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#### Interpretation: The aff must defend that member nations reduce intellectual property protections for all medicines

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab.] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/ TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in (1b), some individual tiger in (2b), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in (3b)—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In (1b), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in (1a) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. (1a) does not entail that animals are striped, but (1b) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1a) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (1b) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “Medicines” – adding “generally” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning and the rez doesn’t entail reducing IP protections for all biotechnology

#### Violation: They spec

#### Net benefits -

#### [1] Limits – 580 recognized medicines plus combinations makes negating impossible especially with no unifying disads against medicines with different policies, implementation and IP procedures

#### [2] Precision outweighs – it determines which interps your ballot can endorse by providing the only salient focal point for debates—if their interp is not premised on the text of the resolution, its benefits are irrelevant to the question of topicality since it fails to interpret the topic

#### [3] Ground - The aff can claim any advantage to a virtual infinite combination of affs and the lack of predictability for negatives means virtually no DAs are applicable because Affirmatives can de-link out of them.

#### DTD on T-- indicts their ability to read the aff and the debate shouldn’t have happened to begin w if the aff was abusive

#### Competing Interps on T since its binary and a question of models—reasonability arbitrary and invites judge intervention

### 1NC – T

#### Interp:

#### Reduce means decreasing an existing quantity – it excludes preventing a future increase/implementation

**Popattanachai 18** – PhD dissertation at Nottingham Trent University (NAPORN, “REGIONAL COOPERATION ADDRESSING MARINE POLLUTION FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES: AN INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE 207 OF THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION FOCUSING ON MONITORING, ASSESSEMENT, AND SURVEILLANCE OF THE POLLUTION” http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/33374/1/Naporn%20Popattanachai%202018.pdf

For the second question, the provision demonstrates that the goal of adoption of such laws and regulations must be to ‘prevent, reduce, and control’ MPLA. In so doing, the LOSC obliges States to ‘taking into account internationally agreed rules, standards, and recommended practices and procedures’.480 Having considered the ordinary meanings of the term ‘prevent, reduce, and control’, ‘prevent’ means ‘to stop something from happeningor someone from doing something**.**’481 The word ‘reduce’ means ‘to make something smaller in size, amount, degree, importance etc.’482 and the word ‘control’ means ‘to order, limit, or rule something or someone's actions or behaviour.’ 483 From the meanings, the term ‘prevent’ suggests an action to stop the future occurrence of something, whereas the terms ‘reduce**’** and ‘control’, noting their difference, point to an action dealing with something that has already happened and continues to occur, but needs to be made smaller, limited or regulated. Also, control also applies to future pollution in the sense that it limits the future pollution to be created or emitted not to exceed the specified level. Therefore, the preliminary reading of these terms suggests that laws and regulations adopted to deal with MPLA must yield the result that conforms with these terms. In so doing, the adoption of laws and regulations to prevent, reduce, and control MPLA can be done by legislating primary or secondary regulations with the use of various legal techniques and procedures and are underpinned by some rules and principles of international law discussed in the previous chapter. These legal techniques and procedures can be used to achieve the prevention, reduction and control of MPLA depending on the design and use of them. Noting that the measures outlined below are not exhaustive and not exclusively limited to implement any specific obligation, these are typical legal techniques and procedures used to prevent, reduce, and control pollution and therefore protect the environment. They can be categorised into two groups, that is, (1) substantive and (2) procedural legal techniques and measures. They can be discussed hereunder.

#### Violation:

#### THEY DON’T REDUCE—THEY DELAY THE ENFORCEMENT OF STATUS QUO PROTECTIONS

#### Their interpretation allows any aff that postpones or indefinitely postpones a reduction of IP—

#### 1] Ground---they can no link out of every DA because the plan does not occur until later or read non-inherent advantages that are predicated on future reductions of IP. Independently leads to shiftiness.

#### 2] limits---That explodes the caselist to IP for nonexistent medicines such as 3D printed drugs, new precision medicine technology, and infinite drugs that are still being produced which leads to non-inherent affs thhat skirt the core topic controversy.

#### 3] Precision—their interp justifies arbitrarily ignoring words in the resolution which deck predictability and turn functional limits. Slippery slope of affs.

### 1NC – T

#### Interp: The aff must defend reducing patent enforcements for medicines

#### Cannabis isn’t a medicine – most predictable definition

**CDC 10-15-2018** [Center for Disease Control, 10-15-2018, "Is marijuana medicine?," No Publication, https://www.cdc.gov/marijuana/faqs/is-marijuana-medicine.html, accessed 9-6-2021 azhang]

The marijuana plant has chemicals that may help symptoms for some health problems. More and more states are making it legal to use the plant as medicine for certain conditions. But there isn’t enough research to show that the whole plant works to treat or cure these conditions. Also, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)External has not recognized or approved the marijuana plant as medicine.

#### Violation: they defend just “cannabis in the ptx” – not specifically medical either

#### Vote neg for limits because they can defend any arbitrary medicine that isn’t in the core of the literature for treating disease which is the core topic controversy. Their interp always allows them to shift the goalposts, and functional limits can’t check because there are tons of affs that wouldn’t involve diagnosis, but are still unpredictable

### 1NC – CP

#### Text: The member nations of the WTO except the United States should delay patent protection for cannabis.

### 1NC - DA

#### Infrastructure passes given recent changes, but its close

Pramuk 8/24 [Jacob, Digital politics reporter at CNBC. August 24, 2021. “House Democrats clear path toward passing $3.5 trillion budget bill and infrastructure plan after breaking stalemate” [https://www.cnbc.com/2021/08/24/house-passes-budget-resolution-advances-infrastructure-bill.html Accessed 8/27](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/08/24/house-passes-budget-resolution-advances-infrastructure-bill.html%20Accessed%208/27) //gord0]

House Democrats forged ahead with President [Joe Biden](https://www.cnbc.com/joe-biden/)’s economic plans Tuesday after they broke a stalemate that threatened to unravel the party’s sprawling agenda. In a 220-212 party-line vote, the chamber passed a $3.5 trillion budget resolution and advanced a $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill. The vote allows Democrats to write and approve a massive spending package without Republicans and puts the Senate-passed infrastructure plan on a path to final passage in the House. The measure includes a nonbinding commitment to vote on the infrastructure bill by Sept. 27, which aims to appease nine centrist Democrats who pushed the House to consider the bipartisan plan before it took up the Democratic budget resolution. The vote also advances a sweeping voting rights bill, which Democrats aim to pass as soon as Tuesday. In a statement Tuesday, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., said she is “committing to pass the bipartisan infrastructure bill by September 27” and would “rally” her caucus to pass it. She also stressed that she aims to pass a budget reconciliation bill that could get through the Senate — meaning it may prove smaller than House progressives want. The opposition from the nine holdout Democrats threatened an agenda that supporters say will boost the economy and provide a lifeline to working-class households. Democratic leaders have cast the budget plan as the biggest expansion of the American social safety net in decades and the infrastructure bill as an overdue refresh of transportation and utilities. “The bottom line is, in my view, we are a step closer to truly investing in the American people, positioning our economy for long-term growth and building an America that outcompetes the rest of the world,” Biden said Tuesday after the vote. “My goal is to build an economy from the bottom up and middle out, not just the top down.” Pelosi has pushed to pass the bipartisan and Democratic plans at the same time in order to ensure centrists and progressives back both measures. The nine Democrats withheld their support, leaving Pelosi and her top deputies scrambling to find a path forward to salvage the party’s economic plans. All the Democrats ended up voting with their party Tuesday. In a statement after the vote, the Democrats led by Rep. Josh Gottheimer of New Jersey said their deal with party leaders “does what we set out to do: secure a standalone vote for the bipartisan infrastructure bill, send it to the President’s desk, and then separately consider the reconciliation package.” The vote to advance the measures preserves the party’s hopes to push through massive economic proposals this year. Democrats still need to overcome several hurdles — and write a budget bill that can win support from spending-wary centrists and progressives alike — to get the proposals through a narrowly divided Congress. Underscoring the challenges ahead, House leaders face pressure to write and pass the reconciliation plan before they approve the infrastructure bill — which Pelosi pledged to do in about a month. In a statement Tuesday, Congressional Progressive Caucus Chair Pramila Jayapal, D-Wash., said the two proposals are “integrally tied together, and we will only vote for the infrastructure bill after passing the reconciliation bill.” Democrats in the Senate and House hope to write their bill to strengthen the social safety net and invest in climate policy in the coming weeks. The budget measure calls for expanding Medicare, child care and paid leave, extending strengthened household tax credits passed last year, creating universal pre-K and making incentives for green energy adoption. While the resolution allows for up to $3.5 trillion in spending, centrists will likely try to trim the price tag. Many Republicans have supported the bipartisan infrastructure bill, saying it will jolt the economy. But they have opposed the trillions more in spending proposed by Democrats and the tax hikes on businesses and wealthy individuals the Democrats hope to use to pay for it. The GOP has also argued the Democratic plan would increase inflation, which White House officials have disputed.

