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#### Interpretation—the aff may not specify medicines

#### Bare plurals imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how bare plurals are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified marijuana—

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision – if we win definitions the aff is not topical. The resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

**2] Limits: unlimited topics incentivize obscure affs that negs won’t have prep on – limits are key to reciprocal prep burden– also means there is no universal DA to spec affs**

**3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage – most authors advocate for a change in WTO policy or TRIPS**

**4] No PICs offense – potential neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse because that would permit infinite 1AC abuse**
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#### Drug price reform coming now – fight is ramping up but Biden has the opportunity

Cancryn 9/9 Cancryn, Adam. Adam Cancryn is a health care reporter for POLITICO Pro, graduate of Washington & Lee University."Biden admin backs direct government drug price negotiations." POLITICO, 9 Sept. 2021, www.politico.com/news/2021/09/09/biden-drug-price-negotiations-510828.

A new Biden administration plan aimed at lowering prescription drug prices endorses giving the government sweeping power to directly negotiate the cost of medicines, calling it one of the key steps Congress could take to make drugs “more affordable and equitable” for all Americans.

The plan — developed by the Department of Health and Human Services and released on Thursday — largely backs Democrats’ ongoing efforts to lower drug prices as part of a $3.5 trillion reconciliation proposal, and mirrors a range of legislative options that both House and Senate lawmakers have floated in recent years.

Those include capping out-of-pocket costs in Medicare Part D, limiting how quickly pharmaceutical companies can hike prices on existing drugs and banning so-called pay-for-delay agreements aimed at blocking generic competition to brand-name drugs.

But the HHS report’s embrace of broad price negotiation is the administration’s latest signal that it’s siding with progressives who have pushed for a far more aggressive approach to slashing pharmaceutical costs.

Under the HHS plan, the government would directly negotiate prices for drugs in Medicare parts B and D, with those prices also being available to private insurance plans and any employers who want to participate.

House Democrats passed a similar provision as part of a major drug pricing bill in 2019. But it never made it into law, and some in the party’s centrist wing have since vowed to oppose drug price negotiation.

Notably, the plan stops short of supporting the use of “march-in rights” that progressives argue empower the government to pull patent rights from a drug that is deemed too expensive. Sen. Elizabeth Warren has long advocated for the approach, and urged HHS to utilize it in an August letter with Sen. Amy Klobuchar and Rep. Lloyd Doggett.

“The Biden Administration has the opportunity to lower the prices of key drugs using these authorities,” the lawmakers wrote to HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra.

The department in its report acknowledged that it has been petitioned to use march-in rights, saying only that it would give them “due consideration.”

The HHS plan also lays out a series of administration actions that the department could take to fulfill what it identified as three “guiding principles:” making drugs more affordable, improving competition within the industry and encouraging innovation.

Those options included testing value-based payment models and boosting cost-sharing support to certain low-income Medicare beneficiaries. It also suggests that improved data collection from insurers and pharmacy benefit managers could give the government better insight into drug pricing, as well as rebates and out-of-pocket spending on prescription medications.

HHS developed the report in response to an executive order that President Joe Biden issued earlier this year aimed at improving competition across a range of industries, including the drug sector.

#### Biden’s PC is key to wrangle democrats and counter pharma lobbying

Johnson 8/12 Johnson, Jake, writer for Alternet . "Joe Biden throws support behind bold reforms to slash drug prices." Alternet, August 12, 2021, www.alternet.org/2021/08/biden-medicare-negotiate-prices.

The powerful industry's public and behind-closed-doors lobbying push is likely to grow more aggressive as congressional Democrats' reconciliation package begins to take shape.

On Wednesday, the Senate approved a $3.5 trillion budget resolution setting the boundaries for the package, and the House is expected to take up and pass the resolution later this month. Once both chambers have passed an identical resolution, congressional committees will begin crafting legislative text.

"We will save taxpayers hundreds of billions by requiring that Medicare negotiate prescription drug prices with the pharmaceutical industry and we will use those savings to expand Medicare by covering the dental care, hearing aids, and eyeglasses that seniors desperately need," Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), the chief architect of the budget resolution, said in a statement earlier this week.

But it's far from certain that a Medicare negotiation provision will survive the process of developing the final reconciliation bill, particularly given that a number of Big Pharma-backed House Democrats—including Reps. Scott Peters (D-Calif.) and Jake Auchincloss (D-Mass.)—have recently voiced skepticism about the proposal.

With Republicans unanimously opposed to the reconciliation package, Democrats can afford just a handful of defections in the House and none in the Senate.

Larry Levitt, executive vice president for health policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation, told HuffPost on Thursday that "it's not yet clear how the Democratic leadership will corral the necessary votes for a drug pricing plan, but there's no sign they're backing off."

"An epic battle with the pharmaceutical industry is coming," said Levitt.

