this region is the strategic challenge of our time and a key to winning the campaign against terrorism. Choices made there could determine the shape of the 21st century—whether weapons of mass destruction will be unleashed upon mass populations; whether the oil and gas fields of the Caucasus and Central Asia will become reliable sources of energy; whether the Arab world will meet the challenges of modernization and globalization; whether Russia’s borderlands will become stable and secure democracies; whether Israel and its neighbors can live together in peace; and whether the great religions of the world can work together. This is a long term effort. We cannot hope to transform this turbulent region into an area of democratic stability and prosperity soon. But we can act more successfully together to defend common interests, to dampen the negative trends that are gaining momentum, and to work with those in the region who seek to carve out areas of civil society where the state does not intrude.  Such an effort is far more likely to succeed if America and Europe were to pool our energies and resources and pursue it together.

Impact Turn – Environment (1/2)

A. Neoliberalism improves quality of life and checks environmental destruction

Goklany 7 (independent scholar writing on global and national environmental issues. 03-23-2007 The Improving State of the World: Why We're Living Longer, Healthier, More Comfortable Lives on a Cleaner Planet, <http://www.reason.com/news/show/119252.html>)JFS

Environmentalists and globalization foes are united in their fear that greater population and consumption of energy, materials, and chemicals accompanying economic growth, technological change and free trade—the mainstays of globalization—degrade human and environmental well-being. Indeed, the 20th century saw the United States’ population multiply by four, income by seven, carbon dioxide emissions by nine, use of materials by 27, and use of chemicals by more than 100. Yet life expectancy increased from 47 years to 77 years. Onset of major disease such as cancer, heart, and respiratory disease has been postponed between eight and eleven years in the past century. Heart disease and cancer rates have been in rapid decline over the last two decades, and total cancer deaths have actually declined the last two years, despite increases in population. Among the very young, infant mortality has declined from 100 deaths per 1,000 births in 1913 to just seven per 1,000 today. These improvements haven’t been restricted to the United States. It’s a global phenomenon. Worldwide, life expectancy has more than doubled, from 31 years in 1900 to 67 years today. India’s and China’s infant mortalities exceeded 190 per 1,000 births in the early 1950s; today they are 62 and 26, respectively. In the developing world, the proportion of the population suffering from chronic hunger declined from 37 percent to 17 percent between 1970 and 2001 despite a 83 percent increase in population. Globally average annual incomes in real dollars have tripled since 1950. Consequently, the proportion of the planet's developing-world population living in absolute poverty has halved since 1981, from 40 percent to 20 percent. Child labor in low income countries declined from 30 percent to 18 percent between 1960 and 2003. Equally important, the world is more literate and better educated than ever. People are freer politically, economically, and socially to pursue their well-being as they see fit. More people choose their own rulers, and have freedom of expression. They are more likely to live under rule of law, and less likely to be arbitrarily deprived of life, limb**,** and property. Social and professional mobility have also never been greater. It’s easier than ever for people across the world to transcend the bonds of caste, place, gender, and other accidents of birth. People today work fewer hours and have more money and better health to enjoy their leisure time than their ancestors. Man’s environmental record is more complex. The early stages of development can indeed cause some environmental deterioration as societies pursue first-order problems affecting human well-being. These include hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, and lack of education, basic public health services, safe water, sanitation, mobility, and ready sources of energy. Because greater wealth alleviates these problems while providing basic creature comforts, individuals and societies initially focus on economic development, often neglecting other aspects of environmental quality. In time, however, they recognize that environmental deterioration reduces their quality of life. Accordingly, they put more of their recently acquired wealth and human capital into developing and implementing cleaner technologies. This brings about an environmental transition via the twin forces of economic development and technological progress, which begin to provide solutions to environmental problems instead of creating those problems. All of which is why we today find that the richest countries are also the cleanest. And while many developing countries have yet to get past the “green ceiling,” they are nevertheless ahead of where today’s developed countries used to be when they were equally wealthy. The point of transition from "industrial period" to "environmental conscious" continues to fall. For example, the US introduced unleaded gasoline only after its GDP per capita exceeded $16,000. India and China did the same before they reached $3,000 per capita. This progress is a testament to the power of globalization and the transfer of ideas and knowledge (that lead is harmful, for example).

Impact Turn – Environment (2/2)

B. Environmental Degradation causes extinction

Suurküla 6 (Jaan, Chairman of Physicians and Scientists, M.D., for Responsible Application of Science and Technology (PSRAST), Physicians and Scientists for Responsible Application of Science and Technology, 6/24, http://www.globalissues.org/article/171/loss-of-biodiversity-and-extinctions)JFS

The world environmental situation is likely to be further aggravated by the increasingly rapid, large scale global extinction of species. It occurred in the 20th century at a rate that was a thousand times higher than the average rate during the preceding 65 million years. This is likely to destabilize various ecosystems including agricultural systems. …In a slow extinction, various balancing mechanisms can develop. No one knows what will be the result of this extremely rapid extinction rate. What is known, for sure, is that the world ecological system has been kept in balance through a very complex and multifacetted interaction between a huge number of species. This rapid extinction is therefore likely to precitate collapses of ecolosystems at a global scale. This is predicted to create large-scale agricultural problems, threatening food supplies to hundreds of millions of people. This ecological prediction does not take into consideration the effects of global warming which will further aggravate the situation. Industrialized fishing has contributed importantly to mass extinction due to repeatedly failed attempts at limiting the fishing. A new global study concludes that 90 percent of all large fishes have disappeared from the world’s oceans in the past half century, the devastating result of industrial fishing. The study, which took 10 years to complete and was published in the international journal Nature, paints a grim picture of the Earth’s current populations of such species as sharks, swordfish, tuna and marlin. …The loss of predatory fishes is likely to cause multiple complex imbalances in marine ecology. Another cause for extensive fish extinction is the destruction of coral reefs. This is caused by a combination of causes, including warming of oceans, damage from fishing tools and a harmful infection of coral organisms promoted by ocean pollution. It will take hundreds of thousands of years to restore what is now being destroyed in a few decades. …According to the most comprehensive study done so far in this field, over a million species will be lost in the coming 50 years. The most important cause was found to be climate change

Impact Turn – Poverty/Economy (1/2)

A. Neoliberalism solves the economy and poverty

Balakrishnan, 2000 (Political Science Professor at University of Chicago and member of the editorial board of New Left Review, Gopal, “Hardt and Negri’s Empire”, New Left Review, September-October, <http://newleftreview.org/A2275>)JFS

Inseparable from the failure to think politically, Hardt and Negri, like the rioters endlessly disrupting World Trade Organization meetings, offer no evidence to support their basic charge that economic globalization is causing wide-scale planetary misery. Predictably, this past summer, as the G-8 meeting got underway in Genoa, Italy, the New York Times chose these two "joyful" Communists to write a lengthy op-ed extolling the virtues of anti-globalization rioters. The truth about globalization is exactly the reverse of what Hardt and Negri assert. Globalization is dramatically increasing world prosperity and freedom. As the Economist's John Micklethwait and Adrian Wooldridge point out, in the half century since the foundation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the world economy has expanded six-fold, in part because trade has increased 1,600 percent; nations open to trade grow nearly twice as fast as those that aren't; and World Bank data show that during the past decade of accelerated economic globalization, approximately 800 million people escaped poverty.

B. Economic collapse causes extinction

Kerpen 8 (Phil policy director for American’s for Prosperity October 28, 2008 http://www.philkerpen.com/?q=node/201 From Panic to Depression? The dangers of blaming free trade, low taxes, and flexible labor markets)JFS

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors — not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale.