#### Cannabis legislation costs Biden floortime and kills bipartisanship.

Roberts '21 (Chris Roberts; Chris Roberts is an award-winning investigative reporter with bylines in VICE, The Daily Beast, The Guardian, The Verge, Curbed, Forbes, SF Weekly, and others; 2-7-2021; "On Marijuana Reform, Joe Biden Will Disappoint You"; https://whowhatwhy.org/opinion/on-marijuana-reform-joe-biden-will-disappoint-you/, WhoWhatWhy, accessed 9-6-2021; JPark)

Democrats control the White House and, for now, both houses of Congress. This should be good for weed since, after all, the Democrats’ official platform calls for decriminalization. And it was Republican obstructionism that kept cannabis policy reform — including the Senate version of the MORE Act, the federal decriminalization bill that passed the House in December — reliably bottled up in Washington. This analysis neatly forgets the president’s inconvenient history as one of the chief architects of the war on drugs that filled America’s prisons. And this also assumes that Biden, or other top Democrats, will spend limited **political capital on cannabis**, when getting even coronavirus relief through Congress, let alone censuring a member who liked social media posts advocating murdering her opponents, aren’t sure things. “We’re not going to see Biden or the White House pushing for the MORE Act, or de-scheduling marijuana,” John Hudak, a scholar at the Brookings Institution think tank, told the Verge. Even thinking about what Biden would do hinges on whether he is presented with a bill he likes. And getting that far will require Republicans — not just a couple, but 10 — in the Senate. Recall that accomplishing most anything in the United States Senate requires 60 votes, not a simple majority. Biden is struggling to find 10 Republican senators willing to meet him halfway on coronavirus relief. Who are the 10 Republicans willing to hop on the Democratic bandwagon for an issue that’s still a front in the culture war? Tellingly, the cannabis lobbyists and executives gushing to Politico did not have this answer handy. And what about the Democrats? The MORE Act passed, but only after top leadership canceled a September vote because they were worried cannabis reform would be a bad look ahead of the November election — an election in which weed won a clean sweep, with voters approving legalization by wide margins in Arizona, New Jersey, Montana, and South Dakota. Voters like legalization, but Congress should not realistically be expected to spend too much time debating the needs of the cannabis industry, even after a record year of cannabis sales, when it can’t deliver $1,400 checks to impoverished Americans. “Look at the Democrats helping pot dealers while you suffer in silence,” is a line that the Democratic leadership will fall all over itself to avoid hearing during the 2022 midterms. And it shows.

#### Bill key to prevent infrastructure disaster from Grid Collapse

PPG, 3/4/2021 (MAR 4, 2021 9:00 PM, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Editorial Board. Invest in infrastructure. March 4, 2021. <https://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/editorials/2021/03/05/Invest-in-infrastructure/stories/202102270028>, recut by JMP)

Now is the time for a reckoning, a realization: While it’s important to study the past to avoid repeating the same mistakes, the country must also look to its future and see the obvious — that America’s infrastructure as a whole needs some serious upkeep.

Democrats and Republicans alike have flirted with the idea of a sweeping infrastructure bill in recent years, and President Joe Biden’s team is working to outline such legislation. These efforts should proceed swiftly — now is the time for Congress to invest in infrastructure, not only to help prevent crises, but also to jump-start an economy mired in the coronavirus pandemic.

Despite being one of the richest countries in the world, the U.S. seems constantly to hover on the edge of disaster, with news of natural forces smashing through power grids and levies and fire prevention strategies on a yearly or monthly basis. Texas is only the most recent state to have been pushed over the edge.

The American Society of Civil Engineers just this week gave America’s infrastructure an overall grade of C-minus in its quadrennial report card. The last grade was D-plus and that report cited decades of underfunding and unheeded recommendations. C-minus is an improvement but deserves not just federal attention but actual intervention. The report notes “we are heading in the right direction, but a lot of work remains.”

There is opportunity in the recent economic and environmental devastation that grabs headlines and breaks hearts. In the aftermath of the Great Depression, the government put millions to work improving parks and building roads and bridges and airports. President Dwight Eisenhower’s interstate highway system remains the life veins of interstate travel.

A new and vigorous infrastructure package for America would fix what needs to be fixed and offer the promise of an economic boon.

The purpose of the federal government is to address the needs of American society in a way that can’t be tackled by states in a piecemeal fashion. What has happened in recent days within The Lone Star State demonstrates keenly that this is the time — actually past the time — that our federal leaders must shore up the foundations of our federation. Congress should act swiftly to lead states in reversing the entropy chewing away at America’s foundations. Until this happens, society stands on shifting sands.

#### Grid collapse causes extinction.

Greene ’19 [Sherrell R.; Nuclear Engineering M.S. degrees from the University of Tennessee, recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development, worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades, as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs; “Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs),” Nuclear Technology 205(3), <https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true> recut gord0]

There are a variety of events that could deal ~~crippling~~ blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5

As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s.

Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack.

Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid.

These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

### 1NC - CP

#### The United States ought prosecute bank employees involved in money laundering for drug trafficking organizations.

#### That’s the best way to fight cartels – eliminates funding and support.

Morris ’13 (Evelyn Krache, Research Fellow, International Security Program, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs @ JFK School of Govt, Harvard; Think Again: Mexican Drug Cartels; Dec 3;www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/12/03/think\_again\_mexican\_drug\_cartels)

"We Need to Hit Them Where It Hurts: the Wallet." Exactly. Despite the ongoing arguments about drug legalization and border security, the most effective way to combat the scourge of the DTOs would be to interdict not drugs or people but money. As in any business, money is the fuel that keeps the cartels running. Even if Sinaloa, to give only one example, were to disappear tomorrow, other organizations would quickly rise to take its slice of the lucrative pie. One of the most basic tenets of business is that highly profitable markets attract lots of new entrants. This is true for legal and illegal enterprises alike. The staggering profits of illegal trade would be much less attractive if the DTOs could not launder, deposit, and ultimately spend their money. But shutting down the cartels' financial operations will be a formidable task, given the help they have had from multinational financial institutions, which have profited from the cartels' large-dollar deposits. In 2010, Wachovia bank (which was acquired by Wells Fargo in 2008) admitted that it had processed $378 billion of currency exchanges in Mexico -- an amount equal to about one-third of the country's GDP -- to which it had failed to apply anti-laundering restrictions. In 2012, British bank HSBC settled with the U.S. government for $1.9 billion to escape prosecution for, among other things, laundering hundreds of millions of dollars for the Sinaloa cartel. U.S. law enforcement has also implicated Bank of America and Western Union in DTO money laundering. Although illegal money transfers can happen without banks' knowledge, the volume and widespread occurrence of these transactions indicate just how easy it is for the cartels to clean their dirty money. Paying a fine to avoid prosecution is almost no punishment at all. The fines Wachovia paid amounted to less than 2 percent of its 2009 profit. Even the record fine assessed on HSBC amounted to only 12 percent of the bank's profits. Furthermore, banks can simply accrue funds to offset any possible fines, either by increasing what they charge cartels or by setting aside some of the earnings from laundering, even as they continue to do business with the DTOs. Prosecuting bank employees involved in money laundering, up through the highest levels of an institution, would be a better tack. Pictures of a chief compliance officer as he entered a courtroom for sentencing would have a far greater deterrent effect than any financial penalty. To that end, investigative techniques and legal precedents for going after global criminal networks are increasingly robust, and the political payoffs could be substantial. One of the more successful campaigns in the war on terrorism has been the financial one; experience gained in tracking the funds of al Qaeda could make it easier to similarly unravel Los Zetas' financing. Malfeasance in the financial industry is nothing new, but public sensitivity to banks' wrongdoing is arguably higher than it has been in decades. An enterprising prosecutor could make quite a reputation for herself by tracking DTO money through the financial system. The cartels, along with the violence and corruption they perpetrate, are threats to both Mexico and the United States. The problem is a complicated one and taps areas of profound policy disagreement. The way to make progress in combating the DTOs is to ignore issues like gun control and illegal immigration and follow the money. Stanching the cartels' profits will do more to end the bloodshed than any new fence or law.