In a series of tweets responding to Biden's prescription drug agenda, Levitt wrote that while the president's "proposal doesn't break new policy ground," it "is significant in that he is now using his political capital to push for congressional action at a pivotal moment in the debate."

#### WTO waiver takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

Bhadrakumar 5/9 M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the awesome clout of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already gone on the offensive blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO dragging on for months, if not years, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be huge opposition to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ European allies as well. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### Drug price controls massively reduce healthcare costs across the board – even assuming conservative models

Gamba 6/9 Gamba, Tyler. Author at the AJMC. "Adoption of the Lower Drug Costs Now Act May Lead to Billions in Savings." AJMC, 9 June 2021, www.ajmc.com/view/adoption-of-the-lower-drug-costs-now-act-may-lead-to-billions-in-savings.

H.R.3, the Elijah E. Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act would improve efficiency and produce billions in savings for the commercial health care market’s employers and end consumers if fully implemented, according to a new study from Milliman commissioned by the West Health Policy Center.

Among its goals, the act’s provisions seek to reduce prescription drug costs, increase drug price transparency, lower member out-of-pocket spending, and increase potential coverage eligibility. Costs for the most expensive brand drugs in the United States would be negotiated between the manufacturers and the HHS secretary. Significant drug cost increases over the rate of inflation would need to be issued back as rebates to CMS.

To predict the effects of such reforms, the Milliman study sought quantitative estimates for the scope of these changes. Milliman’s models incorporated several variables, including current trends and projected spending based on different percentage adjustments to drug prices, rebates, and public vs private cost rates from 2023 through 2029.

The study estimates 46% of drug spending would be subject to negotiation under the legislation’s Title I by 2026, with an average 2.5% reduction in total commercial market claims by 2029.Overall, successful implementation of H.R. 3 means employers may reduce their health care expenditures by $195 billion while employees would save $61 billion. Of this latter amount, reduced premiums would account for $53 billion and out-of-pocket costs, $8 billion.

Overall, the market covered by the Affordable Care Act (ACA) could see savings of $58 billion, comprising $34 billon in reduced beneficiary premiums, $21 billion in federal savings by reduced Advance-Premium Tax Credits, and $2 billion in lower cost-sharing.

The estimates assume manufacturers could make such increases to the prices at a faster rate than the current yearly trends. This possibility still leads to stronger total savings via H.R. 3’s Title I. The study does not factor in further limitations on increases by plan sponsors and pharmacy benefit managers, which could improve savings for employers and employees, because it mainly applies to Medicare.

Under the most conservative pricing model—where manufacturers hypothetically increase supply costs to unprecedented highs to minimize revenue loses—$250 billion in lower costs are still passed on to employers and employees.

Additionally, the study notes that although end consumers are generally responsible for most of their plan premiums, and thus would get most of the savings, the federal government also would save on the significant portion it pays toward member premiums in the individual marketplaces.

#### Collapses the economy

Howrigon, 16 — Ron Howrigon, M.S. in Economics with a focus on Health Economics from North Carolina State University, President and Founder of Fulcrum Strategies, 18 Years of Experience in Healthcare, 12-30-2016, “Flatlining: How Healthcare Could Kill the U.S. Economy,” Greenbranch Publishing, 1st Edition, Accessed via Minnesota Libraries, Date Accessed: 8-10

