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### 1NC – T

#### Interpretation – CRISPR isn’t a medicine.

Merriam Webster ‘ND [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine]

Definition of medicine 1a : a substance or preparation used in treating disease cough medicine

#### Violation: CRISPR isn’t a medicine – it just has potential to be. We read blue

1AC Sfera 2/24 [(Dan, entrepreneur. Clinical Trials) “CRISPR Therapeutics creates gene-based medicines”, Real Dan Sfera, 2/24/2021. <https://therealdansfera.medium.com/crispr-therapeutics-creates-gene-based-medicines-25a66c674998>] BC

Gene-Editing Genius

CRISPR (clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats) has been making news about research and investment. Scientists learned that CRISPR, a naturally occurring gene-editing function of bacteria, has potential for treating genetic diseases. Now a number of companies are using gene-editing to try to cure illnesses caused by errors on a single gene. They include sickle cell disease, hemophilia and cystic fibrosis.

Swiss-based CRISPR Therapeutics, a biopharmaceutical company attempting to create transformative gene-based medicines for serious diseases, “has produced results that could not only make it a winner in single-gene disorders, but position it to tackle much more complex — and profitable — diseases in the years ahead,” according to Jason Hawthorne of The Motley Fool (https://www.fool.com/investing/2020/12/15/where-will-crispr-therapeutics-be-in-10-years/). CRISPR Therapeutics, a gene-editing company, attempts to develop gene-based medicines for serious diseases using its proprietary CRISPR/Cas9 platform. CRISPR/Cas9 is a gene-editing technology that allows for precise, directed changes to genomic DNA. The company has a wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary, CRISPR Therapeutics, Inc., and R&D operations based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and business offices in London, United Kingdom.

CRISPR’s CTX001 is a potential drug to treat sickle cell disease and beta-thalassemia, disorders that affect the oxygen-carrying cells in the blood. After harvesting a patient’s own cells from his or her own bone marrow, medical professionals use CTX001 to edit the gene responsible for red blood cell production and infuse the cells back into the body. In 2015, CRISPR entered into a partnership with Vertex Pharmaceuticals to develop a number of treatments using this technology, receiving cash, equity and future royalties, while Vertex obtained the rights to market the treatments to be developed.

#### CRISPR is a platform technology, not a medicine – being relevant for other medical research isn’t sufficient

Editas n/d [Editas Medicine, transnational medical organization focused on gene research and medical innovation. “CRISPR Gene Editing” https://www.editasmedicine.com/crispr-gene-editing/]

CRISPR (pronounced “crisper”) is an acronym for “Clustered, Regularly Interspaced, Short Palindromic Repeats,” and refers to a recently developed gene editing technology that can revise, remove, and replace DNA in a highly targeted manner. CRISPR is a dynamic, versatile tool that allows us to get to and edit nearly any location in the genome, and has the potential to help us develop medicines for people with a wide variety of diseases. We view CRISPR as a “platform” technology because of its ability to target DNA in any cell or tissue.

#### Vote neg for limits and neg ground – expanding the topic to DNA fragments allows anything from surgery to medical devices to education strategies or mosquito repellent to prevent malaria. Destroys core generics like innovation which are exclusive to disease curing – core of the topic is about proprietary information. No ground for disads against a medicine that doesn’t exist yet.

#### Drop the Debater – topicality a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### Use Competing Interps – you can’t be reasonably topical and reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom

#### No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 2

### 1NC – K

#### All capitalism is racial capitalism – racial capitalism uses the bodies of post-colonial subjects to prop up a new corporate empire of extraction. The flow of capital and information through Western notions of IP rights enables accumulation by dispossession from the Global South. The aff’s modification of CRISPR IP protections merely enables disciplinary and imperial control – piecemeal reforms like the aff only serve to erase Western culpability in neocolonial domination.

Chaurey ‘19 [Keeyaa Chaurey; Master’s Degree from The London School of Economics and Political Science (in Human Rights, Healthcare and Capitalism); January 2019; “Pirates and Property: The Moralities of Branded and Generic Medicines”; http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/102949/1/Keeyaa\_pirates\_and\_property\_submitted.pdf; Accessed 08-28-2021] AK

Behaviours of Accumulation and Extraction

Primitive accumulation’s seizing of land for property has become more abstract during accumulation as dispossession. Here, the accumulation of intellectual property is simply one aspect of a larger project of neoliberalisation. In this section I will outline the behaviours of accumulation and expansion that are evident in the globalisation of the intellectual property regime. I have already argued that these behaviours are self-justified as working against ‘piracy’. The rhetoric of ‘piracy’ makes expansion a moral imperative and the processes of making this imperative come to life connect back to racial capitalism. This will be explored in the following section.

TRIPS as an agreement is about more than patents: it sets minimum standards in copyright, trade marks, geographical indications, industrial designs, and lay-out designs of integrated circuits. It was the first stage in ensuring that the morality of expansion reproduces globally as the intellectual property standards in TRIPS obligate all members of the WTO (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 10). For Big Pharma, TRIPS will ensure the enclosure of biotechnology through patents and trade secret law. It also functions as an important vehicle for accumulation by dispossession through the forcing open of world markets, exactly like India: a country labelled as a notorious ‘pirate’ for making generics a fundamental part of their national pharmaceutical industry. Indeed, as a combination of a market-opener and a globalisation of the morality of accumulation, TRIPS can be seen as a cog in the engine wheels of “the motor of accumulation” (Harvey 2003, 182).