Impact Turn – Poverty/Economy (2/2)

C. Poverty causes extinction through disease, environmental degradation, terrorism and war

Rice 6 (senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Susan E, The National Interest, Spring http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/articles/2006/spring\_globaleconomics\_rice/20060401.pdf)JFS

When American s see televised images of bone-thin children with distended bellies, their humanitarian instincts take over. They don’t typically look at unicef footage and perceive a threat that could destroy our way of life. Yet global poverty is not solely a humanitarian concern. In real ways, over the long term, it can threaten U.S. national security. Poverty erodes weak states’ capacity to prevent the spread of disease and protect the world’s forests and watersheds**—**some of the global threats Maurice Greenberg noted in the Winter 2005 issue. It also creates conditions conducive to transnational criminal enterprises and terrorist activity, not only by making desperate individuals potentially more susceptible to recruitment, but also, and more significantly, by undermining the state’s ability to prevent and counter those violent threats. Poverty can also give rise to the tensions that erupt in civil conflict, which further taxes the state and allows transnational predators greater freedom of action. Americans can no longer realistically hope that we can erect the proverbial glass dome over our homeland and live safely isolated from the killers—natural or man-made—that plague other parts of the world. Al-Qaeda established training camps in conflict-ridden Sudan and Afghanistan, purchased diamonds from Sierra Leone and Liberia, and now targets American soldiers in Iraq. The potential toll of a global bird-flu pandemic is particularly alarming. A mutated virus causing human-to-human contagion could kill hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans. Today, more than half the world’s population lives on less than $2 per day, and almost 1.1 billion people live in extreme poverty, defined as less than $1 per day. The costs of global poverty are multiple. Poverty prevents poor countries from devoting sufficient resources to detect and contain deadly disease. According to the World Health Organization (who), low- and middle-income countries suffer 90 percent of the world’s disease burden but account for only 11 percent of its health care spending. Poverty also dramatically increases the risk of civil conflict. A recent study by the uk’s Department for International Development showed that a country at $250 gdp per capita has on average a 15 percent risk of internal conflict over five years, while a country at $5,000 per capita has a risk of less than 1 percent. War zones provide ideal operational environs for international outlaws. If in the old days the consequences of extreme poverty could conveniently be confined to the far corners of the planet, this is no longer the case. The end of U.S.-Soviet competition, the civil and regional conflicts that ensued, and the rapid pace of globalization have brought to the fore a new generation of dangers. These are the complex nexus of transnational security threats: infectious disease, environmental degradation, international crime and drug syndicates, proliferation of small arms and weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism. Often these threats emerge from impoverished, relatively remote regions of the world. They thrive especially in conflict or lawless zones, in countries where corruption is endemic, and in poor, weak states with limited control over their territory or resources.

Impact Turn – Globalization

A. Neoliberalism is key to globalization (duh…)

George 99 (“A Short History Of Neo-Liberalism: Twenty Years Of Elite Economics And Emerging Opportunities For Structural Change,” pg online @ <http://www.zmag.org/CrisesCurEvts/Globalism/george.htm>)JFS

Over the past twenty years, the IMF has been strengthened enormously. Thanks to the debt crisis and the mechanism of conditionality, it has moved from balance of payments support to being quasi-universal dictator of so-called "sound" economic policies, meaning of course neo-liberal ones. The World Trade Organisation was finally put in place in January 1995 after long and laborious negotiations, often rammed through parliaments which had little idea what they were ratifying. Thankfully, the most recent effort to make binding and universal neo-liberal rules, the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, has failed, at least temporarily. It would have given all rights to corporations, all obligations to governments and no rights at all to citizens.

B. This turns the aff – globalization checks exploitation – your movement works better in a world of globalization

Weede 4 (Erich, Professor, Sociology, University of Bonn, “The Diffusion of Prosperity and Peace by Globalization,” INDEPENDENT REVIEW v. 9 n. 2, September 22, p. 165)JFS

With regard to the expansion of economic freedom and secure property rights, globalization provides reason for hope. Globalization ties politicians’ hands and prevents them from pursuing politically attractive but self-defeating policies, such as those that created the welfare state and its disastrous effects on incentives to produce goods or services for others. As Vanberg has observed, “competition among jurisdictions offers citizens and jurisdiction-users effective protection against exploitation, be it in favor of privileged groups or of those who hold the reigns of political decision-making power” (2000, 106). Where markets are significantly larger than political units, stifling the markets by political controls and by undermining economic freedom becomes more difficult than elsewhere. In my view (Weede 1996, chap. 4, and 2000, inspired by Jones 1981), even the rise of the West and the comparative stagnation of the great Asian civilizations until the mid- or late twentieth century is owing to political fragmentation and disunity in Europe in contrast to the huge centralized empires in China, India, or the Middle East. Capital and even labor to a lesser degree could exit from oppressive rule in the West, thereby mitigating its incidence. By contrast, Asian emperors or sultans were not forced to respect the property rights of merchants and producers.

C. Independently, it prevents nuclear war

Copley News Service 99 (staff, December 1, 1999, LN)

For decades, many children in America and other countries went to bed fearing annihilation by nuclear war. The specter of nuclear winter freezing the life out of planet Earth seemed very real. Activists protesting the [WTO] World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle apparently have forgotten that threat. The truth is that nations join together in groups like the WTO not just to further their own prosperity, but also to forestall conflict with other nations. In a way, our planet has traded in the threat of a worldwide nuclear war for the benefit of cooperative global economics. Some Seattle protesters clearly fancy themselves to be in the mold of nuclear disarmament or anti-Vietnam War protesters of decades past. But they're not. They're special-interest activists, whether the cause is environmental, labor or paranoia about global government. Actually, most of the demonstrators in Seattle are very much unlike yesterday's peace activists, such as Beatle John Lennon or philosopher Bertrand Russell, the father of the nuclear disarmament movement, both of whom urged people and nations to work together rather than strive against each other. These and other war protesters would probably approve of 135 WTO nations sitting down peacefully to discuss economic issues that in the past might have been settled by bullets and bombs. As long as nations are trading peacefully, and their economies are built on exports to other countries, they have a major disincentive to wage war. That's why bringing China, a budding superpower, into the WTO is so important. As exports to the United States and the rest of the world feed Chinese prosperity, and that prosperity increases demand for the goods we produce, the threat of hostility diminishes. Many anti-trade protesters in Seattle claim that only multinational corporations benefit from global trade, and that it's the everyday wage earners who get hurt. That's just plain wrong. First of all, it's not the military-industrial complex benefiting. It's U.S. companies that make high-tech goods. And those companies provide a growing number of jobs for Americans. In San Diego, many people have good jobs at Qualcomm, Solar Turbines and other companies for whom overseas markets are essential. In Seattle, many of the 100,000 people who work at Boeing would lose their livelihoods without world trade. Foreign trade today accounts for 30 percent of our gross domestic product. That's a lot of jobs for everyday workers. Growing global prosperity has helped counter the specter of nuclear winter. Nations of the world are learning to live and work together, like the singers of anti-war songs once imagined. Those who care about world peace shouldn't be protesting world trade. They should be celebrating it.

Impact Turn – Micro-Credit Programs

A. Neoliberalism is key to the success of micro-credit programs

GDRC, 97 (Global Development Research Center is an independent nonprofit think tank, “The Limits of Micro Credit as a Rural Development Intervention” <http://www.gdrc.org/icm/jimmy-roth.pdf>)JFS

The rise of neo-liberalism has facilitated a distorted perspective of the prospects and possibilities of micro finance as a rural development intervention. The promotion of micro credit as a rural development intervention has tied in neatly with neo- liberal development ideology. As mentioned, it develops new markets and promotes a culture of entrepreneurship; it involves minimal state intervention; and provides loans, not grants, moving away from welfare type interventions; finally and perhaps most importantly, it shifts the locus of attention away from society towards the individual. This ideological conjunction has, to borrow a phrase from John Toye “expanded their [the micro finance evangelists] access to public platforms and their prospects for reward and honour” (Toye 1993: 23). As the rewards and honours increase (heading CGAP, US presidential awards etc.) so the incentive for biased appraisals of the prospects and possibilities of micro finance increases. Eventually we are left with a situation in which Yunus Mohammed tells us that after the global spread of micro credit, "Maybe our great-grandchildren will go to museums to see what poverty was” (quoted in Bornstein 1996) The limits of micro credit as a rural development intervention have been lost in the promotional frenzy. Essentially, the limits arise from the individualist focus of the intervention. Micro credit as a development intervention requires an enabling environment for it to be successful.