Ok, let’s shift from looking at individuals to looking at the big picture—from micro- to macroeconomics. It’s important to understand where healthcare **fits into the big picture** when it comes to the economy at large. Most people who don’t work in the industry don’t clearly understand how much of the U.S. economy healthcare makes up. In fact, given the size of the economy, healthcare in the U.S. can be impactful on the ***world* economy**. This is important to understand because future changes in healthcare not only affect ow we get care and how much we pay for it, but could also significantly affect things like **unemployment**, the **national debt**, and **interest rates**. The influences on the U.S. economy will have **a ripple effect** on other countries around the world. In 1960, healthcare as a market accounted for only 5% of the U.S. economy. For every dollar transacted, only 5 cents were spent for healthcare. The entire U.S. economy was $543 billion, and healthcare accounted for about $27 billion. By itself, in 1960, the U.S. healthcare market would rank as the 15th largest world economy, putting it just in front of the GDP (Gross Domestic Product) of Australia and just behind the GDP of Italy. Think about that for a minute: the U.S., **spent more money on healthcare** than the Australians did on everything! To put this further into perspective, in 1960, the U.S. Department of Defense was twice as large as healthcare. The Defense Department consumed 10% of the U.S. economy, which means it would rank as the 11th largest world economy just in front of Japan and just behind China. Now fast-forward 50 years. In 2010, the United States GDP was $15 trillion. The total healthcare expenditures in the United States for 2010 were $2.6 trillion. At $2.6 trillion, the U.S. healthcare market has moved up from 15th and now ranks as the **5th largest world economy**, just behind Germany and just ahead of both France and the United Kingdom. That means that while healthcare was only 5% of GDP in 1960, it has risen to over 17% of GDP in only 50 years. Over that same time, the Defense Department has gone from 10% of GDP to less than 5% of GDP. This means that in terms in terms of its portion of the U.S. economy, defense spending has been reduced by half while healthcare spending has more than tripled. If **healthcare** continues to trend at the same pace it has for the last 50 years, it will consume more than **50% of the U.S. economy** by the year 2060. Every economist worth their salt will tell you that health-care will never reach 50% of the economy. It’s simply not possible because of **all the other things** it would have to **crowd out to reach** that point. So, if we know healthcare can’t grow to 50% of our economy, **where is the breaking point?** **At what point does healthcare consume so much of the economy that it breaks the bank**, so to speak? This is the big question when it comes to healthcare. If something doesn’t happen to reverse the 50-year trend we’ve been riding, when will the healthcare bubble burst? How bad will it be and how exactly will it happen? While no one knows the **exact answers** to those questions, economists and healthcare experts agree that something needs to **happen**, because we simply **can’t continue on this trend** forever. Another way to look at healthcare is to study its impact on the federal budget and the national debt. In 1998, federal healthcare spending accounted for 19% of the revenue taken in by the government. Just eight years later, in 2006, healthcare spending had increased to 24% of federal revenue. In 2010, the Affordable Healthcare Act passed and significantly increased federal spending accounted for almost one-third of all revenue received by the government and surpassed Social Security as the largest single budget category. What makes this trend even more alarming is the fact that revenue to the federal government double from 1998 to 2016. That means healthcare spending by the federal government has almost quadrupled in terms of actual dollars in that same time period. If this trend continues for the next 20 years, healthcare spending will account for over half the revenue received by the government by the year 2035. Again, the simply can’t happen without causing significant issue for the financial wellbeing of out country. In recent history, the U.S. economy has experienced the near catastrophic failure of two major market segments. The first was the auto industry and the second was the housing industry. While each of these reached their breaking point for different reasons, they both required a significant government bailout to keep them from completely melting down. What is also true about both of **those market failures** is that, looking back, it’s easy to see the warning signs. What happens if health care is the next industry to suffer a major failure and collapse? It’s safe to say that a **health care meltdown** would make both the **auto**motive and **housing** industries’ experiences **seem minor** in comparison. While that may be hard to believe, it becomes clear if you look at the numbers. The **auto industry** contributes around 3.5 percent of this country’s GDP and employs 1.7 million people. This industry was deemed **“too big to fail”** which is the rationale the U.S. government used to finance its bail out. From 2009 through 2014, the federal government invested around $80 billion in the U.S. auto industry to keep it from collapsing. Health care is five times larger than the auto industry in terms of its percentage of GDP, and is ten times larger than the auto industry in terms of the number of people it employs. The construction industry (which includes all construction, not just housing) contributes about 6 percent of our country’s GDP and employs 6.1 million people. Again, the health care market dwarfs this industry. It’s **three times larger** in terms of GDP production and, with 18 million people employed in the health care sector, it’s three times larger than construction in this area, too. These comparisons give you an idea of just how significant a portion health care comprises of the U.S. economy. It also begins to help us understand the impact it would have on the economy if health care melted down like the auto and housing industries did. So, let’s continue the comparison and use our experience with the auto and housing industries to suggest to what order of magnitude the impact a failure in the health care market would cause our economy. The bailout in the auto industry cost the federal government $80 billion over five years. Imagine a similar failure in health care that prompted the federal government to propose a similar bailout program. Let’s imagine the government felt the need to inject cash into hospital systems and doctors’ offices to keep them afloat like they did with General Motors. Since health care is five times the size of the auto industry, a similar bailout could easily cost in excess of $400 billion. That’s about the same amount of money the federal government spends on welfare programs. To pay for a bailout of the health care industry, we’d have to eliminate all welfare programs in this country. Can you imagine the impact it would have on the economy if there were suddenly none of the assistance programs so many have come to rely upon? When the housing market crashed, it caused the loss of about 3 million jobs from its peak employment level of 7.4 million in 1996. Again, if we transfer that experience to the health care market, we come up with a truly frightening scenario. If health care lost 40 percent of its jobs like housing did, it would mean 7.2 million jobs lost. That’s more than four times the number of people who are employed by the entire auto industry — an industry that was considered too big to be allowed to fail. The loss of **7.2 million jobs** would increase the unemployment rate by 5 percent. That means we could easily top the **all-time high unemployment rate** for our country. OK, now it’s time to take a deep breath. I’m not convinced that health care is fated to **unavoidable failure** and economic catastrophe. That’s a worst-case scenario. The problem is that at even a fraction the severity of the auto or housing industry crises we’ve already faced, a health care collapse would still be devastating. Health care **can’t be allowed** to continue its current inflationary trending. I believe we are on the verge of some major changes in health care, and that how they’re **implemented** will determine their impact on the overall **economic picture** in this country and around the world. Continued failure to recognize the truth about health care will only cause the resulting market corrections to be worse than they need to be. I don’t want to diminish the pain and anguish that many people caught up in the housing crash experienced. I think an argument can be made, though, that if the health care market crashes and millions of people end up with no health care, the resulting fallout could be could be much worse than even the housing crisis.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Tønnesson, 15 — Stein Tønnesson, Leader of East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University, Research Professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo, “Deterrence, Interdependence and Sino–US Peace” International Area Studies Review, Review Essay, Volume 18, Issue 3, Pages 297-311, SAGE Journals, Minnesota Libraries, Date Accessed: 8-4