TRIPS has been effective since 1995 and was negotiated during the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Those missing from the important negotiation meetings and tables are easily identifiable: African, Asian, South American countries were repeatedly denied entry into spheres in which they might have the power to object and derail TRIPS. Alongside this came a system of coercion and blindsiding in which Third World countries were threatened through trade sanctions, and were also unprepared for the level of capital that had been sunk into intellectual property lawyers and infrastructure. India was the last stand against TRIPS. When finally having to sign during the Final Act of Marrakesh in April 1994, a number of Indian parliamentarians and members of the judiciary delivered rousing speeches about the recolonisation of India (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 146). However, the Indian pharmaceutical industry, along with every other member of the WTO was now forced to play by intellectual property rules set in Washington and New York (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). In the aptly named TRIPS Was Never Enough, Sell says, “Despite the fact that a TRIPS advocate triumphantly exclaimed, “we got 95% of what we wanted,” that 5% has always mattered, and 95% was never enough. While many countries believed that they were negotiating a ceiling on intellectual property rules, they quickly discovered they actually had negotiated only a floor.” (Sell 2011, 448). After TRIPS came TRIPS-plus, U.S.-plus, and ACTA-plus, making TRIPS look like a walk in the park in comparison to the stringency that these initiatives have brought (Sell 2011, 448). TRIPS-plus in particular targets the import of generic medicines and the logics of expansion and accumulation present themselves again.

A crucial aspect of primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession, and racial capitalism is extraction. Within the context of pharmaceutical intellectual property practice and TRIPS, three important kinds of extraction take place: the forcing open of markets through the obligation of building intellectual property infrastructure (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002); the theft from the collective knowledge of indigenous peoples (Olufunmilayo 2006; Drahos and Braithwaite 2002); and the outsourcing of clinical trials to the Third World while producing drugs for a Western market (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002; Fassin 2007; Lurie and Wolfe 1997; Angell 1997).

Minds and Bodies for Extraction

In the world of intellectual property, those who hold the webs of patents, patent lawyers, and the capital to keep it all spinning, are lords of the knowledge economy and thus, knowledge exporters. Those who are knowledge poor, like South Africa and other Third World countries, are also knowledge importers (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). TRIPS ensures that not only will knowledge poor countries have to standardise themselves to Western intellectual property rights, but they will have to pay dearly for the privilege. The message of the discourse around piracy has been that governments of other countries are stealing from the minds of U.S. inventors by not following patent protection. This narrative is connected with larger processes of the world order. In the 1950s, pharmaceutical corporations, particularly Pfizer International, made sweeping overseas sales figures. Due to recently independent post-colonial nations trying to rebuild themselves politically and economically, national pharmaceutical industries were nascent or non-existent. Drugs had to be imported and Pfizer profited. Countries like India and China were at first long-term prospects of profit. As their national pharmaceutical industries grew, they quickly became dangers to an established global system of branded medicine, one rooted in colonialism and imperialism (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). The avid extension and proliferation of the intellectual property regime, particularly in regards to pharmaceuticals, can thus be seen as a legal disciplinary mechanism for those countries daring to circumvent Big Pharma. By pouring resources into an infrastructure to support intellectual property rights, (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002) lower income countries (primarily post-colonies) are being pulled away from investing in basic human rights needs, such as access to medicines. Here we see Harvey’s accumulation by dispossession clearly.

Though Harvey is less particular about the racial aspect of the extraction, Alexander, Legassick and Hemson, Tutu, and even Mbeki make very clear that there is a power imbalance between extractors and those extracted from. Drahos and Braithwaite (2002) point to the ways in which racist narratives of the ‘East’ were mobilised for the movement of the U.S. government to put in place sanctions against Asian countries who did not yet follow patent protection laws in the 1980s and 1990s, forcing them to behave. Indeed, this example of a racial and imperial attitude seems to form a stubborn undercurrent not just through TRIPS but through Big Pharma’s more specific practices in the Third World. For example, Western intellectual property rights did not recognise the rights of indigenous peoples. By the time evidence proved individual pharmaceutical corporations were stealing indigenous peoples’ collective knowledge, TRIPS had been set into stone (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 71). Unethical clinical trials are another striking example. Lurie and Wolfe (1997) describe the deaths of hundreds of infants in the Third World who were needlessly unethically infected in trials of interventions to reduce perinatal transmission of HIV. Even trials that are ‘ethical’, however, are often conducted within vulnerable populations in Third World countries, creating a cheap clinical trial pool for pharmaceutical corporations to test drugs on (Fassin 2007; Lurie and Wolfe 1997; Angell 1997). Informant C, a doctor, tells me they feel that there have been so many conspiracy theories about the HIV/AIDS crisis in South Africa that they feel almost reluctant saying what they think out loud. Yet when I ask about their opinion of Big Pharma’s role in Africa, they tell me with a sigh:

South Africa and Africa is like, what’s the word? a testing ground. I hate saying that but I sometimes do feel. I hate saying that because it’s putting the conspiracy theories, the cynicism into something. I guess, that it’s my feeling: it’s subjective rather than objective. When I say conspiracy theory, I mean it’s something that you don’t want to believe is happening but you know that there is probably truth in it.

Their hesitation comes with high stakes: the only reason their partner is able to get treatment for skin cancer is due to access to a clinical trial. Otherwise, the treatment costs R95, 000 every three weeks for two years. “They are doing some good work out there,” they tell me. Big Pharma’s moral location in South Africa is nebulous and uneven, as is the ‘global apartheid’ of neoliberalism. Indeed, their practices follow the same logic of racial capitalism: the bodies of colonial subjects that propped up the Empire have become the bodies of post-colonial subjects who prop up a much more diffuse, abstract corporate Empire. The lines between conspiracy and controversy are just as thin across the world as they are in South Africa.

#### The 1AC’s fetishism of the public domain, demonstrated in calling the aff a “harmonized approach,” is a form of neocolonial domination that papers over inequalities and information feudalism – that perpetuates and hides white supremacy.