B. Micro-credit key to solve poverty and women’s rights

Pinto 9 (Jim Pinto is the Founder (formerly President & CEO) of Action Instruments Technology Futurist, “Micro-Loans help to Abolish Poverty & Build Self-Respect” <http://www.automationmedia.com/JimPinto.asp?ID=%2026>)JFS

The Nobel Peace Prize for 2006 has been awarded to Muhammad Yunus and Grameen Bank for their efforts to create economic and social development for poor people. I saw Yunus on CPAN the other day, and was impressed by his clear visions and simple answers to many complex questions. With pioneering "micro-credit" loans (as little as $10) Yunus has transformed society in Bangladesh, one of the poorest countries in the world. While poverty is increasing elsewhere in the world, in Bangladesh it is steadily decreasing, and decreasing faster. The movement started in 1974, when Muhammad Yunus, a University economics professor in Bangladesh, took his students on a field trip to a poor village. They saw a woman making bamboo stools, who had to borrow a few pennies to buy raw bamboo. After repaying the money-lender, at rates as high as 10% a week, she was left with a penny profit margin. Had she been able to borrow at better rates, she would have been able to get beyond the subsistence level. Realizing that there was something terribly wrong with the economics he was teaching, Yunus (from his own pocket) lent the equivalent of about $25 to 42 basket-weavers. He found that this tiny amount not only helped them to survive, but also created the spark of personal initiative for them to pull themselves out of poverty. Against the advice of banks and the government, Yunus continued giving "micro-loans" and in 1983 formed the Grameen Bank ("village bank") founded on the principles of trust and solidarity. In Bangladesh today, Grameen has 1,084 branches, with 12,500 staff, and 2.1 million borrowers in 37,000 villages. 94% of the borrowers are women and over 98% of the loans are paid back, a recovery rate higher than any other banking system. Grameen methods are now applied in 58 countries, including the US, Canada, France, The Netherlands and Norway. Muhammad Yunus is that rare thing - a bona fide visionary. His dream is the total eradication of poverty from the world. He has started a fundamental rethink on the economic relationship between the rich and the poor, their rights and their obligations. Yunus was asked for his views on the American welfare system. Here's his direct, simple and startling response, which rings true: "In the wealthy, western countries you have designed a great big box called 'social welfare'. If people are poor, it is society's responsibility to keep them alive. I think that's completely wrong. That way of thinking creates a divide between those who work and can take care of themselves and those who cannot. " "What happens? If you're one of the unlucky few, you get a benefit payment every month. The message is clear: 'No need to do anything, the government will take care of you'. So people become dependent. The get used to having society hand out money. They don't have to do anything for it, don't have to justify it. That is deadly to initiative, and they start waiting for more aid. That's when the fundamental human element of creativity is broken. " "The social welfare system creates a human zoo. The animals in the zoo are given their meals on time and a doctor comes by when they're sick, but they are living in captivity. They still have a vague instinct that tells them they should hunt, but they aren't challenged to go hungry for days and hunt prey. The animals aren't as sharp and inventive as they would be in nature. They have become a poor imitation of themselves. People who are swallowed up in the western social welfare system are also no longer themselves. They aren't stimulated to discover their possibilities, talents and creativity. They are robbed of every challenge. They are curbed in their development." "Every single individual on earth has both the potential and the right to live a decent life. Across cultures and civilizations, even the poorest of the poor can work to bring about their own development. "Micro-credit has proved to be an important liberating force in societies where women, in particular, have to struggle against repressive social and economic conditions. Economic growth and political democracy can not achieve their full potential unless the female half of humanity participates on an equal footing with the male."

Impact Turn – Public/Private Partnerships (1/2)

A. Your authors don’t assume diluted American neoliberalism – it’s not negative and strengthens public/private partnerships

Hill, 2k (Richard Child Hill, Michigan State University “Politics and the State” <https://www.msu.edu/user/hillrr/CS%20The%20Neoliberal%20City%20Hackworth.htm>)JFS

Pure in principle, neoliberalism is always diluted in practice.  As the doctrine spreads among geographical areas and sectors of social life, it weighs into the balance of local political forces, faces competing institutional legacies, and combines with other governance practices.  Consequently, the Neoliberal City is always in the act of becoming. Jason Hackworth, a Geography and Planning Professor at the University of Toronto, organizes The Neoliberal City around a series of contrasts between the Keynesian Managerial City and the Neoliberal City--in social thought, in methods of local governance, in urban form, in patterns of uneven development, and in public activism.  He analyzes the mechanisms of “neoliberalization” driving each transition and provides empirical studies of individual cities to flesh out the contrasts.  Emphasis is mainly on the inner city where the vestiges of the Keynesian welfare state are still most visible. Keynesian urban governance is characterized by managerialism, that is, by an emphasis on national regulation, local participation in federal programs, strong city administration, and commitment to decent standards of collective consumption.  The neoliberal counterpart, urban entrepreneurialism, devolves regulatory power from national to local authorities, diffuses local government authority to public/private partnerships, emphasizes public choice and unregulated growth. Urban form in the Keynesian era is characterized by suburban growth, inner city decline, regulated development, and public investment in infrastructure.  The Neoliberal City, by contrast, evinces investment in the inner city and in the exurbs, declining inner ring suburbs, slack land use controls, and reduced public investment.  The Keynesian focus on public housing in the inner city shifts to the neoliberal emphasis on gentrification and commercial mega-projects. The gentrifyers themselves also change as profit-seeking land development firms replace individual owner occupiers.

B. PPPs key to space exploration – they fill in gaps in government budgets

Taylor 8 (Tom, Lunar Transportation Systems, Vice president and senior member, “Outreach Development Public Private Partnership for Space Exploration”, <http://tinyurl.com/Outreach-Development-Public-Pr>)JFS

Continuing innovation and technology development is one way a global leader nation defines itself. Both happen in war and can happen in peace, if we think like President Lincoln. Innovation adds new dimensions to technology and sometimes comes from unexpected avenues. Innovation and how to stimulate it plus finance it is the subject of this paper. The opportunities available to mankind in the exploration of the universe are bigger than the Louisiana Purchase, and space commerce generally brings innovation and reduces costs in a competitive marketplace. Public Private Partnerships (PPP) are one method of expanding the money available to develop the opportunities. President Lincoln started the Transcontinental Railroad during our most costly war and it accelerated the development of the American West. Space exploration is a milestone for our species of a magnitude and opportunities never before encountered. Lincoln chose to stimulate others to finance the transportation into the American West by leapfrogging into building a railroad to the Pacific. America must again innovate, leapfrog our technology and build the partnerships plus the hardware stimulated by innovation and private investment to come forward and fill in the “gaps” in government space budgets. Space exploration innovation must energize our American economic engine and to “be what we can be.” We need to start the big projects that are not getting start by government space budgets alone. This innovation includes collecting energy in space for Earth use, developing trade routes beyond our home planet, joining nations to build projects, combining global government capabilities to solve climate problems and to use our resources in a peaceful manner, which is done everyday by global commerce. Society expects space tourism to produce low costs quickly, but entrepreneurs/financers need larger commercial markets on which bankers are comfortable. What are some examples of innovation that might impact our problems/solutions? Space Based Solar Power is perceived as so large and expensive everybody is scared to touch it for fear their budgets will be changed, yet it has become near term and very “GREEN” in its solution. Congress waits until problems are so large that massive solutions are forced instead of solving problems in a planned manner. Lunar bases are orders of magnitude more remote than bases on Earth, but lessons learned like the North Slope of Alaska can teach us about our first trade route beyond Earth including logistics and private financial development techniques. Within PPPs, government stretches space budgets, increases vehicle innovation without cost, with less cost to the taxpayers, and gains cost advantages of larger markets. This paper explores innovation and PPPs to bring governments and innovation together to stimulate financing to flourish in a world of dwindling resources. History will view lunar trade routes as a slow start after the Apollo landings in 1969, but the commerce possible from an evolving, affordable, two directional, sustainable trade route will definitely be a part of it, with at least one early transportation native financed privately to remain in operation after NASA moves on to explore the universe.