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may **both inhibit and drive conflict** are right. Interdependence raises the **cost of conflict** for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and **negative trade expectations** may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or **anticipate their own nation’s decline** then they may blame this on **external dependence**, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately **refuse to be deterred by** either **nuclear arms** or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen **abruptly**, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party.

Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is **not** that **a territorial dispute** leads to war under present circumstances but that **changes in the world economy** alter those circumstances in ways that render **inter-state peace** more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have **unforeseen consequences** in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to **protect the world from Armageddon**, and **unreliably so**. Deterrence could **lose its credibility**: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third-party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to **intervene**.

### 1NC – DA

#### Ambiguous standards result in confusion that deters hemp investment now

Fulmer 2 [Melinda Fulmer, award-winning financial writer and media strategist, Vice President of Public Relations for City National Bank, former Times Staff Writer, 1/16/02, Hemp Imports Run Afoul of DEA Rule, LA Times, <http://articles.latimes.com/2002/jan/16/business/fi-hemp16>]

Kenex contends the rule is discriminatory to Canadian producers, who provide the bulk of hemp products to the U.S. because Americans are banned from growing the plant.¶ "Our company has invested a significant amount of money in Canada and the U.S. to develop these markets for the past three years, and it has been one stumbling block after another," said Jean Laprise, Kenex president. "They're squashing an emerging industry."¶ The Kenex case adds more heat to a debate over the provision of NAFTA that allows private investors to sue governments for taking actions that restrict trade. Since NAFTA was enacted, 15 such cases have been filed.¶ Critics argue the provision gives companies too much power and undermines the ability of governments to protect their citizens.¶ But Laprise says it's necessary to protect companies' rights when the law is discriminatory.¶ DEA officials refuse to comment on the issue because of the pending litigation. But DEA Administrator Asa Hutchinson put forward the agency's position recently when he said that "many Americans do not know that hemp and marijuana are both parts of the same plant and that hemp cannot be produced without producing marijuana."¶ The DEA says consumers have until Feb. 6 to dispose of these items or be subject to penalty.¶ Although hemp and marijuana come from the plant species, cannabis, the variety grown for industrial hemp contains much lower amounts of THC, a point the DEA acknowledges. The burning issue for the DEA is: When can cannabis legally be sold as hemp, and when is it still a drug? Hemp oil and seeds can't make people high, but they do contain minuscule amounts of THC, much as poppy seeds contain trace amounts of opium.¶ "The leaves and flowers on industrial hemp, when you smoke them, it gives you a headache," said John Roulac, president of Nutiva in Sebastopol, Calif., which makes snack bars and chips out of hemp. "If you smoke more, you just get a bigger headache."¶ If there weren't a cloud hanging over the industry from this regulation, manufacturers say, it would grow exponentially over the next several years as demand for functional foods grows.¶ However, confusion over the new rule, and high-profile seizures of hemp-containing products such as birdseed, should keep many companies from using the controversial ingredient, Roulac said.¶ Many, however, say they plan to continue to sell their products.¶ Food companies that use hemp ingredients hope that the industry and government can come up with guidelines that will allow the industry to grow as it was expected to before the rule was published.¶ Without them, they say, the DEA's ambiguous standards will make that difficult.

#### Hemp biofuels help achieve energy independence which lowers global oil prices

Keller 13 [Nicole Keller, “NOTE: THE LEGALIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL HEMP AND WHAT IT COULD MEAN FOR INDIANA'S BIOFUEL INDUSTRY,” Indiana International & Comparative Law Review 23 Ind. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 555, Lexis]

