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“On Borrowed Time: Present and Advancing Technologies Enable Terrorists to Cause Increasingly Severe Damage, but Robust Prevention and Response Tools Continue to Lag Behind, Where They Exist at All”

Carl Adrianopoli (cadriano@sbcglobal.net)

Scientific progress has always been a two-edged sword whether we are dealing with gun powder, nuclear power, editing the genome, Big Data or Artificial Intelligence. For example, during the 1930s life-saving penicillin and sulpha drugs were being developed while the Japanese were freeing glanders and anthrax to kill 200,000 or more Chinese. Recently, cyber-attacks threaten power grids, electronic commerce, private financial information of hundreds of millions, and even US elections. Despite loud political discussions of terrorism, the end of the cold war and memories of the World Trade Center (WTC) bombings have faded. Layered, coordinated, federal-state-local programs such as the former Nunn-Lugar Preparedness Program have lapsed, with little to replace or improve them. Even in New York City, whose preparedness and prevention efforts surpass any US city, the terrorist detonation of a relatively small, improvised nuclear device or the freeing of a few kilograms of properly milled anthrax spores could cost trillions of dollars in damages and kill hundreds of thousands. There are three ways to prevent or mitigate catastrophic attacks, though prevention, preparedness and response efforts can be extremely costly and still can have uncertain effectiveness: (1) Standard emergency management preparedness and response tools developed well before they may be needed. (2) Coordinated public and private intelligence. Anti-terrorism experts agree that effective and coordinated, though often intrusive, intelligence gathering is the best way to prevent or minimize terrorist events. But effective efforts can be expensive, can threaten constitutional rights and still fail to prevent attacks. (3) Learn what motivates terrorists, and what can, if anything, be done to address their real or imagined concerns. Unfortunately, the US, as a powerful international force, has often acted, wisely or not, creating almost perpetual enemies. There are reasons, fair or not, “why they hate us so.” But for many reasons, wise policies are difficult to develop and implement. A family, or ten thousand families, will rarely “forgive and forget” a death from a drone attack, regardless of the motivations and actions of the dead.

“Creation of a Modern Public Health Department, 1909-1925: A Policy History”

William P. Brandon, University of North Carolina Charlotte (wilbrand@uncc.edu)
Lauren A. Austin, University of North Carolina Charlotte

This policy history of developments in public health in North Carolina in the first quarter of the twentieth century examines the evolution of public health as political and social conditions changed and the entrepreneurial leadership of the first fulltime public health officer employed by the NC Board of Public Health, Watson S. Rankin, MD. Rankin played a central role in creating what became one of the nation’s leading public health departments.
At first, Rankin improved the quality and scope of accurate health data and began focusing on environmental and sanitary reforms essential for population health; by the end of World War I, he had begun to emphasize the provision of health services to vulnerable populations. This evolution was partly enabled by an increasing shift of power from localities to the State Board of Health in Raleigh, which was facilitated by the first federal legislation creating grants-in-aid in the twentieth century. These grants, unlike the signature land grants of the nineteenth century, provided federal dollars to states that chose to institute federal health policies.

Policy lessons of this case-study of an early “policy entrepreneur” include: The necessity of accurate data/facts to secure support for policy innovation; the role of federal grant funds in eroding local autonomy and enhancing state control and centralization; creation of greater national unity in social welfare policies to parallel the potential for creation and federal control of the national economy permitted by the Constitution’s commerce clause and currency monopoly; and the part played by philanthropy in generating institutions and templates (cultural, scientific, educational, and artistic) that affect individual citizens.

“Securing Social Security Solvency: Addressing an Important Social Determinant of the Health of Seniors and the American Polity”

William P. Brandon, University of North Carolina Charlotte (wilbrand@uncc.edu)
Zachary Mohr, University of North Carolina Charlotte (zmohr@uncc.edu)

Recognition of the social determinants of health entails attention to securing adequate incomes. In the U.S. only older Americans receive inflation-protected guaranteed minimal incomes—Social Security. With insolvency predicted in the mid-2030s and politicians seeking dubious “reforms,” we need another 1983 compromise, when all stakeholders agreed to accept “shared pain.” This paper suggests modest benefit reductions that protect the most vulnerable elders as part of a comprehensive agreement that includes raising additional revenue.