### NC – NC

**The standard is consistency with metaphysics. Metaphysics is the foundation of philosophy and action – the correct theory ensures consistency with reality. Landauer et al,** Landauer, Jeff, and Joseph Rowlands. *Reason Is Absolute*, www.importanceofphilosophy.com/Metaphysics\_Main.html. **Metaphysics is** the branch of philosophy responsible for the study of existence. It is **the foundation of a worldview**. It answers the question "What is?" **It encompasses everything that exists, as well as the nature of existence** itself. It says whether the world is real, or merely an illusion. It is a fundamental view of the world around us. **Metaphysics is the foundation of philosophy. Without an explanation** or an interpretation **of the world around us, we would be helpless to deal with reality**. We could not **feed ourselves, or act** to preserve our lives. **The degree to which our metaphysical worldview is correct is the degree to which we are able to comprehend the world, and act accordingly. Without this firm foundation, all knowledge becomes suspect**. Any flaw in our view of reality will

#### Metaphysics is a prerequisite to any other moral theory.

#### Objects are only differentiable because of space between them, but since those spaces are just new objects, there must be a space between the space and the object, which would just become a new object. Thus, plurality is impossible since any way of distinguishing between things just bridges the distinction.

#### Assuming plurality, anything can be infinitely subdivided to create different objects within an object. Monism solves division altogether since the thesis of monism is that you can't divide an object into other objects.

#### Now Negate:

#### The resolutional statement's truth is dependent on there being distinctions between things – nations and intellectual property. If there is one thing, then you vote neg on presumption.

### NC – K

#### Increasing the scope and scale of the marijuana industry feeds racialized wealth inequality.

Mabee 19 – Carmen Mabee is a student at University of Colorado, Boulder. (“Gentrifying Marijuana: The Construction of Whiteness Through Legalized Marijuana,” 4-19-2019, pg. 5-7) julian

The rise of marijuana legalization in 33 U.S. states has been routinely praised for its perceived contributions to the advancement of American autonomy (McNearney 2018). Legalization has provided a growing number of opportunities for economic advancement and mobility for many Americans through the addition of the highly lucrative medicinal and recreational marijuana industry. An industry that is estimated to exceed $16 billion in net worth by the end of 2019 (Reisinger 2018). These economic gains are just the beginning, with economists forecasting that national legalization would in effect increase the market’s valuation to $80 billion by 2030 (Franck 2019).

While there is no question that legalization has spearheaded economic growth within the states that elected to participate, many would argue that its prosperity is built upon the backs of those most impacted by its prohibition, People of Color (Posner 2018). Legal experts and politicians, such as congressperson Alexanderia Ocasio-Cortez, have highlighted that legal marijuana is largely benefiting white investors and entrepreneurs, thereby compounding the racial wealth gap (Bruney 2019). There are several factors that contribute to the racial disparities. First, the vast majority of legal marijuana states bar those with past marijuana convictions from participating in the legal market, a reality that disproportionately impacts communities of color (Zhang 2019). I argue that this practice makes these states complicit in perpetuating the impacts of the racist history of marijuana criminalization and is used justifiy the hypocrisy of whites owning and operating a business that scores of people are still imprisoned for in many of the same states and across the country (Posner 2018). This notion is made stronger considering that in the state of Colorado, where People of Color were arrested for marijuana violations at a rate four times that of whites prior to legalization, 71% of marijuana executives are male and 81% of them are white (Bruney 2019).

Working in tandem with white domination in high-level executive positions is the overwhelming whiteness of existing legal states. The states and municipalities that have fully legalized marijuana for both recreational and medicinal purposes are as follows: Colorado (2012), Washington (2012), Alaska (2015), Oregon (2015), Massachusetts (2016), Maine (2016), Nevada (2016), California (2016), Washington D.C. (2016), Vermont (2018), and Michigan (2018) (Berke and Gould 2019). With the exception of Washington D.C, every single one of these states is comprised of majority white populations. In fact, the disparity between white and black populations in these states is so high that, aside from major cities, the black population is virtually nonexistent. For example, Colorado has a white population of 87.5% and a black population of a meager 4.5% (US Census Bureau 2016). Further, Massachusetts and Washington have a white population of 81.8% and 87.5% respectively, and a black population of 8.6% and 4.1% (US Census Bureau 2016). Maine’s racial diversity is even more striking, boasting a white population of 94.8% while the entire black population makes up no more than 1.5% (US Census Bureau 2016).

Second, the ability to apply for a license to own and operate a marijuana business requires a significant amount of economic and social capital. In addition to highly selective application procedures the application fee to open a retail marijuana store in Colorado is a nonrefundable $4500 (Colorado Department of Revenue). In New York, where only five medical dispensaries were permitted to open in the state, prospective applicants are required to pay a nonrefundable fee of $10,000 and then an additional $20,000 registration fee (Hamilton 2017). Washington state’s application process has an interview portion, a $250 application fee and an annual fee of $1,480 (Washington State Liquor and Cannabis Board). Additionally, because marijuana is still illegal at the federal level, most banks do not provide loans for any expense relating to marijuana. This stems from anxieties over an uncertain future of legal marijuana and the threat of at-will government raids which result in asset forfeitures of anything that could possibly be linked to marijuana production and distribution (The Economist 2018). When consideration is placed onto both the overwhelming whiteness of legal states and the costs associated with opening up a business, it is clear that marijuana legalization has only worked to benefit affluent whites.

How did a substance that sparked mass moral outrage for generations and provided justifications for the arrest and mass incarceration of vastly disproportionate levels of people of color become such a popular and lucrative commodity for mainstream whites? This study seeks to highlight the ways in which the legal marijuana industry has been whitewashed and subsequently gentrified to appeal to a rising white mainstream consumer base. Further, this study hopes to address a gap in gentrification literature by linking the relationship between marijuana, whiteness, and the revitalization space.

#### Neoliberal exploitation causes extinction.

Clark 18 (Brett, associate professor of sociology and sustainability studies at the University of Utah; Stefano B. Longo, Assistant Professor specializing in Environmental Sociology at NC State; “Land–Sea Ecological Rifts”, Land–Sea Ecological Rifts, https://monthlyreview.org/2018/07/01/land-sea-ecological-rifts/)

Covering approximately 70 percent of the Earth’s surface, the World Ocean is “the largest ecosystem.”1 Today all areas of the ocean are affected by multiple anthropogenic effects—such as overfishing, pollution, and emission of greenhouse gases, causing warming seas as well as ocean acidification—and over 40 percent of the ocean is strongly affected by human actions. Furthermore, the magnitude of these impacts and the speed of the changes are far greater than previously understood.2 Biologist Judith S. Weis explains that “the most widespread and serious type of [marine] pollution worldwide is eutrophication due to excess nutrients.”3 The production and use of fertilizers, sewage/waste from humans and farm animals, combustion of fossil fuels, and storm water have all contributed to dramatic increases in the quantity of nutrients in waterways and oceans. Research in 2008 indicated that there were over 400 “dead zones,” areas of low oxygen, mostly near the mouths of rivers.4 Nutrient overloading thus presents a major challenge to maintaining healthy aquatic ecosystems.

Nutrients are a basic source of nourishment that all organisms need to survive. Plants require at least eighteen elements to grow normally; of these, nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium are called macronutrients, because they are needed in larger quantities. While all essential nutrients exist in the biosphere, these three are the ones most commonly known to be deficient in commercial agricultural production systems. Beginning in the early twentieth century with the Haber-Bosch process, atmospheric nitrogen was converted into ammonia to create synthetic nitrogen fertilizer. The fixation of nitrogen, an energy-intensive process, made the nutrient far more widely available for use in agriculture. This in turn dramatically changed production systems, which no longer depended on legumes and manures to biologically supply nitrogen for other crops such as wheat, corn, and most vegetables.

In the modern era, particularly since the Second World War, the increased production and use of fertilizers served to greatly expand food production and availability. Major macronutrients are routinely applied to soils in order to maintain and increase the growth of plant life on farms, as well as private and public landscapes such as golf courses, nurseries, parks, and residences. They are used to produce fruits, vegetables, and fibers for human and non-human consumption, expand areas of recreation, and beautify communities. However, like many aspects of modern production, given the larger social dynamics and determinants that shape socioecological relationships, these technological and economic developments have generated serious negative—often unforeseen—consequences. The wide expansion and increasing rates of nitrogen and phosphorus application have caused severe damage to aquatic systems in particular. Rivers, streams, lakes, bays (estuaries), and ocean systems have been inundated with nutrient runoff, which has had far-reaching effects.