These countries, which have been able to distinguish between hemp and marijuana, are able to take advantage of an enormous renewable resource that boosts their economies and lessens their country's impact on the global environment. Hemp "can be used to produce more than 25,000 products, ranging from dynamite to cellophane." 35 This statement was made in 1938 when Popular Mechanics released an article toting the wonders of industrial hemp, claiming it was the new billion dollar crop. The article "further state[d] that increased hemp production 'will displace imports of raw material and manufactured products' and call[ed] hemp the 'standard fiber of the world.'" 36 That was in 1938. With today's advanced technologies, it is highly likely that the number of uses exceeds 25,000 products. 37 In fact, some sources claim that over 50,000 products can be made from this single plant. 38 Among the 50,000 products are "textiles, paper, paints, clothing, plastics, cosmetics, foodstuffs, insulation, animal feed," 39 biodegradable industrial products such as fiberglass, replacement for wood products, biofuel, and detergents. 40 For a majority of these products, the fibrous stalk of the hemp plant is used. However, the seeds are also an excellent source of oil, varnishes, body care products, detergents, and biofuel. In other words, the entire hemp plant has a use; nothing goes to [\*559] waste. Many countries now have active industries utilizing industrial hemp to their benefit. For example, China has large hemp paper and textile industries. 41 In 2009 Zhang Jianchun, Director General of China's Hemp Research Centre in Beijing, said, Expanded production of hemp . . . offers enormous benefits for China. First, it would provide a major new source of fibre for the textile industry, reduce dependency on cotton and, in the process, free large areas of cotton-growing land for food production. In addition, hemp cultivation would generate extra income for millions of small-scale farmers in some of the country's poorest rural areas. 42 Three years later, "[China] is the largest exporter of hemp paper and [hemp] textiles." 43 It seems that, at least in China, Popular Mechanics' tout that hemp would become the "standard fiber of the world" 44 is quickly becoming a reality as the Chinese increasingly replace fibers such as cotton with industrial hemp. 45 Additionally, another large producer of hemp products is Canada, which supplies the world with a variety of hemp food products. 46 Canada's hemp food industry is growing, and Canadian farmers are benefiting from the US government's refusal to legalize the crop. 47 Among the products derivable from the industrial hemp plant, and the product most relevant to this Note, is hemp as a biofuel. In a time of high gas prices, political instability, and increasing concerns over the environmental effects of fossil fuel consumption, it is natural to seek an alternative. Globally, the use of biofuels as an alternative to petroleum products is gaining momentum. 48 The United States alone consumed approximately 11.7 million gallons of ethanol in 2011 49 and over 549 [\*560] million gallons of biodiesel in the first 9 months of 2011. 50 In Canada, hemp biofuel research is underway to produce cellulosic ethanol. 51 Cellulosic ethanol is ethanol produced from the non-food parts of feedstock and is a more efficient source of energy. 52 Currently, the majority of feedstock for biofuels comes from corn, soybeans, or wheat. 53 However, in addition to being an inefficient source of fuel, the diversion of these commodities for fuel production is at the expense of the world food supply. 54 The United States has recognized the issue and has "announced a $ 510 million initiative meant to spur development of a new US bio-fuel industry that utilizes non-food crops[.]" 55 The initiative is meant to examine sources such as algae or wood chips; 56 however, there is a more efficient source: industrial hemp. "When compared to other plant species of active interest in biofuel production, Hemp derives 100% more cellulose than species under active investigation." 57 Furthermore, "[h]emp is Earth's number one biomass resource; it is capable of producing 10 tons per acre in four months." 58 Hemp biomass fuel products require a minimal amount of specialization and processing and **"[t**]he hydrocarbons in hemp can be processed into a wide range of biomass energy sources, from fuel pellets to liquid fuels and gas."59 These facts alone make industrial hemp the ideal source for both ethanol and biodiesel production. Yet, industrial hemp, in addition to its fibrous plant matter, also produces seeds wherein lies a rich source of hemp [\*561] oil, and this oil can also be used for fuel. 60 Industrial hemp's fuel capabilities and desirability is further enhanced by the fact that "[i]ndustrial hemp can be grown in most climates and on marginal soils. It requires little or no herbicide and no pesticide[.]" 61 The hemp plant is also known to improve soil conditions for rotationalcrops, 62 and it is a clean-burning fuel, contributing no greenhouse gases. 63 Yet, industrial hemp is not seriously considered as a feedstock input, 64 largely because industrial hemp is illegal to grow in the United States.

#### Drop in oil prices collapses the Russian economy – overwhelms resiliency

**Zotin 13** [Aleksander, Columnist – Kommersant, “AN ECONOMIC CRISIS MAY BE LOOMING FOR RUSSIA”, Kommersant, 8/30/13, http://www.worldcrunch.com/business-finance/an-economic-crisis-may-be-looming-for-russia/russia-economy-ruble-boris-yeltsin-global-crisis/c2s13220/]