It proposes indexing the benefit using the chained consumer price index for all urban consumers (C-CPI-U) and providing a one-time bonus of 8-10% for beneficiaries in their mid-80s when needs are greatest. The chained CPI has little impact when beneficiaries start receiving benefits, but the old-old need protection. Estimated 75-year savings are 14.2 to 18% of Social Security deficits. This benefit reduction is superior to further eligibility age increases and benefit means-testing.

Raising revenue generates more funds than cutting benefits. The analysis suggests modest increases in the payroll taxes and on the income amounts that are taxed. Subjecting unearned income as well as wages and salaries to the 6.2 individual tax can also generate significant revenue.
“Clinton, Trump, and the Enthusiasm Gap that Defined the 2016 Presidential Election”

Erik P. Bucy, Texas Tech University (erik.bucy@ttu.edu)
Zijian Harrison Gong, University of Tampa

Despite widespread expectations among pundits and pollsters that Hillary Clinton would win the 2016 presidential election, Donald Trump’s supporters turned out in critical states and pushed his candidacy to an unexpected victory. Mobilizing his fervent base has been a key element of Trump’s success. To a large degree, Trump’s rise has pivoted on his ability to communicate messages of outrage and discontent that resonate with voters. While much journalistic commentary and early academic research has focused on Trump’s use of Twitter to directly communicate with supporters, much less systematic attention has been given to other elements of his communication behavior, particularly his unorthodox nonverbal style that powers his populist message. In this paper, we examine the contrasting communication styles of Trump and Clinton in the first and third presidential debates to first show significant differences in their nonverbal behaviors, including facial displays of emotion, affinity and defiance gestures, blinking, and other signs of physical duress. We also analyze signals of social dominance such as voice tone, interruptions, and shows of defiance.

In part two of the analysis, we conduct a gap analysis using continuous response measures collected in real-time during the debates to assess differences in viewer ratings of Trump and Clinton. During each debate, 34 members of the West Texas community (a mix of Republican Party identifiers, Independents, and Democratic Party identifiers) rated the performance of each candidate on a moment-to-moment (MTM) basis, providing detailed feedback on the candidates’ communication efficacy. Participants used their dials to indicate a favorable or unfavorable rating, with response options ranging from 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 100 (Strongly Agree). The sampling interval was set at 1 sec intervals. For analysis, participants’ evaluations are categorized into four ranges: extremely positive (80-100), positive (60-79), negative (20-40), and extremely negative (<20). Additionally, the frequency and total duration of peak MTM scores (100) were manually scored for each participant. Observation suggests that Republican Party identifiers expressed much more enthusiasm for Trump than Democrats did for Clinton, particularly when Trump went on the attack against Clinton. Trump’s average ratings peaked in the extremely positive range (80-100) across both debates, while average Democratic ratings peaked considerably lower (60-79) in response to Clinton. In addition, the total duration was longer and frequency of peak scores higher for Trump than for Clinton. On the whole, Trump supporters felt much more favorable towards their candidate’s performance in the debates than Democrats did towards Clinton. We argue that the candidates’ contrasting communication styles during the debates can be viewed as emblematic of a larger “enthusiasm gap” that benefitted Trump and hindered Clinton in 2016—and likely impacted voter turnout during the election.
“Why People Follow Rules? A Reasonable Choice Approach”

Céline Colombo, University of Colorado Boulder (Colombo@ipz.uch.ch)
Sven Steinmo, University of Colorado Boulder (steinmo@colorado.edu)

This paper explores the question: Why do people follow rules? Building on the large body of recent scholarship in evolutionary psychology, cognitive science and behavioral research, we argue that human decision making is best understood as 1) a process of reasoning, 2) humans are social creatures and not autonomous decision makers maximizing their utilities, 3) human reasoning follows a fundamental desire for consistency, and 4) human reasoning is systematically biased in a number of predictable ways. We examine our basic motivations for rule following behavior as well as the cognitive mechanisms most likely at work when we do so.