Impact Turn – Private/Public Partnerships (2/2)

C. Key to prevent extinction from asteriods

Oberg, 99 (James, Space Writer and former Space Flight Engineer Space Power Theory,

<http://www.jamesoberg.com/books/spt/new-CHAPTERSw_figs.pdf>)JFS

We have the great gift of yet another period when our nation is not threatened; and our world is free from opposing coalitions with great global capabilities. We can use this period to take our nation and our fellow men into the greatest adventure that our species has ever embarked upon. The United States can lead, protect, and help the rest of mankind to move into space. It is particularly fitting that a country comprised of people from all over the globe assumes that role. This is a manifest destiny worthy of dreamers and poets, warriors and conquerors. In his last book, *Pale Blue Dot*, Carl Sagan presents an emotional argument that our species must venture into the vast realm of space to establish a spacefaring civilization. While acknowledging the very high costs that are involved in manned spaceflight, Sagan states that our very survival as a species depends on colonizing outer space. Astronomers have already identified dozens of asteroids that might someday smash into Earth. Undoubtedly, many more remain undetected. In Sagan’s opinion, the only way to avert inevitable catastrophe is for mankind to establish a permanent human presence in space. He compares humans to the planets that roam the night sky, as he says that humans will too wander through space. We will wander space because we possess a compulsion to explore, and space provides a truly infinite prospect of new directions to explore. Sagan’s vision is part science and part emotion. He hoped that the exploration of space would unify humankind. We propose that mankind follow the United States and our allies into this new sea, set with jeweled stars. If we lead, we can be both strong and caring. If we step back, it may be to the detriment of more than our country.

No Solvency – Neoliberalism Inevitable

Neoliberalism is inevitable – markets control our thought

Hudson 99 [Mark, Progressive Librarian, Fall, “Understanding Information Media in the Age of Neoliberalism: The Contributions of Herbert Schiller”]JFS

Neoliberal ideas are as old as capitalism itself, but in recent decades they have seen a tremendous resurgence and have displaced the state-interventionist economic theories of the interwar and post-World War II periods to become the reigning ideology of our time. Neoliberalism emerged full force in the 1980s with the right-wing Reagan and Thatcher regimes, but its influence has since spread across the political spectrum to encompass not only centrist political parties but even much of the traditional social-democratic left. In the 1990s, neoliberal hegemony over our politics and culture has become so overwhelming that it is becoming difficult to even rationally discuss what neoliberalism is; indeed, as Robert McChesney notes, the term "neoliberalism" is hardly known to the U.S. public outside of academia and the business community (McChesney). The corporate stranglehold on our information and communications media gives neoliberal ideologues a virtually unchallenged platform from which to blast their pro-market messages into every corner of our common culture. At the same time, neoliberalism provides the ideological cover for deregulatory legislation (most recently the 1996 Telecommunications Act) that enables corporations to extend their monopoly over these media even more. For the past three decades, one of the fiercest and most coherent critics of corporate control over the information/communications sphere has been the social scientist Herbert Schiller. Although Schiller began his career before neoliberalism's ascendance, and he does not even today use the term in his writings, his work provides essential insights into the roots of neoliberal/corporate hegemony over our information media and the adverse consequences of that hegemony for our politics, economy and culture.

Turn – Public/Private Distinctions

Critiques of privatized force are flawed – they create arbitrary distinctions between private and public that don’t exist.

Sullivan 10 (CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW VOLUME 42 FEBRUARY 2010 NUMBER 3, “Private Force / Public Goods” SCOTT M., Assistant Professor of Law, LSU, http://connecticutlawreview.org/documents/ScottM.Sullivan-PrivateForce-PublicGoods.pdf)KM

1. Illusory Line Drawing The quintessential public nature of national security is a fundamental trait of the theoretical critiques of national security privatization. Despite the intuitive attraction, accepting national security as inherently public would require a principled assessment that lands it irretrievably and impermeably in the “public” sphere.40 Such a position would require a determination that national security is necessarily “public” because its private provision would cause societal harm and evade societal benefit.41 There has never been a clear division of public and private functions. However, the prevalence of privatized governmental services, the expanded markets of globalized business, the interconnectedness provided by contemporary technology, and the predominant corporatization of the free-market make such a determination even more challenging.42 Traditionally, the drive for privatization is couched in economic terms.43 Economically, necessarily “public” services are those that cannot be denied to people who refuse to pay and, thus, do not create a favorable market for private provision.44 Such a quality would exist where the service in question, much like national security, requires universal coverage and would encourage free riding.45 The “public” nature of a service, however, only speaks to a prohibition from public withdrawal in offering the service generally, not to the private provision of such a service.46 As a result, just as the State can privatize the manufacture of weaponry, “[i]t could in principle contract out the operation of that weaponry as well.”47 Deviating from questions of the private provision of goods, national security privatization commentary has often focused on the ideological argument that privatization should be prohibited (or deeply limited) on concerns of discretion and importance.48 In making the claim that the privatization of force represents a distinctively public endeavor of discretion, scholars have pointed their criticism toward contractors of a lethal nature (i.e., armed) while avoiding contractors considered more benign, thus engaging in another line-drawing exercise that only exacerbates the theoretical problem.49 Couched in different terms such as active/passive, armed/non-armed, or lethal/non-lethal potential, the conceptual dilemma is the same.50 Clear lines between a Blackwater guard, an unmanned aerial drone operator, and a weapons logistical mechanic are impossible to materially differentiate within the dimension of public and private functions.51

A2: State Sovereignty Impact

The state doesn’t sacrifice sovereignty through PMC’s – sovereignty lies in the ability to make decisions, not the execution of those decisions.

Sullivan 10 (*CONNECTICUT LAW REVIEW* VOLUME 42 FEBRUARY 2010 NUMBER 3, “Private Force / Public Goods” SCOTT M., Assistant Professor of Law, LSU, http://connecticutlawreview.org/documents/ScottM.Sullivan-PrivateForce-PublicGoods.pdf)KM

The sovereignty critique suffers from the same failings of public and private line drawing endemic to that of the legal scholarship. It multiplies the complication by also failing to discern forms of sovereignty cession that are commonly accepted as not representing an accompanying loss of control. First, sovereignty in all forms possesses a character of a state right of dominion—of law, as authority, and as gatekeeper—the intrinsic nature of which creates a threshold determination of “public” powers residing in the State.52 Just as legal scholars struggle with the public and private characterization, international law scholars do so in the context of sovereignty as well. The argument that delegation of governmental services represents a forfeiture of sovereign power (in any degree) conflicts with conventional conceptions of sovereignty.53 Scholars have long accepted that questions of sovereign control reside within the realm of sovereignty gauged by the process and effectiveness of state decision making rather than the formal executor of those decisions.54 State national security is not an exception. For example, the complete outsourcing of Japan’s national security to the U.S. neither legally divests it of other sovereign powers nor demonstrates any functional inability to reassert sovereign powers (including defense) or effectuate the same goals through other policy points. Just as treaty regimes with reporting requirements and alliances among nations may complicate sovereign rights, the complication is undertaken as part of a presumed state interest in consenting to that exchange.