MOSCOW — On Aug. 17, 1998, the Russian government announced a default on short-term obligations and a currency devaluation. The financial system was practically destroyed. Ten years later, in 2008, there was another crisis, this time a global one, that hit all the world’s economies, including Russia’s. There were both similarities and differences between the two crises — each resulted from internal and external shocks. But we haven’t learned our lessons from them, and there are reasons to be worried that a new economic catastrophe is on the horizon. Although it’s been five years since the last global crisis, it wouldn’t be accurate to say that the world economy is truly healthy. An exterior shock similar to the one that caused the economic collapses in 2008 and 1998 is still possible. In 2008, the epicenter of the crisis was the United States, but today the biggest threat comes from China — and from the fact that the entire developed world still balances on the edge of recession. If, in addition to that, there is a major shock from China, such as a slowdown in growth to just 3%, the world will be faced with another economic meltdown. A slowdown in demand for metals, for example, is already a menacing hint that this could happen. Ominous signs Nobody knows whether, or when, the global economy will suffer another body blow, but what is clear is that while Russia was relatively well-prepared for the 2008 crisis, we don’t have the same safety cushion today. Instead of a surplus, we have a deficit, and the non-oil and gas deficit is **exceptionally high**, with experts predicting that said deficit will be 10.7% of GDP this year. In 2007, the country adopted new rules about how income from oil and gas could be spent, and it was meant to be used increasingly for government savings. But the crisis wrecked that plan, as the government tried to spend its way out of its economic problems. Russia not only failed to save its income from the oil and gas industries during the crisis years, but it also **emptied** its **reserve fund**. The non-oil and gas deficit rose to 13.5% of GDP. The crisis of 2008-2009 passed, but Russia still didn’t heed the World Bank’s recommendation to keep the non-oil and gas deficit below 4% of GDP. The gold reserves are also less important now than they were in 2008, and the private sector’s international debt level is much higher. We are also **more vulnerable** now to **external shocks** than we were in 2008 because of domestic factors. We have witnessed economic stagnation this year even with high oil prices. There are also serious weaknesses in the Russian financial system. There has been a boom in credit and debt, which caused a quick rise in family incomes that has now become the expected norm. Consumer debt has now reached 15% of GDP. That’s low compared to other developed countries, but the advantages of having a low level of indebtedness are negated by the high cost of debt service and the fact that most of the debt is borrowed over very short terms. In fact, Russians spend 11% of their income paying down debt, more than even the United States, where citizens pay on average 10.5% of their income for debt service, researchers say. This is the case even though household debt is 78% of GDP in the United States, much higher than Russia’s 15%. If there is a **sharp drop** in prices for natural resources, a new crisis will be **unavoidable**. And there were not be many choices: either devalue the ruble or cut government spending.

#### Nuke war

Dr. Benjamin Ståhl 15, CEO of the Blue Institute, PhD in Business Studies and Economics from Uppsala University, MA in International Relations from the University of Kent, and Johan Wiktorin, Founder and CEO of the Intelligence Company Brqthrough, Licensed Master of Competitive Intelligence and Former Member of the Swedish Armed Forces, “What’s At Stake?: A Geopolitical Perspective on the Swedish Economic Exposure in Northeast Europe”, Swedish Growth Barometer, 7/1/2015, https://blueinst.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/whats-at-stake\_geopolitical-perspective.pdf