Here we examine the socioecological relationships and processes associated with the transfer of nutrients from terrestrial to marine systems. We employ a metabolic analysis to highlight the interchange of matter and energy within and between socioecological systems. In particular, we show how capitalist agrifood production contributes to distinct environmental problems, creating a metabolic rift in the soil nutrient cycle. We emphasize how the failure to mend nutrient cycles in agrifood systems has led to approaches that produce additional ruptures, such as those associated with nutrient overloading in marine systems. This analysis reveals the ways that the social relations of capitalist agriculture tend to produce interconnected ecological problems, such as those in terrestrial and aquatic systems. Further, we contend that these processes undermine the basic conditions of life on a wide-ranging scale. It is important to recognize that nutrient pollution of groundwater as well as surface waters has been a major concern since the rise of modern capitalist agriculture and the development of the global food regime.5 The failure to address the metabolic rupture in the soil nutrient cycle and the contradictions of capital are central to contemporary land-sea ecological rifts.

#### The alternative is to adopt a social medicine approach to health.

Mohan J. DUTTA 15, Professor and Head of the Department of Communications and New Media at the National University of Singapore, Adjunct Professor of Communication at the Brian Lamb School of Communication at Purdue University [*Neoliberal Health Organizing*, 2015, p. 231-234]

Latin American social medicine depicts a distinct and long strand of theorizing of health systems that challenges the liberal capitalist organizing of health, grounded in the organizing principles of social medicine and noting [END PAGE 231] that changing the overarching structures is central to transforming the conditions of poor health (Waitzkin, 1991, 2011; Waitzkin & Modell, 1974). That health is constituted within broader social conditions is the basis for research, teaching, clinical practice, and activism in socialist medicine, with early roots in Latin America. Social medicine thus connects health, healing, and health care delivery to the politics of social change and structural transformation, clearly voicing an activist agenda directed at transforming the unequal social conditions.

One of the earliest influences of social medicine was evident in the work of the medical student activist Salvador Allende, who would later become the president of Chile. In his book The Chilean Medico-Social Reality, Allende (1939) outlined the social conditions in Chile that resulted in poor health outcomes, emphasizing the broader conditions of foreign debt dependence, underdevelopment, international dependence, and resource consolidation in the hands of the local elite. Proposing social rather than medical solutions to health, Allende emphasized “income redistribution, state regulation of food and clothing supplies, a national housing program, and industrial reforms to address occupational health problems” (Waitzkin, 2011, p. 160). In his political life, Allende sought reforms in the Chilean national health service, complemented by reforms in the housing and nutrition areas, efforts at national income redistribution, and minimizing the role of multinational corporations.

The individualized model of public health that sees health and illness as a dichotomy is interrogated by the framework of social medicine that suggests that health and illness exist in a dialectical relationship that is dynamic and is continually shifting on the basis of social conditions, structures, cultural practices, economic production, reproduction, marginalizing practices, and processes of political participation. Thus, interventions in social medicine point toward the necessity for transforming the underlying relationships of production and resource distribution, resisting the public health narrative of interventions as mechanisms for improving economic productivity. Taking a social-class-driven approach to health inequities, Latin American social medicine sees the problems with health being situated within means of economic production, patterns of ownership of means of production, and control over productive processes. Therefore, health is approached from the framework of transforming the processes of economic production and labor processes.

The dominant framework of health as integral to growth and economic productivity is questioned by the framework of social medicine that situates the relationship between health and illness amid the very processes of economic organization, distribution of economic resources, and the pervasive effects of social class on health services and health outcomes. [END PAGE 232] The innovations in organizing of health structures in Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Bolivia, and Venezuela offer invaluable insights about the possibilities of alternative organizing that seek to redo the entire structure of social organizing that constitute health. The strong health indicators in Cuba demonstrate the effectiveness of a health system that is committed to addressing the structural determinants of health, creating equitable contexts for the realization and delivery of health (Campion & Morrissey, 2013). Social medicine research has looked at the relations among work, reproduction, the environment, and health, describing in-depth the material conditions that constitute health. For instance, researchers studying health in Mexico within the context of unions and local communities have documented health problems that relate to work processes and the environment. Similarly, researchers in Chile have documented the relations between gender, work, and environmental conditions. A key strand of social medicine examines the relationship between violence and health, connecting violence to poverty, the structures of organizing, and the inequities in ownership of processes of economic production. Investigations of violence attached to the U.S.-supported dictatorship in Chile, the violence connected to narcotics traffic and paramilitary operations, and the violence within the broader structures of the state-imperial networks draw linkages to the broader political economic configurations of neoliberalism.

Emerging from the broader framework of social medicine, the Barrio Adentro movement in Venezuela, started by former president Hugo Chavez, offers insights into structures and processes of alternative organizing of health, connecting local community structures, community ownership, and community solutions with state infrastructures and state-driven public health resources and solutions (Briggs & Mantini-Briggs, 2009; Muntaner et al., 2006; Waitzkin, 2011). The state-driven referendum by the Chavez government to create public health infrastructures and structures of delivery of integrated family medicine, build preventive infrastructures, and develop community health resources in extremely marginalized communities is supported by massive mass-based participation in popular politics and widespread community participation in developing local community infrastructures, community-based resources of problem solving, and community decision-making capacities. The community health centers built within the barrios serve approximately 250 families and are staffed with one integrated family care doctor, one community health worker, and one health promoter. The community health centers are stocked with medical supplies. The health team not only provides health care but also conducts health surveys in the communities and makes home visits for patients that are too ill to travel to the health centers. The Barrio Adentro is integrated with other missiones addressing education, food insecurity, housing, and [END PAGE 233] unemployment, addressing health within a broader structural context (Muntaner et al., 2006). Local community participatory processes are connected with state-driven processes of building community health infrastructures at the local level.

The narrative of Barrio Adentro offers an alternative to the neoliberal narrative of the community in mainstream health communication and yet is marked by its absence from disciplinary discourses. Similarly, social medicine and its tradition of addressing the structural contexts of health is marked by its absence from the dominant discourses of health communication. A review of the two major collections of health communication scholarship, The Routledge Handbook of Health Communication and The Handbook of Global Health Communication, depicts the marked absence of the Latin American innovations of social medicine from the discursive space. Opportunities for resistance to neoliberal organizing of health structures and the invitation to imagine alternative possibilities is grounded in materially grounded concrete politics of popular participation in supporting state policies for building public health and health care infrastructures, complemented by local processes of participation in the creation of health solutions.

#### Neoliberal rhetorical framing is a relevant epistemological concern

Keshavjee 14

(Salmaan Keshavjee, associate professor in the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine and Department of Medicine at Harvard Medical School, *Blind Spot: How neoliberalism infiltrated global health,* pgs. 134-135)

In his analysis of a failed development program in Lesotho, anthropologist James Ferguson (1994) suggests that the most important thing about a development project may rest not in what it fails to do but in what it achieves in failure: its side effects.47 Quoting Michel Foucault’s analysis of the prison system, where Foucault asks, “What is the use of these different phenomena that are continually being criticized?” Ferguson argues that repeated failure allows us to speak about a logic that transcends the program being implemented. In Foucault’s language, this is the space of discourse, or what he calls power/knowledge.48

Though NGOs were the vehicle William Douglas proposed as the transplanting mechanism, in truth what matters is the policy itself—its exposure to the light of day in places where it had hitherto been unimaginable and alien. The policy itself is the vehicle of change; it is the ideological underpinnings of the policy and not the specific health project (nor the organization) that is being funded. In this case, a policy cloaked in an ostensibly neutral technical activity to which nobody could object—mechanisms for ensuring a steady supply of medicines at a moment of profound vulnerability—had been used to introduce a set of ideas targeted at transforming expectations between citizen and state in Badakhshan, Tajikistan, Central Asia, and beyond.

On a broader level, this very local example explains why the Bamako Initiative, though it had failed to meet its health goals in a number of settings, was funded and replicated again and again in many parts of the world. And though, as Ferguson and Foucault suggest, repeated failure reveals the discursive forces behind the intervention, the programs themselves—as global health interventions likely based on the best of intentions but steeped in the ideological rather than the phenomenological— fall into the trap of neoliberal programmatic ~~blindness~~. That is to say, because of the ideological underpinnings, which frame the behavior of the donor as well as the recipient in everything from the application for money to the evaluation of the project, the service delivery objectives of the project get lost.