**Turn – Neoliberalism Checks PMCs**

Neoliberalism ensures democratic accountability for PMCs

Krahmann 10 (Elke, Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Bristol, “States, Citizens and the Privatisation of Security”, p. 2-3)

The second characteristic distinguishing the military contractor model from the professional soldier is profit motivation. While profes­sional soldiers ideally rank patriotism higher than financial rewards, private military contractors have no qualms about the primacy of mon­etary gain in their choice of employment."' Although many private military contractors in Iraq also profess other motives such as trying to help and fighting for democracy and freedom, they admit that the key reason for their being in the region is the high wages that they can earn as military contractors. Contrary to Republicanism, Neoliberalism sees profit motivation as a suitable means for ensuring the democratic control and accountability of private military contractors. Rather than believing that soldiers will honour abstract notions of duty towards the state and society, Neoliberalism contends that profit motivation can be used to encourage the efficiency and effectiveness of private military contractors as well as their responsiveness towards public and private demands. Thirdly, military contractors lack a distinct professional and col­lective identity which would ensure their compliance with professional military norms and standards. Due to the differentiation among mili­tary functions in contemporary warfare, private military contractors are typically specialists with a particular technical expertise. While professional soldiers are categorized in terms of rank, private military contractors are trained, hired and paid for their individual skills. The military contractor is an expert who provides a particular function from managing base camps to flying unmanned spy planes. Many private military contractors do not even have basic military training. Military contractors also do not develop a collective group identity. Most pri­vate military contractors work under short-term contracts of two to six months and for different firms. Since speed of deployment is one of their main advantages, private military companies operate through lists of potential employees who are called up if and when their skills are required. Contractors are typically thrown together with others for a particular operation with little training and preparation. The mixing of different nationalities and backgrounds also inhibits the formation of a collective identity. Some companies offering armed security services, therefore, seek to recruit from certain nations, occupations and even sections of national armed forces in order to improve unit cohesion. From an operational viewpoint, the lack of a common professional and group identity might be a disadvantage. However, Neoliberalism contends that the associated fragmentation of influence and resources can facilitate democratic control and accountability by decreasing the size of the armed forces and mixing civilian and military occupational spheres.

Alt Cause – Neoconservativism

Neoliberalism is sustained by neoconservative beliefs – the aff doesn’t solve

Harvey 7 (David, PhD of Anthropology at Cambridge, “A Brief History of Neoliberalism” p. 195)

The consolidation of neoconservative authoritarianism then emerges as one potential answer. Neoconservatism, I argued in Chapter 3, sustains the neoliberal drive towards the construction of asymmetric market freedoms but makes the anti-democratic tendencies of neoliberalism explicit through a turn into authoritar­ian, hierarchical, and even militaristic means of maintaining law and order. In The Neo Imperialism I explored Hannah Arendt's thesis that militarization abroad and at home inevitably go hand in hand, and concluded that the international adventurism of the neoconservatives, long planned and legitimized after the 9/11 attacks, had as much to do with asserting domestic control over a fractious and much-divided body politic in the US as it did with a geopolitical strategy of maintaining global hegemony through con­trol over oil resources. Fear and insecurity both internally and externally were all too easily—and in this case successfully when it came to re-election time—manipulated for political purposes.16

Alt Cause – Nationalism

Nationalism sustains the neoliberal order – aff doesn’t solve

Harvey 7 (David, PhD of Anthropology at Cambridge, “A Brief History of Neoliberalism” p. 195-196)

But the neoconservatives also assert a higher moral purpose, at the core of which lies an appeal to a nationalism that has long had, as we saw in Chapter 3, a fraught relationship with neoliberaliza­tion. US nationalism has, however, a dual character. On the one hand it presumes that it is the God-given (and the religious invoca­tion is deliberate) manifest destiny of the US to be the greatest power on earth (if not number one in everything from baseball to the Olympics) and that, as a beacon of freedom, liberty, and pro­gress, it has been and continues to be universally admired and considered worthy of emulation. Everyone, it is said, wants to either live in or be like the US. The US therefore benevolently and generously gives freely of its resources and its values and culture to the rest of the world, in the cause of conferring the privilege of Americanization and American values on all and sundry. But US nationalism also has a darker stile in which paranoia about fearful threats from enemies and evil forces from outside take over. The fear is of foreigners and of immigrants, of outside agitators, and now, of course, of 'terrorists'. This leads to the internal circling of wagons and the closing down of civil liberties and freedoms in episodes like the persecution of anarchists in the 1920s, the McCarthyism of the 1950s directed against communists and their sympathizers, the paranoid style of Richard Nixon towards opponents of the Vietnam War and, since 9/11, the tendency to characterize all critics of administration policies as aiding and abet­ting the enemy. This kind of nationalism easily fuses with racism (most particularly now towards Arabs), the restriction of civil lib­erties (the Patriot Act), the curbing of press freedoms (the gaoling of journalists for not revealing their sources), and the embrace of incarceration and the death penalty to deal with malfeasance. Externally this nationalism leads to covert action and now to pre­emptive wars to eradicate anything that seems like the remotest threat to the hegemony of US values and the dominance of US interests. Historically, these two strains of nationalism have always coexisted:\* They have sometimes been in open conflict with each other (in the divisions over how to deal with the revolutions in Central America in the 1980s for example).

Alt Cause – Patriarchy

Patriarchy sustains the neoliberal order – the aff doesn’t solve enough

World Council of Churches 7 (Church community that focuses on the elimination of inequality, 6/11, http://www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents/wcc-programmes/public-witness-addressing-power-affirming-peace/poverty-wealth-and-ecology/neoliberal-paradigm/african-womens-statement-on-poverty-wealth-and-ecology.html)

Patriarchal structures are pivotal to processes of neoliberal economic globalisation. The interaction between patriarchy and neoliberal economic globalisation has concentrated decision-making power and productive means and resources, especially capital, in the hands of the so-called "Davos man". It has also resulted in drastic cuts in investment in life-giving areas such as sustainable agriculture and education and health services. Women, who stand at the fulcrum of production and reproduction, have been disproportionately affected through: Weakened participation in economic decision-making processes; Diminished access to productive resources and services (e.g. land, credit and technology); Erosion of food sovereignty; Declining wages and destruction of livelihoods; Violation of economic, social and cultural rights (e.g. the right to avail health and education services); and Intensification of socially-ascribed reproductive or caring responsibilities especially in light of the HIV-AIDS pandemic (e.g. caring for the ill and fetching water and fuel).

Alt Cause – Racism

Racism underpins neoliberalism – the aff doesn’t solve enough

Davis 8 (Angela, writer for ABC News, http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2008/03/19/2193689.htm)

Neoliberalism sees the market as the very paradigm of freedom and democracy emerges as a synonym for capitalism, which has reemerged as the telos of history. In the official narratives of US history, the historical victories of civil rights are dealt with as the final consolidation of democracy in the US, having relegating racism to the dustbin of history. The path toward the complete elimination of racism is represented in the neoliberalist discourse of colourblindness. Equality can only be achieved when the law, as well as individual subjects, become blind to race and fail to apprehend the material and ideological work that race continues to do. When obvious examples of racism appear to the public, they are considered to be isolated aberrations, to be addressed as anachronistic attributes of individual behaviour. There have been a number of such cases in recent months in the US: the noose that was hung on a tree branch by white students at a school in Jena, Louisiana as a sign that black students were prohibited from gathering under that tree; the public use of racist expletives by a well-known white comedian; the racist and misogynist language employed by a well-known radio host in referring to black women on a college basketball team, and finally, recent comments regarding the golfer Tiger Woods. But if we see these individual eruptions of racism as connected to the persistence and further entrenchment of institutional and structural racism that hides behind the curtain of neoliberalism, their meanings cannot be understood as individual aberrations.