Scenario 1: Disintegration If the Russian economy continues to deteriorate and the regime continue to distance themselves from the West, the centre may not be capable to maintain legitimacy and keep the periphery together. Already, some regions and counties are highly indebted. In other parts, ethnic Russians are a minority. Regions in eastern Russia, rich in raw materials, may look to China for funding. It is, however, probable that Beijing will not want to undermine the stability in Russia. Closer to the region in focus in this report, Kaliningrad is an area that could distance itself from the Kremlin. Economic problems and security concerns form a background that could lead to a political uprising. A “Kaliningrad-Maidan” development is at the heart of this scenario. Triggers could also come from outside Kaliningrad, in or in the immediate surrounding of the Russian Federation, or from other factors such as severe pollution. The other countries in the region would in all probability remain cool in this situation, considering the county’s military importance for the Russian government. However, a mutiny like the ones in Kroonstad in June 1917, March 1921 or on the frigate Storozjevoj in November 1975 cannot be excluded. Economic and political tensions in Europe could weaken the EU and worsen the development at the same time. A Greek withdrawal from the EU, triggered by its exit from the Eurozone, could set such a movement in motion. A Podemos-led government in Spain could undermine confidence for the single market, at a time when Europe also faces the consequences of a highly unstable North Africa, with a large flow of migrants. Attempts by Russia to influence certain members in the EU, such as Hungary and Cyprus, could sow further discord in the EU. At the most severe levels of disintegration, France could adopt policies effectively blocking EU and NATO response in a time of increased tensions. Britain may opt out of the union altogether, or be forced out if their demands for special status is rejected by the other member states. In all varieties of disintegration, uncertainty concerning the control over the nuclear arsenals will increase. The US will become involved both diplomatically and financially in order to bring clarity and establish control over the arsenals. Should Russia, in that situation, ask for military support for this, it is highly probable that the US would acquiesce: such operations in other parts of the world were the object of joint US-Russian exercises just a few years ago. Scenario 2: Ultra-nationalism If Russian domestic and international policy continues to become more radicalised, it might take ever more drastic forms. As the economy deteriorates, wages fall and shortages become common, a focus on nostalgic nationalism, using belligerent rhetoric and demonstrations of military power, could be used to deflect growing discontentment. A logical target would be to “protect” zones which are perceived as Russian, e.g. where there are Russian ethnic minorities or even just Russian-speaking areas. Such rhetoric was and is used in the Ukraine. The coming years will tell what the Russian ambitions are in the Ukraine. Offensives to secure and expand their supply lines, and weakening those of the Ukraine, are probable, and more ambitious plans, such as the opening of new directions in Kharkiv or Odessa, are possible. As a distraction, conflicts in Moldavia can be fuelled. If the West, primarily the US, UK and Poland, support Ukraine with military means, the risk increases for further escalation of the conflict. Remaining passive, on the other hand, runs the risk that Russia perceives that it could act against other targets. A second country that could be the target of Russian nationalism is Belarus. Judging by president Putin’s justification of the annexation of Crimea, Belarus would similarly be a legitimate candidate for “re-inclusion” in Russia. There are indications that the regime in Belarus are worried about such a development and acting to thwart it. In late 2014, Lukashenko appointed a new government, and has increased the emphasis on “Belorussian”. The fragmented (and thoroughly infiltrated) opposition has declared that it will not field candidates in elections this autumn, since they deem the threat of president Putin to be greater than of Lukashenko himself. Belarus has also passed laws permitting prosecution of non-regular armed troops, as a consequence of the Russian method employed in the annexation of Crimea. In the economic sphere, Russia has complained that Belarus is profiting from sanctions against Russia. Any attempts from Russia to enter Belarus’ with military means would probably not be met by any effective resistance from the Belorussian security apparatus. The opportunities for Russia are in some ways more favourable here than in Ukraine, due to the close cooperation between the countries’ armies and intelligence services. Passive resistance cannot be ruled out but would not mean much in a short-term. However, tensions with other former Soviet Union republics, with the EU and with NATO would surely increase. Polish and Lithuanian forces would probably mobilize to counteract spillover effects. EU policy would be substantially revised. Belorussian citizens would attempt to flee, primarily to neighbouring Poland, Lithuania and Latvia. The Russian government would also threaten the Baltic states, in order to undermine their economies and try to influence policy in these countries. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania would be in a precarious situation. While they need to strengthen their civil and military defence, they must retain credibility with their allies and not be perceived as to exaggerate the Russian threat. The higher the tensions, the more sensitive the world is to psychological influence. Russia would, in this scenario, also fan nationalism in other parts of Europe through political and financial support. West Balkan is particularly vulnerable, as the EU and the US have invested considerable political capital in the region with only mixed success. Bosnia, Kosovo and Macedonia have stagnated in their political and economic development with high levels of unemployment, political polarisation and even the establishing of Islamic fundamentalist cells: a fertile ground for nationalist movements. Finally, Russian ultra-nationalism would also be directed inwards, with an escalated persecution of the domestic political opposition, independent media, and nationalisation of foreign assets. This will be combined with attacks on minority groups, especially on Jews. This scenario could happen separately or as a precursor to the final, and most dangerous, scenario. Scenario 3: Test of strength In this scenario, Russia would attempt to break NATO through challenging of one or more of the Baltic states. The objective would be to demonstrate to alliance members that NATO’s response is too late and too weak. A precondition for success is a distraction through a crisis by an intermediator, which would tie down especially American attention and resources. The distraction could come in many forms, e.g. by partnering with North Korea, fanning war in the Middle East, or even hidden support for terrorists. If the current polarisation in US domestic politics continues, any reaction will be obstructed and delayed. An especially vulnerable window of opportunity is in the period between the presidential elections in November 2016 and the