“Competition, Self-Esteem, and Attitude Towards the Otherness: Investigating the Psychological Foundations of Right-Wing Populism”

Malu Gatto, University of Zurich
Jordan Mansell, University of Oxford (jordan.mansell@linacre.ox.ac.uk)

As a result of the rise in right-wing populism Western nations have recently experienced a significant change in their political landscapes. This new political dynamic has the potential to exert a lasting effect on political discourse; however, political scientists using existing methods and approaches have struggled to fully understand this new phenomenon. In this paper, we investigate whether right-wing populist attitudes concerning social out-groups are linked to an interaction between individual competitive motivations and self-esteem. Research in evolutionary psychology on dominance and social hierarchies links the expression of hostile and aggressive behaviour with individuals’ successes and failures in competitive social environments. We suggest that recent increases in economic uncertainty and inequality in Western Nations are causing individuals who perceive themselves as unsuccessful and uncompetitive to engage in out-group aggressive behaviours. To investigate this hypothesis, we recruit a sample of (N=600) American participants to complete an Other-Self Implicit Association Test in which we compare individuals’ sense of implicit and explicit self-esteem, social competiveness, and cognitive flexibility. We hypothesize that individuals who display both damaged self-esteem (low-implicit vs. high-explicit self-esteem) and a disposition towards dominant competitive behaviour will be more likely to support right-wing populist views on social-outgroups, immigration, and ethnic minorities. Funding for this project has been generously provided by the University of Zurich.

“Neurocognitive Hacking”

John J. Heslen, Augusta University (JHeslen@augusta.edu)

Neurocognitive hacking involves the influencing of behavior through the presentation (either subliminal or supraliminal) of specific visual and/or auditory stimuli. Previous research has shown
that perceiving mortality-related stimuli has neurological correlates in specific areas of the brain and mediates both unconscious prejudicial behavior toward those considered out-group members and greater affiliative behavior toward one’s in-group. Although the theoretical framework behind neurocognitive hacking is not fully developed, perceiving mortality-related stimuli is believed to activate the body’s attentional system in order to help scan for the locus of the potentially-lethal threat. The unconscious prejudicial reactions against out-group members likely involve behavioral heuristics (previously characterized as a Mortality Bias) that evolved to protect one’s in-group in the event the mortality-related stimuli portend a more serious, lengthy, or sustained struggle for resources. As such, presenting subliminal/supraliminal mortality-related stimuli over computer networks to targeted populations may facilitate their subsequent ingestion of tailored propaganda, increase the likelihood they will engage sphere-phishing emails containing weaponized payloads, as well as support numerous other computer network exploitation tools related to information operations.

“Doped and Disclosed: Meldonium, Malpractices and Bad Governance in Russian Sport Industry”

Andrey Makarychev, University of Tartu, Estonia (andrey.makarychev@ut.ee)
Sergey Medvedev, Higher School of Economics, Moscow

In this paper we scrutinize one of policy areas in which the Russian government had to react to the negative publicity it received in last years, namely the doping scandal that erupted in 2015 and uncovered important aspects of Russia’s vulnerability in global sports milieu. The doping practices are grounded in the Soviet sports system as the USSR conducted an extensive doping program, and the structure of Russia’s doping program and its problems with WADA could certainly be seen as legacies of a state-sport system designed to achieve victories for the state through promoting doping and protecting dopers. Since 2015 World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) issued a series of public reports unveiling the mass-scale and government-supported system of doping usage in many sports in Russia. The international media published eye-witness’ evidence accusing Russian Sport Ministry and Federal Security Service of destroying proofs of Russian athletes’ positive doping tests resulted from the wide usage of meldonium in Russian sports. The ensuing debate went far beyond sports: “If independent investigators were allowed into Russia's government procurement system, the military-industrial complex, state energy companies or the "public movements" supporting President Vladimir Putin, their findings would almost certainly be similar to the ones detailed in the anti-doping agency report” (Bershidsky 2015).