For health projects, the best outcome is to stem the spread of disease and prevent morbidity and mortality. Optimal outcomes may involve the state delivering care, or private markets, or both. However, when policies are driven by a neoliberal agenda—when a medical intervention is used as the means for enacting a broader ideological goal of changing the nature of the state and its relationship with citizens—then the purported outcome of delivering care and improving health, even if measured, becomes less relevant. This may be one reason why it took many years for policy makers in the West to realize that levying user fees on the sick poor has resulted, in many cases, in excess morbidity and death. Instead, the empirically unsupported neoliberal belief that participation in the market is an economic form of political democracy takes precedence.

## Case

#### Licensing problems, regulatory complexity, and city bans are alt causes

**White 18** [Martha White, NBC writer, “Growing like a weed? California marijuana market off to slow start”, April 20th, https://www.nbcnews.com/business/business-news/growing-weed-california-marijuana-market-slow-start-n867871?icid=related]

“The launch of the California market has been a total mess, and not entirely unexpected,” said Troy Dayton, CEO and co-founder of cannabis market research firm Arcview Group. “This is the most complex, onerous and far-reaching regulatory scheme that’s ever been tried. Every time you add a level of complexity, you add a level of uncertainty,” he said. According to research firm BDS Analytics, 2018 sales at dispensaries licensed to sell for recreational use in California were $339 million through February, a figure below the state’s expectations. Greg Shoenfeld, vice president of operations at BDS Analytics, said initial projections could have been overly optimistic.”Whenever there’s a proposal to move to a legalized market, the best case scenarios are laid out in terms of revenue expectation, but typically, implementation moves a bit slower,” he said. Experts suggest that much of the industry is still operating underground. “We estimate that 85 to 90 percent of the industry that existed last year is not licensed,” said Chris Beals, president and general counsel for Weedmaps. Although some faulted the state for its pace of issuing licenses, Beals said the bottleneck was happening at the municipal level. “The biggest problem has been that there’s been a complete failure of local governments to issue licenses,” he said, adding that 85 percent of cities and counties in the state have bans on recreational marijuana retailers. The thinking goes that, without legal storefronts from which to purchase their cannabis products, people will continue to rely on the black market.

#### Marijuana’s not key to cartels, and they’ll exploit taxation, sell elsewhere, switch to other drugs, or other illicit markets which are worse

**Bender 13** [Steven W. Bender, Professor, Seattle University School of Law, 2013, “ARTICLE: JOINT REFORM?: THE INTERPLAY OF STATE, FEDERAL, AND HEMISPHERIC REGULATION OF RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA AND THE FAILED WAR ON DRUGS,” Albany Government Law Review, 6 Alb. Gov't L. Rev. 359]

Gauging the effect of U.S. legalization requires some sense of the economic importance of marijuana to the Mexican drug cartels. Unfortunately, the nature of the beast of an illegal enterprise with diffuse money laundering throughout the hemisphere is that estimates of revenues vary widely, both as to the dollar amount of overall revenues and the percentage role that marijuana plays in cartel proceeds from a variety of drugs. No doubt by any measure those revenues are enormous, with the swing in estimated annual revenue to Mexican cartels ranging from one estimate of $ 80 billion to a U.S. government estimate of $ 13.8 billion - with $ 8.5 billion of that revenue coming from marijuana and the vast amount coming from U.S. sales. n174 According to this government estimate, marijuana comprises more than 60% of cartel revenue, with the remainder coming from cocaine and methamphetamine trafficking, as well as other illicit drugs and activities. n175 As I speculated in Run for the Border, if this estimate is accurate, legalization of marijuana should have a "cataclysmic effect" on the Mexican cartels, n176 allowing cross-border enforcement to better focus on remaining (and more dangerous) illicit drugs for which U.S. demand is less pervasive. Presumably, the south-of-the-border violence might ultimately ease as the cartels succumb to this economic squeeze. Yet there are many reasons to be less optimistic about the impact [\*388] of state legalization on Mexican trafficking, even if that reform takes hold nationally. First, some commentators discount the estimate that marijuana plays such a key role in cartel revenues, with one commentator suggesting a more accurate figure falls in the range of 15-to-26%. n177 Having become the gateway for illicit drugs from South and Central America into the United States, Mexican cartels might also send their product elsewhere, such as Canada or within Mexico, n178 redouble their efforts to export drugs that remain illicit in the United States, such as cocaine and methamphetamine, or concentrate on expanding demand for these illicit drugs as cartels did within Mexico when enhanced U.S.-border enforcement prompted them at times to liquidate their inventory to Mexican users. n179 Presumably, legalization within the United States that leaves minors unable to purchase marijuana lawfully might reserve some of that illicit market to cartels, yet the likelihood is that, as with alcohol, this demand would be supplied through fake identification or by friends and relatives purchasing lawful marijuana for minors. Some commentators have looked to the tobacco market and speculated that should government tax legal marijuana too steeply, an illicit market might emerge, n180 perhaps to be supplied by the cartels [\*389] rather than by licensed domestic producers operating outside the law. Still, given the history of spraying of illicit marijuana crops with toxic chemicals, the lesser environmental policing in Mexico, and the reality that some marijuana has been smuggled, while soaked in gasoline or perfume, in such unsanitary conveyances as the inside of a full septic tank truck, n181 presumably most U.S. users would be willing to pay extra for the assurance of some quality and safety control over the production of legalized marijuana. Surely, too, the cost of bribes that divert a fair share of cartel revenue is an expense that lawfully produced marijuana need not duplicate. Most alarmingly, however, Mexican drug cartels of late have augmented their drug profits with other enterprises for which their infrastructure of vast capital, weaponry, manpower, and graft is well suited. These sidelines include kidnapping the family members of the wealthy for ransom, n182 trafficking undocumented immigrants and sex workers into and within the United States, n183 and robbing undocumented immigrants, whether from Mexico or Central America, who aim to reach U.S. employers. n184 The most ominous scenario ahead is one in which the drug cartels expand these other ventures to replace marijuana revenues. Immigration is driven and limited by job opportunities available within the United States and thus depends on labor demand. Therefore, cartels searching for replacement revenue presumably would be drawn to expand their kidnappings or their role in illicit sex markets, such as those for underage prostitutes. n185 Overall, then, the impact of legalization on cartel revenues, and the surging violence within Mexico, is hard to predict.

#### No Mexican state collapse---crime and violence are effects of failed states, not causes

Couch 12 [Neil Couch, Brigadier in the British Army, July 2012, “’Mexico in Danger of Rapid Collapse’: Reality or Exaggeration?” http://www.da.mod.uk/colleges/rcds/publications/seaford-house-papers/2012-seaford-house-papers/SHP-2012-Couch.pdf/view]

A ‘collapsed’ state, however, as postulated in the Pentagon JOE paper, suggests ‘a total vacuum of authority’, the state having become a ‘mere geographical expression’.16 Such an extreme hypothesis of Mexico disappearing like those earlier European states seems implausible for a country that currently has the world’s 14th largest economy and higher predicted growth than either the UK, Germany or the USA; that has no external threat from aggressive neighbours, which was the ‘one constant’ in the European experience according to Tilly; and does not suffer the ‘disharmony between communities’ that Rotberg says is a feature common amongst failed states.17,18¶ A review of the literature does not reveal why the JOE paper might have suggested criminal gangs and drug cartels as direct causes leading to state collapse. Crime and corruption tend to be described not as causes but as symptoms demonstrating failure. For example, a study for Defense Research and Development Canada attempting to build a predictive model for proximates of state failure barely mentions either.19 One of the principal scholars on the subject, Rotberg, says that in failed states, ‘corruption flourishes’ and ‘gangs and criminal syndicates assume control of the streets’, but again as effect rather than trigger.20 The Fund for Peace Failed States Index, does not use either of them as a ‘headline’ indicator, though both are used as contributory factors.¶ This absence may reflect an assessment that numerous states suffer high levels of organised crime and corruption and nevertheless do not fail. Mandel describes the corruption and extreme violence of the Chinese Triads, Italian Mafia, Japanese Yakuza and the Russian Mob that, in some cases, has continued for centuries.21 Yet none of these countries were singled out as potential collapsed or failed states in the Pentagon’s paper. Indeed, thousands of Americans were killed in gang warfare during Prohibition and many people ‘knew or at least suspected that politicians, judges, lawyers, bankers and business concerns collected many millions of dollars from frauds, bribes and various forms of extortion’.22 Organised crime and corruption were the norm in the political, business, and judicial systems and police forces ran their own ‘rackets’ rather than enforcing the law.23 Neither the violence nor the corruption led to state failure.