Vats and Keller ‘18 [Anjali Vats; Assistant Professor of Communication and African and African Diaspora Studies at Boston College and Assistant Professor of Law at Boston College Law School; Deirdré A. Keller; Professor of Law at Ohio Northern University, Claude W. Pettit College of Law; 2018; “Critical Race IP”; Cardozo Arts & Ent. LJ; https://www.cardozoaelj.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/VATS-KELLER-ARTICLE.pdf; Accessed 08-29-2021] AK

3. The Public Domain

Critical Race IP scholarship, like intellectual property scholarship generally, is concerned with the public domain. However, unlike their law and economics counterparts, Race IP Crits are concerned with the racial and social justice dimensions of the management of the public domain, especially in ways that refuse to recognize property rights in existing traditional knowledge and hinder access to knowledge. Recent cases such as Eldred v. Ashcroft206 and Golan v. Holder207 have extended the term and scope of intellectual property rights, posing considerable problems for marginalized groups, particularly with respect to A2K. Unsurprisingly, as per claims of the rise of information feudalism, such transfers of information often unfold along (neo)colonial axes, with the developing world paying the price for the privatization and increasing scope of copyright, patent, and trademark law.208 Intellectual property maximalism in copyright and patent results in a “shrinking” public domain by restricting access to knowledge along distinctly racial lines.209 James Boyle210 and Michael Brown211 offer in- depth accounts of this process, while Sunder and Chander highlight the need to read the public domain as not simply the opposite of intellectual property but also as a space for (neo)colonial ownership claims to traditional knowledge.212 “The romance of the public domain” refers to the fetishistic desire to embrace the public domain as an alternative to intellectual property maximalism without adequate consideration of its underlying inequalities.213 Meanwhile, as the expansion of trademark law threatened and threatens to make the brand all-powerful, both as a legal and cultural form, it too erodes equal access to the public domain, particularly for those who were racially stereotyped. Jane Gaines and Rosemary Coombe trace this process, demonstrating the increasing value and significance of ownership of the brand as well as resistance to that ownership, particularly when racial symbols are invoked.214

As information feudalism has grown more intense in the 2000s, calls for equal access have become more commonplace. Chon, for instance, argues for wide access to educational materials,215 one which was borne out in the Delhi University copyright case in which the Indian Supreme Court determined that the policy interest in access to knowledge outweighed the monopoly afforded to publishers.216 In contexts such as access to copyrighted materials or access to pharmaceuticals, the public domain is not a universal concept but one that must be situationally redefined to account for the states of development and growth trajectories of nations in the Global South.217 While we take up some of these examples in the sections that follow, we observe generally that the public domain is not an unqualified good, nor is its designation as the opposite of property without complications. It is instead a social construction which often erases intellectual property law’s protection of white supremacy and denies A2K to the world’s most vulnerable populations. The regulation of the public domain and the scope of its contents, therefore, remain important questions for scholars of race and intellectual property.

#### Capitalism causes extinction – the system only postpones its future demise. The impacts are environmental collapse, endless war, and fascism.

Shaviro ‘15 (Steven Shaviro is an American academic, philosopher and cultural critic whose areas of interest include film theory, time, science fiction, panpsychism, capitalism, affect and subjectivity. He earned a PhD from Yale in 1981. “No Speed Limit: Three Essays on Accelerationism” <https://track5.mixtape.moe/qdkkdt.pdf> rvs)