“CRISPR and the Human Condition”

Val Martin, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago

The sudden rise of the new CRISPR technique for DNA manipulation has raised a lot of hopes for curing genetic disease and replacing inefficient cures. It however raises the question how far can therapy go, and what are the limits of the medical use of scientific discoveries. This paper focuses
on the recent developments in CRISPR research, and the current prospective of its applicability. Like in earlier cases of medical research, optimism goes in parallel with ethical concerns.

“A Second Look at Partisanship’s Effect on Receptivity to Social Pressure to Vote”

Richard E. Matland, Loyola University, Chicago
Gregg R. Murray, Augusta University (gmurray@augusta.edu)

Social pressure can exert a powerful, but sometimes counterproductive, influence on compliance with the social norm of voting. Scholars have tested several implicit social pressure techniques to reduce negative reactions to these methods. Among the most innovative is the use of “watchful eyes” in voter mobilization messages. Using three large randomized field experiments, this study retests Panagopoulos and van der Linden’s (2016) finding that political partisanship moderates the effect of watchful eyes messages on voter turnout. Our findings diverge from previous findings statistically and substantively and indicate partisanship may have limited influence on the effectiveness of watchful eyes in mobilizing voters.

“Policies as Species: Viewing Policies from an Evolutionary Perspective”

Samantha Mosier, Missouri State University (smosier@missouristate.edu)

This paper proposes the idea of equating policies as species to develop a better understanding of how policies emerge, change, and diffuse across policymaking environments. Scholars have long shown an interest in understanding policy change and reinvention, whether incremental or non-incremental in nature. The two subfields of public policy that can answer how or why policies change are not unified, thereby leading to difficulty in comprehensively assessing policy emergence and change. The policy species concept bridges knowledge of the policy process to knowledge in the policy process by creating a operationalized definition of public policy and suggesting a process for classifying policies to observe subsequent behavior. Drawing from the field of biology, the policy species framework outlines how policies possess genotypes and phenotypes, which dictate what a policy is and how it can change. In tracing genotypic and phenetic change over time, policy evolution and change are more easily discernable. In turn, a more precise picture of how policies function is painted.

“It's not biology bro: Torture and the Misuse of Science”

Shane O’Mara, Trinity College, Dublin (smomara@tcd.ie)
John W. Schiemann, Fairleigh Dickinson University (jws@fdu.edu)

In Zero Dark Thirty, the 2012 film about the CIA’s hunt for Osama Bin Laden, a CIA operative named Daniel has just waterboarded Ammar, who is refusing to provide any information about a Saudi-based terrorist group. When Ammar has recovered sufficiently to listen, Daniel says “It's
cool that you’re strong. I respect it, I do. But in the end everybody breaks, bro. It’s biology” (Boal 2011, 6). Although this Hollywood apologia for the effectiveness of interrogational torture is wrong on many counts, this statement is revealing in two ways.

First, there is the implicit assumption that breaking a human being psychologically and physically is the same thing as effectiveness, as getting good intelligence. In other words, there is nothing new here; this is interrogational torture as it always has been and is today, about imposing suffering to “break” human beings. Second, there is the claim that this method of breaking was “scientific,” rooted in the biology of the human being and so fail-safe and sure-fire. The CIA – and the policy makers higher up who approved the torture program – embraced the second claim but denied the first. Indeed, their “scientific” approach to torture was claimed to be something different than simple torture.