#### No Latin-America war

Sanchez **19** [Wilder Alejandro Sanchez, Defense IQ researcher who focuses on geopolitical, military and cyber security issues. Are main battle tanks obsolete? The view from Latin America. Feb 7, 2019. https://www.defenceiq.com/armoured-vehicles/articles/is-heavy-armour-obsolete-the-view-from-latin-america]

While there are ongoing border disputes (e.g. Bolivia and Chile or Guyana and Venezuela) and tensions (mostly coming out of Venezuela these days), security threats in the region are generally insurgent in nature. For example, terrorist movements like Colombia’s ELN and EPL, Peru’s Shining Path, or Paraguay’s EPP; narco-cartels in Mexico; or organised gangs such as the Maras in Central America or the Primero Comando da Capital in Brazil. These entities are highly mobile and operate in isolated regions or in urban areas. Latin American governments continue to acquire new (or used) platforms for their armed forces, but heavy armour is not purchased particularly often. Some recent deals worth noting are: In December 2018, the Brazilian Army completed the transfer of 25 M41C light tanks to the Uruguayan army. “Of the 25 vehicles, 15 were completely refurbished by Brazil while the remaining 10 will be used for parts. Those that will remain intact will be assigned to armoured infantry units, which currently use M24 light tanks,” Jane’s explains. In 2016, Russia delivered 50 T-72B1 tanks to Nicaragua. The platforms are “an upgrade of the 1970s-era main battle tank and feature explosive reactive armour and thermal weapon sights, among other improvements.” Venezuela has received a plethora of Russian weaponry over the past couple of decades, though these deals have been quite scarce in recent years due to Caracas’ financial crisis. Amongst the acquisitions are T-72 tanks, as well as infantry fighting vehicles like the BMP-3M, and an array of transport vehicles. "Latin American governments continue to acquire new (or used) platforms for their armed forces, but heavy armour is not purchased particularly often" As for other nations, while no other major sales have occurred, there are ongoing reports about armoured vehicles in need of modernization or replacement. For example, Chile possesses Leopard 2A4 tanks, and it will be interesting if they will be upgraded anytime soon, given that the Chilean government is replacing the famous Copper Law, which helps fund the Ministry of Defence. Meanwhile, Peru has yet to find a replacement for its old T-55 tanks, while Ecuador recently upgraded several AML and M113 A2 Plus armoured vehicles, as the country does not possess heavy armour. As for Mexico, its fleet consists of light and medium armoured vehicles. Finally, Colombia also possesses light armoured vehicles; for example, media reports published in late January show vehicles that appear to be the EE-09 Cascavel, a 6x6 light tank, on patrol in urban areas close to the border with Venezuela. Latin American Armoured Vehicle Requirements The intrastate conflict that has plagued many Latin American countries is one of the strongest drivers for defence spending. Many countries continue to acquire new (or refurbished) platforms, such as Brazil’s new carrier Atlantico, Chile’s new Sikorsky S-70i Blackhawk helicopters, Argentina’s used AB-206 helicopters, or Mexico’s new patrol vessel Reformador. As for Peru, the Andean state has commenced the construction of a second landing platform vessel, BAP Paita. However, when it comes to heavy armour (or even medium armour) new contracts have been quite scarce in recent years. One argument in favour of procuring heavy armour is so that nations can maintain minimal deterrence capabilities. While interstate warfare is very unlikely, it does not mean that the scenario is impossible. The Venezuelan government’s behaviour, particularly during the 2008 crisis in the Andes is an example of this ever-present possibility. Nevertheless, given the region’s current peaceful status, limited defence budgets and other security threats, it is understandable that regional governments have other priorities. Moreover, the focus for Latin American governments is the acquisition of multipurpose platforms, which can be utilized not solely for war.

### Water

#### They go for some cannabis growers have found more efficient water shortages to China invades Siberia because they have no water – massive missing internal link

#### Water shortages don’t cause conflict.

Mehsud et al. 17 – Meshud is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Hazara University Mansehra. Manzoor Ahmad is Chairman, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan. Adil Khan is Lecturer, Department of Pakistan Studies, Hazara University Mansehra. (Muhammad Imram; Published: 2017; "When States Go Thirsty: A Critical Analysis of Water War Thesis"; Global Strategic and Security Studies Review Vol. II, No. I; Accessed: August 18, 2021; https://gsssrjournal.com/papers/1%20When%20States%20Go%20Thirsty%20-%20Imran%20Mehsud.pdf)//CYang

This group argues that no doubt water is scarce and is unevenly distributed across planet earth. However, water scarcity doesn’t necessarily result in war. In fact, water scarcity could create both conflict and cooperation. For Toynbee, such a scarcity or challenge would create a cooperative environment whereas for Homer-Dixon such scarcity would generate conflicts. This dichotomy of two divergent perspectives thus resulted in the creation of two different and contending schools of thought. The first school which draws their argument from Toynbee is represented by the writings of Sandra I.Postel, and Aaron T.Wolf. This group is sanguine about the peaceful resolution of water disputes.

Their claim is based on certain arguments. Firstly, it is argued that there exist almost 3600 water treaties at different levels, and nearly all of the disputed parties to water conflicts of one form or another have either managed to reach an agreement or is in the process of charting a strategy to manage waters (Priscoli and Wolf 2008). Egypt-Sudan in 1959 over the Nile, IndianPakistan in 1960 over Indus, Thailand-Vietnam, Lao Peoples Democratic Republic-Cambodia in 1995 over the Mekong, the eleven co-riparian countries of the Danube River in 1994, India-Bangladesh in 1996 over the Ganges are few of the examples where water disputes have been resolved through cooperative arrangements.

Secondly, most of these treaties remained intact even when the parties to the agreement actually waged war against one another. The functioning of the Indus Water Treaty between India and Pakistan amidst large scale wars between these two nations and the smooth working of the Lebanese water supply system during Lebanese civil wars (Global Water Shortages1999) are cited as solid examples in this regard. Thirdly, Wolf further augments the arguments in hand by arguing that historical water disputes have never turned violent and that water war is strategically irrational, hydrographically ineffective and economically not viable (Chakraborty and Serageldin 2004). Fourthly, it is opined that increase in a number of water dispute’s resolution mechanisms, the expanding international law of waters and positive role of third parties in the resolution of water disputes have left no room for the water war thesis (Wolf 1998). Owing to the aforementioned reasons, some of the analysts from Swedish Water House echoed that, “the loudest alarmist calls for future “water wars” have died away” (Brennan 2008, 10).

#### Marijuana causes emissions

Davis 8/22 [Melanie David, August 22, 2021. “How The Current Weed Industry Is Bad For The Environment” <https://www.gossipcop.com/how-the-current-weed-industry-is-bad-for-the-environment/2570638/> Accessed 8/22 //gord0]