The problem may be summarized as follows. Capitalism has indeed created the conditions for general prosperity and therefore for its own supersession. But it has also blocked, and continues to block, any hope of realizing this transformation. We cannot wait for capitalism to transform on its own, but we also cannot hope to progress by appealing to some radical Outside or by fashioning ourselves as militants faithful to some “event” that (as Badiou has it) would mark a radical and complete break with the given “situation” of capitalism. Accelerationism rather demands a movement against and outside capitalism—but on the basis of tendencies and technologies that are intrinsic to capitalism. Audre Lord famously argued that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” But what if the master’s tools are the only ones available? Accelerationism grapples with this dilemma. What is the appeal of accelerationism today? It can be understood as a response to the particular social and political situation in which we currently seem to be trapped: that of a long-term, slow-motion catastrophe**. Global warming, and environmental pollution and degradation, threaten to undermine our whole mode of life.** And this mode of life is itself increasingly stressful and precarious, due to the depredations of neoliberal capitalism. As Fredric Jameson puts it, the world today is characterized by “heightened polarization, increasing unemployment, [and] the ever more desperate search for new investments and new markets.” These are all general features of capitalism identified by Marx, but in neoliberal society we encounter them in a particularly pure and virulent form. I want to be as specific as possible in my use of the term “neoliberalism” in order to describe this situation. I define neoliberalism as a specific mode of capitalist production (Marx), and form of governmentality (Foucault), that is characterized by the following specific factors: 1. The dominating influence of financial institutions, which facilitate transfers of wealth from everybody else to the already extremely wealthy (the “One Percent” or even the top one hundredth of one percent). 2. The privatization and commodification of what used to be common or public goods (resources like water and green space, as well as public services like education, communication, sewage and garbage disposal, and transportation). 3. The extraction, by banks and other large corporations, of a surplus from all social activities: not only from production (as in the classical Marxist model of capitalism) but from circulation and consumption as well. Capital accumulation proceeds not only by direct exploitation but also by rent-seeking, by debt collection, and by outright expropriation (“primitive accumulation”). 4. The subjection of all aspects of life to the so-called discipline of the market. This is equivalent, in more traditional Marxist terms, to the “real subsumption” by capital of all aspects of life: leisure as well as labor. Even our sleep is now organized in accordance with the imperatives of production and capital accumulation. 5. The redefinition of human beings as private owners of their own “human capital.” Each person is thereby, as Michel Foucault puts it, forced to become “an entrepreneur of himself.” In such circumstances, we are continually obliged to market ourselves, to “brand” ourselves, to maximize the return on our “investment” in ourselves. There is never enough: like the Red Queen, we always need to keep running, just to stay in the same place. Precarity is the fundamental condition of our lives. All of these processes work on a global scale; they extend far beyond the level of immediate individual experience. My life is precarious, at every moment, but I cannot apprehend the forces that make it so. I know how little money is left from my last paycheck, but I cannot grasp, in concrete terms, how “the economy” works. I directly experience the daily weather, but I do not directly experience the climate. Global warming and worldwide financial networks are examples of what the ecological theorist Timothy Morton calls hyperobjects. They are phenomena that actually exist but that “stretch our ideas of time and space, since they far outlast most human time scales, or they’re massively distributed in terrestrial space and so are unavailable to immediate experience.” Hyperobjects affect everything that we do, but we cannot point to them in specific instances. The chains of causality are far too complicated and intermeshed for us to follow. In order to make sense of our condition, we are forced to deal with difficult abstractions. We have to rely upon data that are gathered in massive quantities by scientific instruments and then collated through mathematical and statistical formulas but that are not directly accessible to our senses. We find ourselves, as Mark Hansen puts it, entangled “within networks of media technologies that operate predominantly, if not almost entirely, outside the scope of human modes of awareness (consciousness, attention, sense perception, etc.).” We cannot imagine such circumstances in any direct or naturalistic way, but only through the extrapolating lens of science fiction. Subject to these conditions, we live under relentless environmental and financial assault. We continually find ourselves in what might well be called a state of crisis. However, this involves a paradox. A crisis—whether economic, ecological, or political—is a turning point, a sudden rupture, a sharp and immediate moment of reckoning. But for us today, crisis has become a chronic and seemingly permanent condition. We live, oxymoronically, in a state of perpetual, but never resolved, convulsion and contradiction. Crises never come to a culmination; instead, they are endlessly and indefinitely deferred. For instance, after the economic collapse of 2008, the big banks were bailed out by the United States government. This allowed them to resume the very practices—the creation of arcane financial instruments, in order to enable relentless rent-seeking—**that led to the breakdown of the economic system in the first place.** The functioning of the system is restored, but only in such a way as to guarantee the renewal of the same crisis, on a greater scale, further down the road. Marx rightly noted that crises are endemic to capitalism. But far from threatening the system as Marx hoped, today these crises actually help it to renew itself. As David Harvey puts it, it is precisely “through the destruction of the achievements of preceding eras by way of war, the devaluation of assets, the degradation of productive capacity, abandonment and other forms of ‘creative destruction’” that capitalism creates “a new basis for profit-making and surplus absorption.” What lurks behind this analysis is the frustrating sense of an impasse. Among its other accomplishments, neoliberal capitalism has also robbed us of the future. For it turns everything into an eternal present. The highest values of our society—as preached in the business schools—are novelty, innovation, and creativity. And yet these always only result in more of the same. How often have we been told that a minor software update “changes everything”? Our society seems to function, as Ernst Bloch once put it, in a state of “sheer aimless infinity and incessant changeability; where everything ought to be constantly new, everything remains just as it was.” This is because, in our current state of affairs, the future exists only in order to be colonized and made into an investment opportunity. John Maynard Keynes sought to distinguish between risk and genuine uncertainty. Risk is calculable in terms of probability, but genuine uncertainty is not. Uncertain events are irreducible to probabilistic analysis, because “there is no scientific basis on which to form any calculable probability whatever.” Keynes’s discussion of uncertainty has strong affinities with Quentin Meillassoux’s account of hyperchaos. For Meillassoux, there is no “totality of cases,” no closed set of all possible states of the universe. Therefore, there is no way to assign fixed probabilities to these states. This is not just an empirical matter of insufficient information; uncertainty exists in principle. For Meillassoux and Keynes alike, there comes a point where “we simply do not know.” But today, Keynes’s distinction is entirely ignored. The Black-Scholes Formula and the Efficient Market Hypothesis both conceive the future entirely in probabilistic terms. In these theories, as in the actual financial trading that is guided by them (or at least rationalized by them), the genuine unknowability of the future is transformed into a matter of calculable, manageable risk. True novelty is excluded, because all possible outcomes have already been calculated and paid for in terms of the present. While this belief in the calculability of the future is delusional, it nonetheless determines the way that financial markets actually work. We might therefore say that speculative finance is the inverse—and the complement—of the “affirmative speculation” that takes place in science fiction. Financial speculation seeks to capture, and shut down, the very same extreme potentialities that science fiction explores. Science fiction is the narration of open, unaccountable futures; derivatives trading claims to have accounted for, and discounted, all these futures already. The “market”—nearly deified in neoliberal doctrine—thus works preemptively, as a global practice of what Richard Grusin calls premediation. It seeks to deplete the future in advance. Its relentless functioning makes it nearly impossible for us to conceive of any alternative to the global capitalist world order. Such is the condition that Mark Fisher calls capitalist realism. As Fisher puts it, channeling both Jameson and Žižek, “it’s easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism.”

#### The alternative is Black Marxism. Their opposition to IP protections fails because it starts at the wrong place. This radical Black tradition disrupts the terms of ownership, turning Marxism inside out to generate Black kinship and social life outside of the university. That rebuilds the IP system from the ground up to solve the aff.

Moten ‘13 (Fred Moten, Moten is professor of performance studies at New York University and has taught previously at University of California, Riverside, Duke University, Brown University, and the University of Iowa, 3 July 2013, “The Subprime and the beautiful”, African Identities Volume 11, 2013 - Issue 2, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14725843.2013.797289>) \\EGott