Impact Turn – Innovation

A. Neolib key to innovation

Sandefur 8 (Timothy, lead attorney in the Economic Liberty Project at the Pacific Legal Foundation in Sacramento, http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Innovation.html#abouttheauthor)

There are two common sayings about innovation. The first is that “if you build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door.” In a seminal work on innovation, economist Jacob Schmookler gave credence to this view when he compared the rates at which patents were issued with the amount of investment in new technologies. Schmookler concluded that innovation is driven almost exclusively by economic demand: people engage in innovation out of a belief that the economic returns will be greater than its costs.19 But some economists criticize his approach as overly simplistic, particularly for ignoring factors independent of economics that heavily influence how innovation happens.20 Mere demand for a new product or service is not enough to bring an innovation about. The other common saying holds that “necessity is the mother of invention.” But the reality is that *leisure* is the mother of innovation. In economic terms, surplus capital provides the necessary time and startup costs for implementing a new idea (see investment).21 Because a new product or service, or even a new social more, might not succeed, a potential innovator must assemble the resources to permit him to begin implementation without a guaranteed return on the investment. The ability to assemble and invest capital is therefore indispensable for innovation of any sort, and capital is available only when some people have enough wealth to permit innovators to spend their time thinking creatively.

B. Innovation key to survival

Sandefur 8 (Timothy, lead attorney in the Economic Liberty Project at the Pacific Legal Foundation in Sacramento, http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Innovation.html#abouttheauthor)

Defenders of innovation, whom Virginia Postrel calls “dynamists,”16 argue that innovation is essential for solving problems that impose significant social and personal costs. For example, humans lived with disease and starvation for most of recorded history, but technological advancement has led to cures for many of these diseases and improved the production of food, with beneficial consequences for a great many people. The introduction of labor-saving technology was essential to this process even though it initially caused disruption by costing the jobs of manual laborers. Moreover, some defenders of innovation point out that some of what opponents see as “costs” of innovation are in reality benefits. C. P. Snow, for example, argues in *The Two Cultures* that opponents of innovation tend to overlook the suffering of disenfranchised groups, or even to romanticize it. Postrel criticizes Leon Kass’s views on medical science on these grounds, arguing that it is morally wrong to regard suffering and illness as essential parts of human experience that ought to be preserved.17 By contrast, defenders of innovation often see it as beneficial for innovation to disrupt social orders they see as unjust; in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame,* for example, Victor Hugo dramatizes the importance of the printing press in disrupting the unjust social order of the middle ages.18 As with social disruption, dynamists regard the economic disruption caused by innovation as a benefit to the consumer and as an important step in the pursuit of economic efficiency. In short, dynamists tend to favor innovation out of a humanistic concern for the survival and flourishing of individuals.

\*\*\*Mercenaries PIC\*\*\*

1NC (1/2)

TEXT:

The term “Private military contractors” is a façade used to cover the reality of their mercenary status – we should refer to “PMCs” as mercenaries to unveil the legal circumvention used to justify their actions.

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.879-880)

It is often assumed that the international legal definition of “mercenary” is so vague that no private military contractor could ever be found to qualify as such.168 In this Section, however, a close examination of Protocol I shows that at least some private military contractors may qualify as mercenaries under the four main criteria of Protocol I’s definition. First, private contractors can be deemed to have been “specially recruited”; second, private contractors frequently meet the direct participation requirement; third, private contractors will sometimes meet the foreign nationality requirement; and fourth, private contractors are even more likely to meet the financial motivation requirement than the traditional mercenary. I conclude this Section by rejecting two frequently asserted distinctions between mercenaries and private contractors: first, that contractors cannot be considered mercenaries because of their corporate structure, and second, that they cannot be considered mercenaries because they are employed by legitimate states. Ultimately, I demonstrate that at least some private contractors can be defined as mercenaries. I go on to conclude that defining private contractors as mercenaries will increase public debate surrounding their role and their overall democratic accountability, the lack of which, I have argued, currently characterizes the private military industry and threatens the democratic nation-state.

This legal circumvention is a state of exception in line with the same logic used by the State to justify all forms of insidious biopolitical control

Agamben 5(Giorgio, professor of aesthetics at the University Iuav of Venice, “State of Exception”, 8-9)

In Rossiter's book these aporias explode into open contradictions. Unlike Tingsten and Friedrich, Rossiter explicitly seeks to justify con­stitutional dictatorship through a broad historical examination. His hypothesis here is that because the democratic regime, with its com­plex balance of powers, is conceived to function under normal circum­stances, "in time of crisis a democratic, constitutional government must temporarily be altered to whatever degree is necessary to overcome the peril and restore normal conditions. This alteration invariably involves gov­ernment of a stronger character; that is, the government will have more power and the people fewer rights" (Rossiter 1948, 5). Rossiter is aware that constitutional dictatorship (that is, the state of exception) has, in fact, become a paradigm of government ("a well-established principle of constitutional government" 141) and that as such it i**s** fraught with dangers; nevertheless, it is precisely the immanent necessity of consti­tutional dictatorship that he intends to demonstrate. But as he makes this attempt, he entangles himself in irresolvable contradictions. Indeed, Schmitt's model (which he judges to be "trail-blazing, if somewhat oc­casional," and which he seeks to correct [14]), in which the distinction between commissarial dictatorship and sovereign dictatorship is not one of nature but of degree (with the decisive figure undoubtedly being the latter), is not so easily overcome. Although Rossiter provides no fewer than eleven criteria for distinguishing constitutional dictatorship from unconstitutional dictatorship, none of them is capable either of defining a substantial difference between the two or of ruling out the passage from one to the other. The fact is that the two essential crite­ria of absolute necessity and temporariness (which all the others come down to in the last analysis) contradict what Rossiter knows perfectly well, that is, that the state of exception has by now become the rule: "In the Atomic Age upon which the world is now entering, the use of constitutional emergency powers may well become the rule and not the exception" (297); or as he says even more clearly at the end of the book, "In describing the emergency powers of the western democracies, this book may have given the impression that such techniques of govern­ment as executive dictatorship, the delegation of legislative power, and lawmaking by administrative degree were purely transitory and tempo­rary in nature. Such an impression would be distinctly misleading... . The instruments of government depicted here as temporary 'crisis' ar­rangements have in some countries, and may eventually in all countries, become lasting peacetime institutions" (313). This prediction, which came eight years after Benjamin's first formulation in the eighth the­sis on the concept of history, was undoubtedly accurate; but the words that conclude the book sound even more grotesque: "No sacrifice is too great for our democracy, least of all the temporary sacrifice of democ­racy itself" (314).

1NC (2/2)

This form of biopolitical control justifies all mass atrocities

Foucault 78 (Michel, French philosopher, “The History of Sexuality – Volume One” p.136-137)

 Since the classical age, the West has undergone a very profound transformation of these mechanisms of power. “Deduction” has tended to be no longer the major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it: a power bent on generating forces, making them grow, and ordering them, rather than one dedicated to impeding them, making them submit, or destroying them. There has been a parallel shift in the right of death or at least a tendency to align itself with the exigencies of the life-administering power and to define itself accordingly. This death that was based on the right of the sovereign is now manifested as simply the reverse of the right of the social body to ensure, maintain, or develop its life. Yet wars were never as bloody as they have been since the nineteenth century, and all things being equal, never before did regimes visit such holocausts on their own populations. But this formidable power of death – and this is perhaps what accounts for part of its force and the cynicism with which it has so greatly expanded its limits – now presents itself as the counterpart of a power that exerts a positive influence on life, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations. Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many to be killed. And through a turn that closes the circle, as the technology of wars has caused them to tend increasingly toward all-out destruction, the decision that initiates them and the one that terminates them are in fact increasingly informed by the naked question of survival. The atomic situation is now at the end point of this process: the power to expose a whole population to death is the underside of the power to guarantee an individual’s continued existence. The principle underlying the tactics of battle – that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living – has become the principle that defines the strategy of states. But the existence in question is no longer the juridical existence of sovereignty; at stake is the biological existence of a population. If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill; it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population.