Cannabis is a plant. Unlike other drugs, it doesn’t come from a lab. Since the ’60s, weed has been associated with earth-loving hippies and pacifists. Yet, despite its natural origins, the weed industry is actually harming the planet. The industry’s carbon footprint is growing rapidly for several reasons. Together, these problems roll up into one huge, complicated joint. So sit back, spark it up and get ready—this one is a doozy. The Environmental Impact Of Cannabis Alone The problem of weed cultivation is a layered one. Its roots stretch into law, agriculture, racial inequity and interstate commerce. First, let’s start with the plant itself. The [Press Democrat reported in 2014](https://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/news/effort-afoot-to-develop-water-use-rules-for-pot-growers/) that the average pot plant consumes up to six gallons of water per day. At this rate, these plants drink enough water to fill 160 Olympic-sized swimming pools over five months. Researchers determined this through satellite images from California’s “Emerald Triangle” (Mendocino, Humboldt and Trinity counties). That’s only three counties in one state. There are 37 other states with supplies of thirsty pot plants. A single adult plant also [emits hundreds of harmful BVOCs](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31498732/https:/pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31498732/) a day. These BVOCs cause the [same type of air pollution](https://scied.ucar.edu/learning-zone/air-quality/ozone-troposphere#:~:text=Tropospheric%20ozone%20is%20formed%20by,occur%20during%20warm%20summer%20months.) as car exhausts and smokestacks. Of course, weed isn’t the only thirsty crop we grow in the United States. One pound of [cannabis requires one gallon](https://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/content/how-much-water-does-cannabis-really-need/17831417/) of water. One pound of [almonds requires 1,900](https://www.paesta.psu.edu/podcast/how-much-water-does-it-really-take-grow-almonds-paesta-podcast-series-episode-43#:~:text=To%20grow%20one%20almond%20requires,high%20demand%20at%20this%20time.). However, we didn’t demonize almonds for 100 years [under racial pretenses](https://www.aclu.org/blog/criminal-law-reform/drug-law-reform/marijuana-legalization-racial-justice-issue). As I said, this issue’s roots run deep. (Legal) Grow Operations’ Carbon Footprint Weed laws differ across state lines. Therefore, we have to consider both legal and illegal grow operations. Both come with their fair share of concerns. [According to Politico](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/08/10/weed-cannabis-legalization-energy-503004), 80% of weed is grown indoors. Indoor growing maximizes plant yield, and the name of the game here is profit. [This California study shows](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254408509_The_carbon_footprint_of_indoor_Cannabis_production) that indoor facilities use up to 2,000 watts of electricity per square meter. Additionally, it found that producing one kilogram of weed emits 4600kg of carbon dioxide. The [Resource Innovation Institute’s 2020 data](https://www.healtheuropa.eu/a-resource-efficient-cannabis-industry-starts-with-benchmarking/103049/) shows that indoor grow operations have the largest environmental impact. Outdoor growing has the least. Finally, greenhouse operations sit in the middle. They use around 45% of the energy of an indoor site. Switching to LED lights can help increase indoor efficiency. The [Cannabis Reporter cites the EPA](https://thecannabisreporter.com/cannabis-has-a-big-carbon-footprint-heres-how-leds-reduce-it/) as saying, “LEDs offer the potential for cutting general lighting energy use nearly in half by 2030.” But of course, it isn’t as simple as indoor vs. outdoor. Across all locales, Bloomberg Environment estimates that legal cannabis cultivation in the U.S. [consumed 1.1 million megawatt-hours of electricity in 2017](https://news.bloomberglaw.com/environment-and-energy/states-want-pot-to-grow-greener-as-legal-cannabis-expands). That’s enough to power 92,500 homes for a year. Now, the keyword here is “legal.” Bloomberg’s data doesn’t take into account illegal operations. These operations are harder to track, but their environmental impacts aren’t. (Illegal) Grow Operations’ Carbon Footprint The United States [made cannabis illegal in 1937](https://www.britannica.com/story/why-is-marijuana-illegal-in-the-us#:~:text=Aided%20by%20an%20eager%20news,illegal%20across%20the%20United%20States.). 59 years later, California became the first state to legalize cannabis with [Proposition 215](https://ballotpedia.org/California_Proposition_215,_Medical_Marijuana_Initiative_(1996)). However, cannabis didn’t drop off the face of the earth during those 59 years. Illegal grow operations continued throughout cannabis’s prohibition, and they continue today. In Humboldt County, California, law enforcement officers found [14,000 illegal grow sites](https://www.jstor.org/stable/90023267?mag=the-environmental-downside-of-cannabis-cultivation&seq=3#metadata_info_tab_contents) on federal or private lands in 2018. Growers log heavily wooded areas to make room for farms. In doing so, they displace wildlife and use up vital water resources. Weed’s Long-Lasting Effects On Wildlife Illegal operations don’t follow the same environmental standards as legal ones, either. [NPR reported in 2019](https://www.npr.org/2019/11/12/773122043/illegal-pot-grows-in-americas-public-forests-are-poisoning-wildlife-and-water) that many of these “trespass grow” sites use massive quantities of pesticides and other chemicals. These chemicals include Bromethalin, a rat poison, and carbofuran, an [insecticide banned by the EPA in 2009](https://archive.epa.gov/pesticides/reregistration/web/html/carbofuran_noic.html). Ecologist Greta Wengert spoke to NPR at an illegal grow site. During the interview, she points to a tree where she found a gallon of carbofuran. “It is incredibly toxic,” she told NPR. “A quarter-teaspoon could kill a 600-pound black bear. So, just a tiny amount can kill a human. It remains in an ecosystem for a long period of time.” “We have detected [carbofuran] in the soil, cannabis plants, in native vegetation, the water, the infrastructure,” Wengert continues. “You name it, we have detected it. It’s horrible.” Mule deer, gray foxes, coyotes, northern spotted owls and ravens [have also been victims of poisoning](https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/thompson/psw_2017_thompson001.pdf) linked to weed farms. But these poisons affect more than the animals who ingest them. The Pacific fisher, a type of weasel, is [reaching endangered status](https://www.hcn.org/blogs/goat/between-wildfire-and-weed-pacific-fisher-survival-hangs-in-the-balance) at an alarming rate. When fishers ingest the poison, they pass those toxins to their offspring in utero. Salmon, too, are in [danger of extinction](https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2014/01/08/260788863/californias-pot-farms-could-leave-salmon-runs-truly-smoked) due to dwindling water sources.

#### Cannabis ag fragments forests and kills mammal biodiversity

Shoemaker 17 [Stephen Shoemaker, Ithaca College, WRITER AND CONTENT SPECIALIST, PUBLIC RELATIONS, CREATIVE AND MARKETING GROUP) Co Authored by Jake Brenner, Associate Prof. of Environmental Studies and Sciences at Ithaca) “Ithaca College Professor Finds Cannabis Cultivation Hurts Environment” IC News, Oct 31 2017] RM

Planting cannabis for commercial production in remote locations is creating forest fragmentation, stream modification, soil erosion and landslides. Without land-use policies to limit its environmental footprint, the impacts of cannabis farming could get worse, according to a new study published in the November issue of Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment.

Earlier studies have shown that cannabis production causes environmental damage, including rodenticide poisoning of forest mammals and dewatering of streams due to improper irrigation.

Cannabis, as either a medicinal or recreational drug, is now legal in more than 30 U.S. states and in several countries. In California, where medicinal marijuana has been legal since 1996, voters in November approved the sale and possession of one ounce of marijuana for recreational use. As a result, cannabis production is ramping up.

"Cannabis leaves a small spatial footprint but has potentially significant environmental impacts," said co-author Jake Brenner, associateprofessor in the Department of Environmental Studies and Sciences at Ithaca College. "To mitigate these impacts, policymakers and planners need to enact specific environmental and land-use regulations to control cannabis crop expansion during this early stage in its development."

Scale matters Effective policymaking for a new crop can be challenging without scientific data. In this study, Brenner, along with Van Butsic, a University of California Cooperative Extension specialist in UC Agriculture and Natural Resources and the UC Berkeley Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, and Ian J. Wang, assistant professor in the UC Berkeley Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, present an approach for early assessment of landscape changes resulting from new agricultural activities.

Their approach uses per-unit-area analysis of landscape change. To study forest fragmentation in northern California, the scientists compared the effects of cannabis cultivation to those of timber harvest from 2000 to 2013 in Humboldt County.

Based on the size, shape and placement of the cannabis grows among 62 randomly selected watersheds, they quantified the impacts relative to those of timber harvest.

"We found that although timber has greater landscape impacts overall, cannabis causes far greater changes in key metrics on a per-unit-area basis," said Butsic.

On a per-unit-area basis, the cannabis grows resulted in 1.5 times more forest loss and 2.5 times greater fragmentation of the landscape, breaking up large, contiguous forest into smaller patches and reducing wildlife habitat.

"The results show how important it is to consider environmental impacts at different scales," said Brenner.

Current California law caps the size of outdoor cannabis production to 1 acre per parcel, to prohibit the development of industrial-scale cannabis operations outdoors. An unintended consequence of this law may be small dispersed cannabis grows that edge out wildlife.

While the long-term effects of cannabis cultivation on the environment are unknown, the researchers concluded that land management and agricultural policy informed by further research may reduce these threats in California and in other states and countries where cannabis production can be regulated.

"Studies like this one have the potential to directly inform local land-use policy and state environmental regulation," said Brenner. "It's exciting to be a part of this research because it is capturing a human-environment phenomenon at the moment of its emergence."

#### Continued biodiversity loss causes extinction

Corbett 2/19 [(Jessica, a staff writer for Common Dreams) Internally cites IPBES (the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, an intergovernmental organization established to improve the interface between science and policy on issues of biodiversity and ecosystem services.) “World Leaders Urged to 'Act Now' to Save Biodiversity” EcoWatch, 2/19/2020] BC

Ahead of government negotiations scheduled for next week on a global plan to address the biodiversity crisis, 23 former foreign ministers from various countries released a statement on Tuesday urging world leaders to act "boldly" to protect nature.