In a recent review of Fredric Jameson’s Valences of the Dialectic, Kunkel (2010) writes: It’s tempting to propose a period ...stretching from about 1983 (when Thatcher, having won a war, and Reagan, having survived a recession, consolidated their popularity) to 2008 (when the neoliberal programme launched by Reagan and Thatcher was set back by the worst economic crisis since the Depression). During this period of neoliberal ascendancy – an era of deregulation, financialization, industrial decline, demoralization of the working class, the collapse of Communism and so on – it often seemed easier to spot the contradictions of Marxism than the more famous contradictions of capitalism ... (p. 12) The year that marks the beginning of the period Kunkel proposes – which is characterized by ‘the peculiar condition of an economic theory that had turned out to flourish above all as a mode of cultural analysis, a mass movement that had become the province of an academic “elite,” and an intellectual tradition that had arrived at some sort of culmination right at the point of apparent extinction’ – is also the year of the publication of Cedric Robinson’s Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition, a book that could be said to have announced the impasse Kunkel describes precisely in its fugitive refusal of it (Kunkel 2010, p. 12; Robinson 2000). If the culmination of the Marxian intellectual tradition coincides with the moment in which Jameson begins magisterially to gather and direct all of its resources toward the description and theorization of what most clear-eyed folks agree is the deflated, defeated spirit of the present age, Robinson’s project has been to alert us to the radical resources that lie before that tradition, where ‘before’ indicates both what precedes and what awaits, animating our times with fierce urgency. One of the fundamental contradictions of capitalism is that it establishes conditions for its own critique (which anticipates a collapse whose increasing imminence increasingly seems to take the form of endless deferral); that those very conditions seem to render that critique incomplete insofar as it will have always failed to consider capitalism’s racial determination is, in turn, a contradiction fundamental to Marxism. While Black Marxism emphatically exposes these contradictions, it is not reducible to such exposure. Rather, in elucidating an already given investigation of the specificities of Marxism’s founding, antifoundational embarrassment, which bears the massive internal threat of critique becoming an end in itself while operating in the service of the renovation, rather than the overturning, of already existing social and intellectual structures, Robinson understands the Marxian tradition as part of the ongoing history of racial capitalism. This is not dismissal; indeed, it echoes the deepest and richest sounds of Marx’s own blackness. It does, however, sanction the question in which I am interested today: what made Robinson’s critique – and, more importantly, that which, in Robinson’s work (and in Marx’s), exceeds critique – possible? The answer, or at least the possibility for a more precise rendering of the question, is also to be found in Black Marxism, in which critique is interrupted by its own eruptive condition of possibility roughly at the book’s rich, dense, but simultaneously, open and capacious center, a chapter called ‘The Nature of the Black Radical Tradition’. Robinson’s critical discovery of racial capitalism depends upon and extends the preservation of what he calls ‘the ontological totality’. In describing this integrated totality’s character, Robinson notes how preservation impossibly proceeds within the confines of ‘a metaphysical system that had never allowed for property in either the physical, philosophical, temporal, legal, social or psychic senses’. It’s motive force is ‘the renunciation of actual being for historical being’, out of which emerges a ‘revolutionary consciousness’ that is structured by but underived from ‘the social formations of capitalist slavery, or the relations of production of colonialism’ (Robinson 2000, pp. 243–244, 246). It is not just that absolutist formulations of a kind of being-fabricated are here understood themselves to be fabrications; it is also that renunciation will have ultimately only become intelligible as a general disruption of ownership and of the proper when the ontological totality that black people claim and preserve is understood to be given only in this more general giving. The emergence and preservation of blackness, as the ontological totality, the revolutionary consciousness that black people hold and pass, is possible only by way of the renunciation of actual being and the ongoing conferral of historical being – the gift of historicity as claimed, performed dispossession. Blackness, which is to say, black radicalism, is not the property of black people. All that we have (and are) is what we hold in our outstretched hands. This open collective being is blackness – (racial) difference mobilized against the racist determination it calls into existence in every moment of the ongoing endangerment of ‘actual being’, of subjects who are supposed to know and own. It makes a claim upon us even as it is that upon which we all can make a claim, precisely because it – and its origins – are not originary. That claim, which is not just one among others because it is always one þ more among others, however much it is made under the most extreme modes of duress, in an enabling exhaustion that is, in Stanley Cavell’s word, unowned, takes the form, in Edouard Glissant’s word, of consent (Cavell 1995, p. 101; Glissant & Diawara, 2011, p. 5). ‘To consent not to be a single being’, which is the anoriginal, anoriginary constitution of blackness as radical force – as historical, paraontological totality – is, for Robinson, the existential and logical necessity that turns the history of racial capitalism, which is also to say the Marxist tradition, inside out. What cannot be understood within, or as a function of, the deprivation that is the context of its genesis, can only be understood as the ongoing present of a common refusal.1 This oldnew kind of transcendental aesthetic, off and out in its immanence as the scientific productivity of such immanence projects, is the unowned, differential, and differentiated thing itself that we hold out to one another, in the bottom, under our skin, for the general kin, at the rendezvous of victory. To say that we have something (only insofar as we relinquish it) is to say that we come from somewhere (only insofar as we leave that place behind). Genesis is dispersion; somewhere is everywhere and nowhere as the radical dislocation we enact, where we stay and keep on going, before the beginning, before every beginning, and all belonging, in undercommon variance, in arrivance and propulsion, in the flexed load of an evangelical bridge, passed on this surrepetitious vamp, here. If you need some, come on, get some. We come from nothing, which is something misunderstood. It’s not that blackness is not statelessness; it’s just that statelessness is an open set of social lives whose animaterialized exhaustion remains as irreducible chance. Statelessness is our terribly beautiful open secret, the unnatural habitat, and habitus of analytic engines with synthetic capacities. Preservation is conditional branching, undone computation (tuned, forked, tongued), improvisation and, what it forges, digital speculation beyond the analogical or representational or calculative reserve. Critique – for example, the deciphering of the fundamental discursive structures that (de)form Western civilization – is part of its repertoire but it must always be kept in mind that cryptanalytic assertion has a cryptographic condition of possibility. Robinson’s movement within and elucidation of the open secret has been a kind of open secret all its own. For a long time, before its republication in 2000, Black Marxism circulated underground, as a recurrent seismic event on the edge or over the edge of the university, for those of us who valorized being on or over that edge even if we had been relegated to it. There, at least, we could get together and talk about the bomb that had gone off in our heads. Otherwise we carried around its out, dispersive potenza as contraband, buried under the goods that legitimate parties to exchange can value, until we could get it to the black market, where (the) license has no weight, and hand it around out of a suitcase or over a kitchen table or from behind a makeshift counter. Like Pryor (1994) said: ‘I got some shit, too ... you respect my shit and I’ll respect yours’. Maybe there is some shit in the back of our cars that we don’t even know about. Certainly, this smuggled cargo would be cause for optimism, even against the grain of our constant, clear-eyed vigilance, even against the general interdiction – the intellectual state of emergency – enforced when we emphysemically authorize ourselves to speak of the spirit of the age. That spirit marks the scene in which the etiolation of black studies in the name of critique is carried out by way of our serial flirtation with forgetting our own animation, the collective being that is more precisely understood as being-in-collection insofar as the latter term denotes a debt that is not only incalculable but also subprime. Therefore, by way of the brilliant black light in Frank B. Wilderson’s Afro-pessimistic sound – which materializes, in an investigation of black being, the most rigorous instance of this fatal but necessary proximity to oblivion – I’d like to consider what it is (again and again) to lose a home. This is Wilderson (2007): Slavery is the great leveler of the black subject’s positionality. The black American subject does not generate historical categories of entitlement, sovereignty, and immigration for the record. We are ‘off the map’ with respect to the cartography that charts civil society’s semiotics; we have a past but not a heritage. To the data-generating demands of the Historical Axis, we present a virtual blank, much like that which the Khosian presented to the Anthropological Axis. This places us in a structurally impossible position, one that is outside the articulations of hegemony. However, it also places hegemony in a structurally impossible position because – and this is key – our presence works back on the grammar of hegemony and threatens it with incoherence. If every subject – even the most massacred among them, Indians – is required to have analogs within the nation’s structuring narrative, and the experience of one subject on whom the nation’s order of wealth was built is without analog, then that subject’s presence destabilizes all other analogs (p. 31).