We challenge both claims, showing that the decision to use torture as well as the so-called scientific approach adopted by the CIA had nothing to do with science and that the program in practice differed little from age-old practices of torture. We also show what the science on – not “of” – torture actually tells us about both its effectiveness and its brutality. To do so, the next section reconstructs the decision by the Bush administration to employ torture immediately after 9/11, prior to any research or justifications based on science. The following section outlines the pseudoscientific model employed by the CIA before showing just why and how that model was pseudoscience in the section which follows. The last section presents what the actual science has to say about the informational effectiveness of torturing human bodies and brains.

“Biological Variables and Political Corruption: A Comparative Case Study”

Steven A. Peterson, Penn State Harrisburg (Sap12@psu.edu)

There is a relatively small but important research oeuvre in the biological study of comparative and international politics. This essay is situated within that literature.

One significant issue in comparative politics is corruption—its causes, its consequences, and remediation. This study focuses on the first point with a focus on biopolitical variables that might be at work. Prior research has suggested that health status of a nation affects extent of democratization, electoral integrity, and fragility of states. In no case is health status the dominant predictor. Given its relationship with those three aspects of a polity, this paper examines the effect of health status and nutritional level on corruption within states. Given prior results, there is good reason to hypothesize that as health status increases, states are less apt to have high rates of corruption.

The base for this analysis comprises data on over 150 nations. Among the variables as part of that data set are: health status, nutrition level, and corruption.

Results are reported and discussion centers on the meaning of the data and what this might imply for addressing corruption.
“A Curated Directory for Politics and the Life Sciences”

James H. Rutherford, MD, Grant Hospital, Columbus, OH (jrutherfordmd@hotmail.com)

The APLS would appropriately have an interest in two of the major issues of our times -- global education and global health care. One of the ways of addressing a part of this is the use of the information revolution and the world wide web.

For the last 10 years I have been working on a curated (hand-selected), open access (free) directory for the internet. This is a network of over 800 active websites that cover all of the general topics, but we focus on education, www.top20education.com and health care, www.top20health.com. In education we cover all of the high school and college topics. This includes www.top20politicalscience.com, www.top20government.com, and www.top20philosophy.com. We have also put the first two years of medical school online with selected and aggregated videos at www.top20medicalschool.com.

Many of the world class universities as well as individual professors have put some of their courses with video lectures online for free. We have selected and aggregated the best of these resources. The problem is now one of information overload, and that is the problem that we try to address with a curated directory.

“CRISPR – A POLITICAL MOLECULE”

Ullica Segerstrale, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago

CRISPR holds out a new promise for successful genetic engineering, since this gene-editing system can repair or replace faulty genes and can be much more targeted than earlier attempts. It won the status of “scientific discovery of the year” in 2015. The mechanism has turned out to be more complicated than expected, but one indicator of its importance is certainly the intense patent fight currently occurring between researchers from the University of California Berkeley and the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard – Jennifer Doudna and Elisabeth Charpentier vs. Feng Zhang and Eric Lander, all claiming priority on different grounds. The patent dispute has gone through several rounds, and it is not yet clear who will be the winner. The case involves several difficulties (and different groups of lawyers) including a surprising lack of clarity in patent law as to what is the exact procedure that establishes priority, and what exact formulation would be needed for a claim to be universally valid. We are served contrasting narratives of CRISPR discoveries with the scientists depicted as heroes or villains. Overall, this is an exciting story, somewhat similar to the drama around the famous Double Helix, and with the extra spice of patent law differences between the US and Europe.

Patrick A. Stewart, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (pastewart@uark.edu)
Reagan Dye, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Erik P. Bucy, Texas Tech University

This paper aims to replicate and extend upon experimental work carried out by Fein, Goethals, and Kugler (Fein, Goethals, & Kugler, 2007) and Vraga et al. (Vraga, Johnson, Carr, Bode, & Bard, 2014) regarding the social influence of laughter on the evaluation of political and media figures as well as the processing of media messages. Specifically, this study will consider the influence of observable audience response (OAR) in the form of laughter during what was considered a highly critical five-minute long news story concerning Ronald Reagan by CBS reporter Leslie Stahl during the 1984 presidential election. This study will evaluate the influence of audience laughter on participants’ evaluation of Reagan’s leadership traits, Stahl’s performance, and the impact of the news story itself by either diminishing the strength of, removing, or replacing audible audience laughter. Data will be collected through an internet-based experiment with three conditions (control-laughter in; treatment-laughter removed; treatment-laughter diminished) using Qualtrics. Participants will be recruited from introductory courses in exchange for extra credit.