"It is clear to us... that climate change, ecosystem degradation, and the excessive exploitation of natural resources are now threatening millions of species with extinction and jeopardizing the health of our planet," says the statement. "The loss and degradation of nature jeopardizes human health, livelihoods, safety, and prosperity. It disproportionately harms our poorest communities while undermining our ability to meet a broad range of targets set by the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals."

"The world has a moral imperative to collaborate on strong actions to mitigate and adapt to the current climate change and biodiversity crisis. Ambitious targets for conservation of land and ocean ecosystems are vital components of the solution," the statement continues. "Humanity sits on the precipice of irreversible loss of biodiversity and a climate crisis that imperils the future for our grandchildren and generations to come. The world must act boldly, and it must act now."

A U.N. report released in May 2019 by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) warned that, as Common Dreams reported at the time, "human exploitation of the natural world has pushed a million plant and animal species to the brink of extinction—with potentially devastating implications for the future of civilization."

That report and a growing body of scientific research on rapidly declining biodiversity has led scientists and policymakers alike to raise the alarm about the consequences of not acting ambitiously enough to address what experts have called the "sixth mass extinction." U.N. biodiversity chief Elizabeth Maruma Mrema told the Guardian last month that humanity risks being left to contend with an "empty world."

The new statement from diplomats came before the Feb. 24–29 meeting of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which was recently moved from Kunming, China to Rome, Italy due to the ongoing coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. The event will build on an August 2019 meeting in Nairobi, Kenya. A third meeting in Cali, Colombia is planned for July.

#### Cannabis causes ag loss from plant diseases

Geaseeds 20 [Geaseeds, cannabis seeds. November, 2020. “MARIJUANA DISEASES | CANNABIS” <https://geaseeds.com/blog/en/marijuana-diseases-cannabis/> Accessed 9/5 //gord0]

The intention of this article is to offer all kinds of **information related to the diseases that affect the correct development of cannabis** (as well as its causes and consequences). As every expert grower knows, diseases are many and fighting them takes a lot of time, dedication and effort. Below, we will summarize a wide and varied amount of information related to the types of diseases, the factors that favor their appearance and expansion, as well as the symptoms that provoke and help us to recognize them. Introduction Generally, losses in agricultural production are attributed **to insect and parasite** [pests](https://geaseeds.com/blog/en/cannabis-pests-marijuana/) **that attack crops.** This is logical, as it usually is, but there is another factor that causes numerous losses in agriculture and yet it is not as well-known as the previous one; we are referring to what are known as plant diseases. These types of diseases **cause irreparable damage to crops**, causing significant annual losses in agriculture. The following is a brief and concise summary of the various diseases that can affect our [cannabis cultivation.](https://geaseeds.com/blog/en/manual-of-cultivation/) What is a plant disease? Plant diseases are infectious agents and abiotic disorders that attack plants and negatively influence the development of their vital functions. This occurs when pathogenic microorganisms or environmental factors determine adverse changes in plant form, integrity or function, negatively affecting plant tissues and cells. The result is partial inability to perform their vital functions, and even death at worst. How are marijuana diseases classified? In terms of classification, it should be noted that they are divided into two main groups, parasitic and non-parasitic. The former are those caused by microscopic **organisms such as** [fungi](https://geaseeds.com/blog/en/types-of-fungi-in-cannabis-prevention-remedies-and-treatments/)**, viruses, bacteria and nematodes, among others.** On the other hand, non-parasitic diseases are those whose causative agents are not contagious and can be very varied. For example, non-parasitic diseases can be caused by adverse climatic conditions, as well as by excess or lack of irrigation, over-fertilization and, in general, poor agricultural practices. **It is estimated that approximately 10% of losses in the agricultural industry** worldwide are caused by plant diseases. Therefore, this type of infectious agents and abiotic disorders are the cause of very important losses in agriculture. This gives us an idea of the importance of this type of disease, which, like the agricultural industry, also leads to numerous losses in cannabis cultivation. Although being a very resistant plant species, marijuana is also affected by these diseases. In fact, it is estimated that there are approximately 100 plant diseases that directly affect the correct development of the vital functions of cannabis. This is the reason why we have decided to dedicate an entire article to the resolution of all types of doubts, providing the customer with the necessary information to know and prevent this problem. Which parts of the plant are affected and how do they affect them? **Plant diseases** do not attack plants in the same way. In fact, depending on the disease in question, the tissues and cells affected will be different and, therefore, the type of physiological function that will be affected will also be different. Below, we explain what parts of the plant affect infections and what functions they affect. Firstly, to highlight the root infections, which can cause rotting of the same. If this happens, the plant will be unable to absorb the nutrients and water necessary for its proper development. Secondly, diseases can also affect xylem vessels. For those less placed in the matter, it should be noted that xylem is the plant tissue formed by cells that carry the sap to the leaves. When xylem is affected by disease, the translocation of water and nutrients within the plant is negatively affected and vascular and fungal shriveling begins to appear. Another part of the plant that is usually affected by plant diseases is the leaves. These infections directly interfere with the plant’s photosynthesis process and manifest themselves in the form of stains, rust, blight, mildew and mosaics. Finally, it is worth mentioning the infections of flowers and fruits, which will directly interfere with the reproduction of the plant. Most plant diseases cause infected plant cells to weaken or die. However, there are also other diseases in which infected cells are induced to divide more rapidly (hyperplasia) or to enlarge (hypertrophy) and thereby produce abnormal and amorphous tissues (tumors) or abnormal organs.

#### Ag key to food security

Miller 17 [Jim Miller, Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services. Feb 21, 2017. “Agriculture Key to Food Security” [https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2010/08/05/agriculture-key-food-security Accessed 9/5](https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2010/08/05/agriculture-key-food-security%20Accessed%209/5) //gord0]

During this year’s International Food Aid and Development Conference (IFADC), food security featured prominently as both a major concern and a primary program focus for current and future USDA projects. Each year the IFADC brings together USDA, the U.S. Agency for International Development, private sector companies and voluntary organizations who collaborate throughout the year to provide America’s food aid and assistance to the world’s neediest people. This week I joined USDA and USAID leaders in Kansas City to address this important subject.

You may not be aware, but the United States is the largest provider of food assistance in the world. Over the past 10 years, we have supplied about one-half of total international food assistance, and in 2009 alone United States programs reached over 70 million people worldwide.

Even with America’s food aid experience and resources, the number of poor, hungry people continues to grow.  In 2008, a supply and demand imbalance in global food systems raised international food prices and resulted in increased instability in food insecure countries. This served as a wake-up call to rich and poor countries alike that we need to begin reinvesting in our agricultural sectors.

Last year, the G8 leaders committed to combating food insecurity, a priority echoed by the Obama Administration’s pledge to invest $3.5 billion in the next three years and the whole-of-government [Feed the Future (FTF)](http://www.feedthefuture.gov/) initiative. Agriculture plays an important role in this new approach. The majority of people in developing countries depend on it not only for food, but also as a main source of income and employment.

Public-private partnerships provide farmers technical assistance to form cooperatives, improve production, or storage and handling, and these practices and information can be passed on to future generations and larger groups. Through sustainable food programs that continue years after U.S. funding has ended, such as [USDA’s McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program](http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/foodaid/ffe/FFE.asp), the U.S. will increasingly seek new ways of using private money, businesses and trade to help struggling countries become self-sufficient in feeding their people.

With the number of chronically hungry people now surpassing one billion, we need a sustainable approach to answer the call of those in need, sharing America’s bounty and knowledge with those less fortunate. USDA sees its engagement in Feed the Future as central to achieving that goal. Our unique capacities in research, extension, and institutional capacity building can make an important contribution to long term food security.

#### Food wars go nuclear---expert consensus agrees.

FDI, 12 [Future Directions International, Global Food and Water Crises Research Programme, 25 May 2012, FutureDirections, “International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity,” <https://www.futuredirections.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Workshop_Report_-_Intl_Conflict_Triggers_-_May_25.pdf>, accessed 8-17-2021]JMK

There is little dispute that conflict can lead to food and water crises. This paper will consider parts of the world, however, where food and water insecurity can be the cause of conflict and, at worst, result in war. While dealing predominately with food and water issues, the paper also recognises the nexus that exists between food and water and energy security. There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. Page 9 of 22 In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. . He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.