#### The ROJ is to engage in a project of mapping property. Both property and rhetorical spaces like debate perpetuate IP as whiteness, sustaining racial capitalism and reinforcing an exclusionary praxis. Only the K engages in strategies to fight racial capitalism inside and outside debate.

Vats ‘19 [Anjali Vats, JD, PhD; Associate Professor of Law at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law with a secondary appointment in the Communication Department at the University of Pittsburgh; 10-02-2019; “Mapping property”; Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 105, No. 4, 508–526; DOI: 10.1080/00335630.2019.1666347; Accessed 08-29-2021] AK

Rhetorically mapping property

The insights that the books that I have discussed here provide are important ones for thinking about future directions for rhetoric and rhetorical studies. For a field at a crossroads in terms of its investments in subjects and methods, the rich possibilities for studying (intellectual) property, particularly by way of the rhetorical strategies, cultural practices, and institutional structures that ensure its continued existence as a tool for normalizing racial orders and racial capitalism, can offer direction for scholars. Property implicitly structures the all too familiar “available means of persuasion,” in Aristotle’s words, in which individuals exist, often without notice. Returning to the notion of mapping property, then, can aid rhetorical scholars in thinking about how the field can contribute to studies of (intellectual) property, whether by breaking ground around new objects of study or deepening existing analyses around topics such as the ones that I have described. The property turn in the humanities, however, makes it clear that studying persuasion without an understanding of property as a set of rules for subject-subject relationalities that materially constrain rhetorical situations is ill-advised. Property provides nuanced explanations for material realities that other theories may not.

Bhandar, Karuka, Sunder Rajan, and Eng and Han highlight multiple, multimodal strategies through which property is incorporated, constructed, and decolonized. They show that discursive and material choices are pivotal in the outcome in property cases. In their canonical essay on the separate but equal doctrine, Marouf Hasian, Celeste Condit, and John Lucaites argue that law is dependent on rhetorical culture. They write that: “A rhetorical culture is ... power-in-action, and the meaning of the law necessarily derives from the forms available in rhetorical culture.”20 The books I have reviewed certainly showcase the complex relationships between law and rhetorical culture. However, they also demonstrate that studying rhetorical culture is impossible without sustained attention to political economy, institutional structures, and interpersonal dynamics, among other issues. Rhetoric without materiality simply misses the ways that property and power exist in multiple forms, including deeds, railroads, prescription drugs, and therapeutic exchanges, among others.

There is perhaps no more immediate example in the discipline of rhetoric through which to demonstrate the ubiquity and urgency of (intellectual) property problems than the controversy that erupted in the summer of 2019, when Dr. Martin Medhurst decided to pen an editorial for publication in Rhetoric & Public Affairs on the topic of the long-brewing controversy over the process for selecting the Distinguished Scholars of the National Communication Association. In less than a week, over 1,500 scholars mobilized to express their outrage at Dr. Medhurst’s sentiments – and those in a letter signed by nearly all the living Distinguished Scholars as well. Without belaboring the details or histories of the event, I want to very briefly note some of the ways that property, rhetorical and otherwise, came to the fore, particularly in forms that the authors here would presumably highlight as examples of property’s exclusions.

For instance, editorships, awards, and other markers of disciplinary prowess confer status property on particular individuals for “improving” the discipline. As in the examples that Bhandar highlights, that status property is deeply intertwined with narrow, Euro-American conceptions of (white) romantic scholarship, which I have written about at length elsewhere. Further, the infrastructures of the discipline are built to reinforce whiteness as (intellectual) property. Karuka’s argument is, fundamentally, one about the manner in which material infrastructures have operated through racialized labor to entrench white racial power, even through hegemonic struggle. In the discipline of rhetoric, graduate programs are the metaphorical infrastructure through which (racial) capitalism operates to destroy healthy modes of relationship, all too often replacing them with competitive, patronage-based ones. Additionally, the field is a site for the management of multiple, competing understandings of (rhetorical) knowledge. Sunder Rajan highlights how cultures, nations, and institutions conceptualize value differently, in his case in the context of human health. The emergence of the methodological distinction between close reading and critical rhetoric showcases how such disparate values emerge in spaces that are purportedly attempting to achieve the same ends. Finally, the underdevelopment of critical race studies within rhetoric highlights the exclusionary praxis of the field. If #CommunicationSoWhite and #RhetoricSoWhite have demonstrated anything, it is that the disciplines of communication and rhetoric have, as of yet, not enacted the theory and praxis that can achieve stated goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion.21 More intersectional work remains to be done around race and property.

Indeed, CRT-Net and the Facebook Group “Communication Scholars for Transformation” have demonstrated that many white scholars have not hesitated to invoke the “cultural logics of white racial grievance”22 in order to protect whiteness as (intellectual) property. As scholars in rhetoric take up questions of (intellectual) property in this kairotic moment, they would be well served to begin by interrogating the spaces closest to them. Rhetoric itself is built on the edifices of the regimes that scholars such as Bhandar, Karuka, Sunder Rajan, Eng and Han describe. As with whiteness, the machinations of property frequently goes unnoticed, at considerable cost to those who do not benefit from them.23 Whiteness as (intellectual) property has been normalized for far too long in communication and rhetoric. Turning inward to consider how rhetoric, specifically, is mired in problems of (intellectual) property will not only aid the field in becoming more just but also in thinking with more depth about problems of property in the world.