“Gender Stereotypes and Candidate Behavior: Evaluating Hillary Clinton’s Nonverbal Performance in the 2016 Presidential Debates”

Bingbing Zhang, Texas Tech University
Erik P. Bucy, Texas Tech University (erik.bucy@ttu.edu)

This paper investigates whether gender stereotypes influenced perceptions of Hillary Clinton’s nonverbal behavior and overall performance during the 2016 presidential debates. Facial displays and gestures are particularly telling indicators of candidate emotionality and intention, shaping a gamut of viewer evaluations including judgments about candidate personality, communicative traits, leadership potential, and political competitiveness. At the same time, female candidates are especially susceptible to gender stereotyping and sexism, processes that can be defined as overgeneralizations about individual characteristics based on gender. Many studies have found that gender stereotypes influence citizen preferences for female politicians and that, as a consequence, female candidates tend to show more masculine personality tendencies in an effort to counteract gender stereotypes. As the first female presidential nominee in U.S. history, Hillary Clinton is thought to have emphasized masculine traits during her 2016 debate performances for this very reason. Focusing on the first and third general election debates, this research performs a detailed content analysis of Clinton’s nonverbal behavior to determine the extent to which this pattern was in evidence, then subjects selected clips from the debates to focus group discussion and evaluation. Preliminary results suggest that gender stereotypes do come into play when viewers evaluate Clinton’s performance and broader political appeal. Nonverbal coding shows that her expressive displays are also more disciplined Donald Trump’s, although Trump’s displays
are more easily characterized as attempts at social dominance on the debate stage. Results of the study are explained in light of the gender stereotypes and media biopolitics literature.
Handbook of Biology and Politics

Edited by Steven A. Peterson, Professor of Politics and Public Affairs, Penn State Harrisburg and Albert Somit, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, US

The study of biology and politics (or biopolitics) has gained considerable currency in recent years, as articles on the subject have appeared in mainstream journals and books on the subject have been well received. The literature has increased greatly since the 1960s and 1970s, when this specialization first made an appearance. This volume assesses the contributions of biology to political science. Chapters focus on general biological approaches to politics, biopolitical contributions to mainstream areas within political science, and linkages between biology and public policy. The volume provides readers with a comprehensive introduction to the subject.

‘Stalwart biopolitics scholars Steven A. Peterson and Albert Somit continue their long-running contributions to the cause, this time by assembling, in a single jam-packed volume, dozens of timely, insightful, thought-provoking contributions from an A-list of researchers in this exciting, inter-disciplinary subfield.’
– John Hibbing, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, US

‘Slowly but surely the social sciences are starting to realize that Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution through natural selection comes as a friend and supporter rather than as a foe and conqueror. This splendid collection, Handbook of Biology and Politics, edited by Steven A. Peterson and Albert Somit, shows that work in this field is rapidly moving towards maturity. At a time when, with reason, politics and its practitioners are judged and found sadly wanting, such a volume as this, looking at human nature in its fullest dimension and applying it to an understanding of the problems of society – reinvigorating the original project of Aristotle – is as provocatively stimulating as it is badly needed.’
– Michael Ruse, Florida State University, US
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How Our Stone Age Brain Deceives Us Every Day (And What We Can Do About It)

By Ronald Giphart and Mark van Vugt

Paperback
£14.99

Order via: https://www.amazon.com/Mismatch-Mark-Vugt-Ronald-Giphart/dp/1472139704

“An exciting new popular psychology book looking at the troubling conflict between how our brains have evolved to meet Stone Age demands, and the very different modern problems of the world we now live in.”
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