A2: PMCs ≠ Mercenaries

There’s no distinction – “PMCs” are mercenaries

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.888-890)

Some scholars also argue that private contractors can be distinguished from mercenaries because they work only for legitimate states.227 As a result, the argument goes, such contractors cannot be considered ‘mercenaries’ because their activities have not challenged the sovereignty of states or the right of populations to self-determination. . . . [and because] they have restricted their contracts solely to work for legitimate regimes or organizations. 228 Mercenaries, on the other hand, supposedly operate without government support for their actions229 and serve employers considered illegitimate in the eyes of the state-based system, namely terrorists, arms and drug dealers, “alien governments,” and insurgencies.230 These scholars assert that the international norms against mercenaries were simply not designed “to deal with security corporations employed by recognized regimes.”231 This argument is both factually and legally unpersuasive. First, as I discussed in Part III, this purported distinction is factually inaccurate both because states do employ mercenaries and because private contractors do not work solely for states,232 but also for non-state actors ranging from NGOs and the UN to drug cartels and rebel factions.233 Second, this distinction is not legally supported by the existing international law on mercenaries. While the OAU Convention specifically defined mercenaries in such a way as to allow their continued employ by Member States,234 both Protocol I and the Convention Against Mercenaries moved in the opposite direction—to discourage the state employ of mercenaries. 235 Protocol I only applies to international armed conflicts— that is, conflicts between two or more State Parties.236 As a result, it directly targets the use of mercenaries by States. In addition, the Convention Against Mercenaries specifically prohibits State Parties from recruiting, using, financing, or training mercenaries.237 Thus, even if it were accurate to say that private contractors work only for states, this would not exempt their actions from the sanction of existing international anti-mercenary laws, which specifically target state-employ of mercenaries. It is possible, therefore, to bring at least some private contractors within the scope of article 47 of the First Additional Protocol. Doing so would strip private contractors of the right to combatant status and prisoner of war status upon capture. 238 Without combatant status, private contractors who engage in fighting would be unauthorized combatants, pariahs under international law just like traditional mercenaries, and subject to prosecution for their participation in the conflict.

Language Matters

Our rhetoric matters – the counter plan functions to shed the light on the brutality of mercenaries

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.891-892)

It may, therefore, be primarily rhetorical to refer to private contractors as mercenaries. Nevertheless, I believe that this rhetoric can play an important role in the ongoing debate over the regulation of the private military industry. The industry’s eagerness to avoid the tarnishing effect of a mercenary reputation suggests that there is some strength to the anti-mercenary laws. I propose to leverage that clout to contribute to the public debate surrounding the use of private contractors, particularly in democratic states, in a manner similar to the way in which the human rights movement has shown that legal rhetoric can affect how states act,243 as the “[n]aming and shaming for human rights abuses now have real consequences.” 244 Given the unflattering connotation associated with the term “mercenary,” labeling private contractors as mercenaries may help keep the private military industry in the public eye after the initial outrage over specific abuses dies down. Bolstering public disapproval of private contractors addresses one of the main concerns with the private military industry: that it operates in the shadow of public awareness and debate and that it threatens to undermine democratic checks on war-making. A democratic government simply should not be able to circumvent popular disapproval of a war merely by contracting out the true costs of the war.

A2: Democracy Checks

Wrong – mercenaries are free from democratic accountability

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.867)

In addition to challenging the state’s monopoly on the use of force, the privatization of military force also threatens the democratic state because it allows governments to make war while avoiding democratic accountability.82 Democratic governments are entrusted with a monopoly on the use of force because their power to exercise that force is limited by the rule of law and by accountability to their citizens.83 Private contractors, however, greatly undermine democratic accountability, and in so doing circumvent the democratic reluctance for war. By undermining the public’s control over the warmaking powers of the state, private contractors threaten the popular sovereignty of the state.84 Thus, the problem with private military force may not be simply a lack of state control, as discussed above, but also too much *government* control, particularly executive control, at the expense of *popular*, democratic control.85

Impact Extension

Mercenaries allow the Executive branch to act unilaterally – threatens all forms of secret warfare

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.867-868)

At an extreme, a government, even a democratic government, might use private violence as a brutal police force to ensure its control over the people.86 In reality, however, a democratic government’s outsourcing of military functions undermines the democratic process much more subtly than this far-fetched scenario. Because the executive branch is generally in charge of hiring contractors, private contractors allow the executive to evade parliamentary or congressional checks on foreign policy.87 Indeed, [t]o the extent privatization permits the Executive to carry out military policy unilaterally . . . it circumvents primary avenues through which the People are informed and blocks off primary channels (namely Congress) through which the People can register their approval or voice their misgivings.88 Privatizing military force results in a lack of transparency and puts the military effort outside of the scope of the democratic dialogue, “obscuring choices about military needs and human implications.”89 Notably, in the United States, private contractors are not subject to the scrutiny of the Freedom of Information Act,90 which greatly restricts the public’s ability to be well-informed about the government’s reliance on the private military industry. Thus, the privatization of military force allows the executive “to operate in the shadows of public attention” 91 and to subvert democratic political restraints.92

Debate is Key

This debate is key – we must shed light in open debate about mercenaries

**Salzman 8** (Zoe, graduate from Concordia University in Canada, “PRIVATE MILITARY CONTRACTORS AND THE TAINT OF A MERCENARY REPUTATION” p.869-870)

This impediment to public debate is important because, as Immanuel Kant famously reasoned, the chances for peace are greatly increased when the people control the decision on whether or not to go to war, since it is the people themselves who will suffer “the miseries of war.”99 If, on the other hand, the decision rests with the head of state, he has little incentive to refrain from war because he bears none of its costs.100 At a fundamental level, therefore, the use of private contractors subverts Kant’s reliance on the democratic reluctance to go to war by circumventing the public’s reluctance to sustain casualties. 101 In Iraq, for example, contractor deaths are not counted towards the official death toll,102 allowing the government to present a far lower number of American casualties. Recent estimates suggest that the total number of contractors killed in Iraq is 1,000, with over 10,000 wounded or injured on the job.103 But, as the daughter of one contractor killed in Iraq put it: “If anything happens to the military people, you hear about it right away . . . . Flags get lowered, they get their respect. You don’t hear anything about the contractors.”104

\*\*\*Value to Life Advantage\*\*\*

Value To Life Discourse Bad

Turn – rhetoric about meaningless life denies agency

Neilson ‘4 [Brett; “Potenza Nuda? Sovereignty, Biopolitics, Capitalism”; Contretemps //nick]

In these articulations with Hardt, Negri’s disagreement with Agamben stems from an equation of constituent power with living labour and a refusal to ground ontology in the condition of bare life. If, in Empire, this quarrel with Agamben is relatively marginal (confined to footnotes and passing comments), it assumes prominence in a subsequent essay, “Il mostro politico. Nuda vita e potenza.” In this piece, which traces the philosophical and historical consequences of eugenics (from classical Greece to contemporary biotechnology), the concept of bare life is understood as an ideological device for neutralizing the transgressive potentiality of human existence. Here Negri’s criticism of Agamben is more rhetorical and direct:

Were the Vietnamese combatants or the blacks who revolted in the ghettos naked? Were the workers or the students of the 1970s naked? It doesn’t seem so if you look at photos. At least if the Vietnamese weren’t denuded by napalm or the students hadn’t decided to give witness naked as a sign of their freedom.13