## Case

### FW

### Solvency

#### Vote neg on presumption – IP can mean internet protocol which means they don’t solve anything – this was the first definition on Google which means your plan text is too vague to solve.

[Oxford Languages; “IP”; Accessed from Google Dictionary; No Date; https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=define:ip&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8#dobs=IP]

IP1 See definitions in: All Computing Law noun noun: IP; noun: IPs short for Internet Protocol. "a digital media transport system that runs over standard IP networks"

### Adv 1

#### Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/]

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

#### No way CRISPR solves all disease - lifestyle factors, mistakes

Radcliffe 17 Radcliffe, Shawn. Shawn Radcliffe is a science writer and yoga teacher in Ontario, Canada. "Will Gene Editing Allow Us to Rid the World of Diseases?" Healthline, 26 Aug. 2017, www.healthline.com/health-news/will-gene-editing-allow-us-to-rid-world-of-diseases.

CRISPR-Cas9 is a powerful tool, but it also raises several concerns. “There’s a lot of discussion right now about how best to detect so-called ‘off-target effects,’” said Hochstrasser. “This is what happens when the [Cas9] protein cuts somewhere similar to where you want it to cut.” Off-target cuts could lead to unexpected genetic problems that cause an embryo to die. An edit in the wrong gene could also create an entirely new genetic disease that would be passed onto future generations. Even using CRISPR-Cas9 to modify mosquitoes and other insects raises safety concerns — like what happens when you make large-scale changes to an ecosystem or a trait in a population that gets out of control. There are also many ethical issues that come with modifying human embryos. So will CRISPR-Cas9 help rid the world of disease? There’s no doubt that it will make a sizeable dent in many diseases, but it’s unlikely to cure all of them any time soon. We already have tools for avoiding genetic diseases — like early genetic screening of fetuses and embryos — but these are not universally used. “We still don’t avoid tons of genetic diseases, because a lot of people don’t know that they harbor mutations that can be inherited,” said Hochstrasser. Some genetic mutations also happen spontaneously. This is the case with many cancers that result from environmental factorsTrusted Source such as UV rays, tobacco smoke, and certain chemicals. People also make choices that increase their risk of heart disease, stroke, obesity, and diabetes. So unless scientists can use CRISPR-Cas9 to find treatments for these lifestyle diseases — or genetically engineer people to stop smoking and start biking to work — these diseases will linger in human society. “Things like that are always going to need to be treated,” said Hochstrasser. “I don’t think it’s realistic to think we would ever prevent every disease from happening in a human.”

### Adv 2

#### Nuclear war is not an existential risk – damage-limitation and contemporary science rules out every extinction internal link – their authors exaggerate

Scouras ‘19 (James Scouras, Fellow at the Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory, PhD in Physics from the University of Maryland, creator of the Scouras model which uses an Excel spreadsheet to calculate the outcomes of nuclear force exchanges to create tabular outputs and graphs and incorporate the notion of “sensitivity” into nuclear security, Summer 2019, “Nuclear War as a Global Catastrophic Risk,” *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis* Volume 10 Issue 2, footnotes 2 and 4 included in curly braces) gz

One needs to only view the pictures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki shown in figure 1 and imagine such devastation visited on thousands of cities across warring nations in both hemispheres to recognize that nuclear war is truly a global catastrophic risk. Moreover, many of today’s nuclear weapons are an order of magnitude more destructive than Little Boy and Fat Man, and there are many other significant consequences – prompt radiation, fallout, etc. – not visible in such photographs. Yet, it is also true that not all nuclear wars would be so catastrophic; some, perhaps involving electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attacks2 using only a few high-altitude detonations or demonstration strikes of various kinds, could result in few casualties. {2 Many mistakenly believe that the congressionally established Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack concluded that an EMP attack would, indeed, be catastrophic to electronic systems and consequently to people and societies that vitally depend on those systems. However, the conclusion of the commission, on whose staff I served, was only that such a catastrophe could, not would, result from an EMP attack. Its executive report states, for example, that “the damage level could be sufficient to be catastrophic to the Nation.” See www.empcommision.org for publicly available reports from the EMP Commission. See also Frankel et al., (2015).} Others, such as a war between Israel and one of its potential future nuclear neighbors, might be regionally devastating but have limited global impact, at least if we limit our consideration to direct and immediate physical consequences. Nevertheless, smaller nuclear wars need to be included in any analysis of nuclear war as a global catastrophic risk because they increase the likelihood of larger nuclear wars. This is precisely why the nuclear taboo is so precious and crossing the nuclear threshold into uncharted territory is so dangerous (Schelling, 2005; see also Tannenwald, 2007).

While it is clear that nuclear war is a global catastrophic risk, it is also clear that it is not an existential risk. Yet over the course of the nuclear age, a series of mechanisms have been proposed that, it has been erroneously argued, could lead to human extinction. The first concern3 arose among physicists on the Manhattan Project during a 1942 seminar at Berkeley some three years before the first test of an atomic weapon. Chaired by Robert Oppenheimer, it was attended by Edward Teller, Hans Bethe, Emil Konopinski, and other theoretical physicists (Rhodes, 1995). They considered the possibility that detonation of an atomic bomb could ignite a self-sustaining nitrogen fusion reaction that might propagate through earth’s atmosphere, thereby extinguishing all air-breathing life on earth. Konopinski, Cloyd Margin, and Teller eventually published the calculations that led to the conclusion that the nitrogen-nitrogen reaction was virtually impossible from atomic bomb explosions – calculations that had previously been used to justify going forward with Trinity, the first atomic bomb test (Konopinski et al., 1946). Of course, the Trinity test was conducted, as well as over 1000 subsequent atomic and thermonuclear tests, and we are fortunately still here.

After the bomb was used, extinction fear focused on invisible and deadly fallout, unanticipated as a significant consequence of the bombings of Japan that would spread by global air currents to poison the entire planet. Public dread was reinforced by the depressing, but influential, 1957 novel *On the Beach* by Nevil Shute (1957) and the subsequent 1959 movie version (Kramer, 1959). The story describes survivors in Melbourne, Australia, one of a few remaining human outposts in the Southern Hemisphere, as fallout clouds approached to bring the final blow to humanity.

In the 1970s, after fallout was better understood to be limited in space, time, and magnitude, depletion of the ozone layer, which would cause increased ultraviolet radiation to fry all humans who dared to venture outside, became the extinction mechanism of concern. Again, one popular book, *The Fate of the Earth* by Jonathan Schell (1982), which described the nuclear destruction of the ozone layer leaving the earth “a republic of insects and grass,” promoted this fear. Schell did at times try to cover all bases, however: “To say that human extinction is a certainty would, of course, be a misrepresentation – just as it would be a misrepresentation to say that extinction can be ruled out” (Schell, 1982).

Finally, the current mechanism of concern for extinction is nuclear winter, the phenomenon by which dust and soot created primarily by the burning of cities would rise to the stratosphere and attenuate sunlight such that surface temperatures would decline dramatically, agriculture would fail, and humans and other animals would perish from famine. The public first learned of the possibility of nuclear winter in a *Parade* article by Sagan (1983), published a month or so before its scientific counterpart by Turco et al. (1983). While some nuclear disarmament advocates promote the idea that nuclear winter is an extinction threat, and the general public is probably confused to the extent it is not disinterested, few scientists seem to consider it an extinction threat.

It is understandable that some of these extinction fears were created by ignorance or uncertainty and treated seriously by worst-case thinking, as seems appropriate for threats of extinction. But nuclear doom mongering also seems to be at play for some of these episodes. For some reason, portions of the public active in nuclear issues, as well as some scientists, appear to think that arguments for nuclear arms reductions or elimination will be more persuasive if nuclear war is believed to threaten extinction, rather than merely the horrific cataclysm that it would be in reality (Martin, 1982).4 {4 As summarized by Martin, “The idea that global nuclear war could kill most or all of the world’s population is critically examined and found to have little or no scientific basis.” Martin also critiques possible reasons for beliefs or professed beliefs about nuclear extinction, including exaggeration to stimulate action.}

To summarize, nuclear war is a global catastrophic risk. Such wars may cause billions of deaths and unfathomable suffering, as well set civilization back centuries. Smaller nuclear wars pose regional catastrophic risks and also national risks in that the continued functioning of, for example, the United States as a constitutional republic is highly dubious after even a relatively limited nuclear attack. But what nuclear war is not is an existential risk to the human race. There is simply no credible scenario in which humans do not survive to repopulate the earth.

#### WTO collapse solves extinction

Hilary 15 John Hilary 2015 “Want to know how to really tackle climate change? Pull the plug on the World Trade Organisation” <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/want-to-know-how-to-really-tackle-climate-change-pull-the-plug-on-the-world-trade-organisation-a6774391.html> (Executive Director, War on Want)//Elmer

Yet this grandiose plan soon fell victim to its own ambition. The WTO’s first summit after the launch of the Doha Round collapsed in acrimonious failure. The next was marked by pitched battles in the streets of Hong Kong as riot police fought Asian farmers desperately trying to save their livelihoods from the WTO’s free trade agenda. The WTO slipped into a coma. Government ministers must decide this week whether to turn off its life support. The answer is surely yes. It was the WTO’s poisonous cocktail of trade expansion and market deregulation that led to the economic crisis of 2008. Years of export-led growth resulted in a crisis of overproduction that could only be sustained with mountains of debt. The parallel deregulation of financial services meant that this debt soon turned out to be toxic, and the world’s banking system went into freefall. Nor is the WTO fit for purpose on ecological grounds. If last week’s climate talks in Paris taught us anything, it is that we must rethink the model of ever-expanding production and consumption in order to avoid planetary meltdown. Global capitalism may need limitless expansion in order to survive, but the planet is already at the very limits of what it can take. The choice is ours. Worst of all, it is the WTO’s ideology of unrestricted trade and corporate domination that lies behind all the bilateral trade deals that are proliferating at the moment, including the infamous Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). We need a radically different model of regulated trade and controlled investment if we are to have any chance of breaking the cycle of economic and ecological crisis. For the planet to survive, the WTO must die.

#### WTO already collapsed.

**Maizland 21** [Lindsay Maizland, Edward Alden is Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Fore­­­ign Relations (CFR), specializing in U.S. economic competitiveness, trade, and immigration policy. He is the author of the book Failure to Adjust: How Americans Got Left Behind in the Global Economy, which focuses on the federal government’s failure to respond effectively to competitive challenges on issues such as trade, currency, worker retraining, education, and infrastructure. 4-12-2021, accessed on 8-12-2021, Council on Foreign Relations, "Trump, China, and Steel Tariffs: The Day the WTO Died", <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trump-china-and-steel-tariffs-day-wto-died>] Adam

March 8, 2018: The day the World Trade Organization died. Twenty-three years and sixty-seven days after its launch on January 1 of 1995. RIP. U.S. President Donald Trump did not single-handedly kill the WTO yesterday by announcing he would impose tariffs on imported steel and aluminum. It had been dying a slow death for a long time. China in particular never accepted the norms of the WTO, and its spectacular economic success pursuing policies that too often defied the organization’s market-based principles did more than any other country to weaken the legitimacy of the system. The failed Doha Round negotiations, launched in 2001 and never successfully completed, showed that member nations had no capacity to find the compromises needed to update the WTO’s rules. Trump only gave it the final nudge over the cliff yesterday. But that should not reduce the shock and surprise that it was the United States—which championed the WTO’s creation—that is left holding the murder weapon. For the past quarter century, the United States has been both a leader and a model citizen of the WTO, almost always hewing closely to the rules even when that meant making politically difficult decisions at home to comply with adverse rulings. The White House announcement yesterday threw the rulebook out the window. The Trump administration is set to impose tariffs under a flimsy national security pretext that flouts if

not the rules then at least the widely-shared norms of the WTO. It has further launched a free-for-all negotiating process in which its trading partners are now expected to come to the White House hat in hand begging for exemptions, a clear violation of the understanding that trade will be conducted under internationally agreed rules, not ad hoc negotiations.