Human struggle, by this account, cannot be held ransom to the biopolitical machine that produces bare life. Even in the case of the Nazi camps, Negri contends, it is mistaken to equate bare life with powerlessness. The mussulmani (or denuded concentration camp victims) of whom Agamben writes in Remnants of Auschwitz (1999) are humans before they are naked. And to make bare life an absolute and assimilate it to the horrors of Nazism is a ruse of ideology: Life and death in the camps represents nothing more than life and death in the camps—an episode of the civil war of the twentieth century, a horrific spectacle of the destiny of capitalism and the ideological masking of its will, of the capitalist motive against every instance of liberty.14

For Negri, the concept of bare life denies the potentiality of being. Like Hobbes’s Leviathan, which promotes a vision of life as subjugated and unable to resist, the theory of bare life represents a kind of foundation myth for the capitalist state. It is a cry of weakness that constructs the body as a negative limit and licenses a nihilistic view of history. More pointedly, “bare life is the opposite of Spinozan potential and corporeal joy.”15 With this statement, Negri reaches the nub of his disagreement with Agamben. As an alternative to the Aristotelian notion of potentiality (as intrinsically and paradoxically connected to the act), he poses the Spinozan vision of potentiality (potenza) as the unstoppable and progressive expansion of desire (cupiditas). By this view, fully developed by Negri in The Savage Anomaly, the construction of politics is a process of permanent innovation.

Turn – Slippery Slope

When we view some lives as valueless, we are all reduced to that status

Hanger 92 (Lisa , B.A. at Miami University, Journal of Law-Medicine, Summer , 5 Health Matrix 347)JFS

Considering anencephalic infants "dead" or "close enough to death" instills in the public a fear that other individuals very near death also will be declared dead and will be killed for the sake of procuring their organs. If the UAGA or state statutes are amended to require anencephalic infants to become organ donors, it is believed that other individuals with neural tube anomolies or debilitating cognitive deficiencies also may be forced to become organ donors before their natural deaths. Specifically, the " slippery slope" would lead most directly to those infants born with hydroencephaly and microencephaly as becoming forced organ donors. This position could then extend to other groups of people similarly situated who possess only limited cognitive functioning or who arguably lack a "valid" interest in life, including death row inmates, adults in a permanently vegetative state, individuals with Alzheimer's disease, or incompetent individuals with terminal illnesses. To declare as dead many of these groups whom the general population perceive to be very much alive could jeopardize the ethical integrity of the medical profession and decrease public trust in medicine. Many individuals also would become even more skeptical of organ donation. While some groups have tried to minimize the fear of a slippery slope by arguing that "safeguards" would prevent groups of individuals other than anencephalic infants from being affected by an amendment to the UDDA, any "safeguard" would not be sufficient. Once "very fine distinctions [are made] regarding the dying," the risk of descending down the slippery slope becomes significant.

Turn – “Value to Life” => Genocide

Euthanasia and genocide is justified by the deployment of the rhetoric of “no value to life”

Coleson 97 (Richard M.A.R., J.D., Issues in Law & Medicine, Summer)JFS

Euthanasia also was advocated in Germany. As early as 1895, a widely-used German medical textbook made a claim for "the right to death." Michael Berenbaum, The World Must Know: The History of the Holocaust as Told in the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum 64 (1993). Immediately following World War I, the notion took greater root in the German medical and legal professions, instigated largely by a publication by Professors Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche of Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwertens Leben (Permitting the Destruction of Unworthy Life) (1920). See 8 Issues in Law & Med. 221 (1992) (Patrick Derr and Walter Wright, trans.) (copies of which have been lodged with the Court). What transpired in Germany in the late 1930s and 1940s would unalterably change the debate over the ethics and legality of physicians participating in ending the lives of their patients. In that period, the lives of hundreds of thousands of terminally ill, incurably sick, and mentally incompetent patients were terminated by German doctors--the elite of the profession in Europe--in a program of "euthanasia" propagated both by acceptance of the " unworthy life" thesis and by the imposition of National Socialist theories of eugenics derived from earlier concepts developed by the German medical profession and intelligentsia. Michael Burleigh, Death and Deliverance: 'Euthanasia' in Germany 1900-1945 93-97, 273-277, 284-285 (1994); Robert Jay Lifton, The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide 44-79 (1986); Gallagher, By Trust Betrayed, supra at 74-95. In the ensuing decades, the connection of medical killing in Nazi Germany to contemporary debates regarding the legalization of assisted suicide and euthanasia has been a matter of great controversy. Burleigh, Death and Deliverance, supra at 291-98. [Footnote omitted] It is clear, however, that those closest to these events saw some connection. The condemnation of the "Nazi doctors" was universal and prompted great reflection on the question of ensuring that their actions never be repeated. As one step, the world's physicians reaffirmed the foundational ethical principle of their profession: that doctors must not kill. [Footnote omitted] The cases before this Court are the most important juridical test since that time of the meaning of that principle. For this reason alone, the experience which influenced so much of what the world thinks today of the issue of euthanasia is relevant to the deliberations of this Court. The acceptance by physicians of the notion of a "life not worthy to be lived" under the "euthanasia" program was a cornerstone of the horror that was to follow. Leo Alexander, Medical Science Under Dictatorship, 241 New Eng. J. Med. 39, 44 (1949). Without the willingness of doctors to participate, the euthanasia program would not have occurred. Patrick Derr, Hadamar, Hippocrates, and the Future of Medicine: Reflections on Euthanasia and the History of German Medicine, 4 Issues in Law & Med. 487 (1989). This "cornerstone" principle persists today. The experience of the Netherlands (described in the Brief of Amicus Curiae the American Suicide Foundation in No. 96-110) establishes that the participation of physicians in killing their patients invariably rests upon, and propagates, the notion of life unworthy of life. The writings of pro-euthanasia philosophers James Rachels, Peter Singer, and John Harris [Footnote omitted] confirm this fact. While social and political conditions in Western democracies obviously differ from those of post-World War I and Nazi Germany, the consequences of legalizing physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia will be no less dire.

**Value to Life is Subjective**

Value to life is impossible to measure externally - just because a system calculates somebody's life to be worth nothing doesn't mean they themselves don't value their own life – attempting to calculate value to life denies autonomy

Schwarts 4, (A Value to Life: Who Decides and How?, [www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf](http://www.fleshandbones.com/readingroom/pdf/399.pdf))JFS

The first assertion can be addressed by clarifying that the case of Katherine Lewis must not be taken as a general rule. Deontologists, who are interested in knowing general principles and duties that can be applied across all cases would not be very satisfied with this; they would prefer to be able to look to duties that would apply in all cases. Here, a case-based, context-sensitive approach is better suited. Contextualizing would permit freedom to act within a particular context, without the implication that the decision must hold in general. So, in this case, Katherine might decide that her life is relatively valueless. In another case, for example that of actor Christopher Reeve, the decision to seek other ways of valuing this major life change led to him perceiving his life as highly valuable, even if different in value from before the accident that made him a paraplegic.

This invokes the second assertion, that Katherine could change her view over time.

Although we recognize this is possible in some cases, it is not clear how it applies to

Katherine. Here we have a case in which a rational and competent person has had time to consider her options and has chosen to end her life of suffering beyond what she believes she can endure. Ten months is a long time and it will have given her plenty of opportunity to consult with family and professionals about the possibilities open to her in the future. Given all this, it is reasonable to assume that Katherine has made a well-reasoned decision. It might not be a decision that everyone can agree with but if her reasoning process can be called into question then at what point can we say that a decision is sound? She meets all the criteria for competence and she is aware of the consequences of her decision. It would be very difficult to determine what arguments could truly justify interfering with her choice.

Subjective determination The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life is a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.