installation of the new president in January 2017, which could create a legitimacy problem for the American political system when it comes to the possibilities of directly confronting Russia quickly. An attack on any Baltic state would directly affect Swedish territory and air space. In the worst-case scenario, it will happen immediately before open conflict with NATO. The Baltic states each offer different opportunities for Russia, but they all have in common that they lack any strategic depth, which means that an open invasion would be accomplished in a few days, unless support from other alliance members is forthcoming. Estonia, which is the most powerful of the three, both economically and military, poses as a potential threat to the trade over St Petersburg. To control the maritime traffic through the Gulf of Finland is an important motive for Russia to influence Estonian politics. The population of Estonia, with 25 percent ethnic Russians, could be used to legimize action and as grounds for destabilisation, especially around the border town Narva where more than 90% of the population is ethnic Russian. Latvia is the most vulnerable of the three states. The economy is weaker; the Russian minority is about the same as in Estonia; and Russian organised crime has a strong hold. Especially the eastern parts of the country are vulnerable to Russian influence. Lithuania only have about six percent ethnic Russians and a stronger military tradition. On the other hand, Lithuania offers access to Kaliningrad. Lithuania’s attempts to decrease their dependence on energy from Russia has annoyed the Russian regime, as is evident in the harassments by the Russian navy of the cabling operation which will connect the Lithuanian grid to Sweden. There are also some tensions surrounding the Polish minorities in the country which Russia could exploit. How fast Sweden will become involved depends on the extent of open, armed actions against one or all of the Baltic States. If a confrontation occurs with non-regular or paramilitary means, maintaining dominance over Swedish territory and territorial waters will be in focus. The same will be the case for Finland, but Finnish action could be influenced by Russian fabrication of tensions in Karelia, that Helsinki could be blamed for. NATO would try to respond in a controlled manner, i.e. prioritizing transports by air and sea. This would mean greatly increased traffic in and over the Baltic Sea. Tensions will rise drastically, with increased risks of miscalculations on both sides. Sweden and Finland are expected to act together with the rest of the EU and the US. If no direct military threat emerges against Sweden, then Sweden cannot count on any enforcements from the rest of the world apart from mutual information exchange. The instance that the citizens in the Baltic states perceive a risk of a Russian incursion, the probability is high that a flow of refugees will commence. From Lithuania, the biggest flow will be to Poland while Latvian will flee to Sweden, mainly Gotland. Refugees from Estonia can be expected to flee towards Finland or Sweden depending on where in the country they live and where they have relations or connections. In the worst-case scenario, Swedish and Finnish territory will become an arena for hostilities. As Russian readiness exercises have shown, airborne and marine infantry could rapidly and with surprise occupy parts of Gotland and Åland. A possible option is also to mine the Danish Straits in connection with this. By supplies of surface-to-air and anti-ship missiles, Russian forces can temporarily extend their air and coastal defence in the Baltic Sea, protecting an incursion by land into the Baltic states. NATO would be faced with a fait accompli. The invasion does not need to happen in all three states nor include the entire territory of a country. The only thing that is needed is a demonstration of NATO’s inability to defend alliance members. This would establish a new security order. Depending on the level of conflict that Russia would be willing to risk, air and navy bases in Sweden and Finland could be struck with missiles from the ground, air and sea. It is, however, likely that the governments would be issued an ultimatum to remain neutral, with only a few hours to comply. Public announcement of the ultimatum would put immense pressure on the political system and weaken resistance. Such diplomatic tactics could be reinforced by forced cyber attacks on the electricity and telecommunication networks. During the coldest months of the year, the vulnerability would be the highest. At the same time, Sweden would be expected to support their Western partners’ need for transports into the theatre of action. If Russia would close the Danish Straits, any military support to the Baltic states would need to move over Swedish territory; such as air support Norwegian air bases or aircraft carriers in the Norwegian Sea. There would also be demands to clear of mines in Oresund, and possibly for allowing equipment and troop transports to harbours on the east coast for further transport across the Baltic Sea. The Swedish to such demands would have consequences for generations to come. If Gotland would not be occupied by Russian forces, NATO would demand to set up bases on the island. The smallest indication of acquiescing to such demands would have the Russians racing to the island. Furthermore, Russia would coordinate activities in the far north, with submarines of all kinds and possibly even direct action in northern Finland and even in northern Sweden, in order to expand Russian air defence. Faced with the risk of direct confrontations between Russian and American forces, Russia could mount land-based as well as amphibian operations in the north of Norway and on Svalbard, to improve the defence of Murmansk. Following a similar strategy, occupying parts of Bornholm would make it more difficult for NATO to support their members. This is probably not necessary, but it is a possible option. In most people’s minds, there is a sharp line between the Baltic states’ eastern borders and Russia, the crossing of which is unconceivable. By first gaining the control over Gotland and Åland, the Russian General Army Staff could circumvent a mental Maginot line, in the same way as Germany attacked France through Benelux in May 1940. Russian success in this scenario hinges on speed and the ability to contain the conflict. The first message to Washington will entail the understanding that this is not a direct conflict between the US. For Russia, the uncertainty is therefore how US interests are perceived from an American perspective. For the US, it is not just the credibility of NATO that is at stake but also the unity of the EU. This has global connotations since allies (and enemies) in the Middle East and Asia will also form assumptions regarding the willingness and ability of the US to act in order to protect their allies. The risk is obviously that Russia miscalculates and underestimates the difference between, for instance, the departing presidential administration perceptions of US security interests on the one hand with the wider US security establishment’s perception of these on the other. During the whole process, the threat of nuclear strikes would hover over all decision makers, which increases the degree of uncertainty. Nuclear tests in the period before a test of strength cannot be ruled out, especially since Russian emphasis on nuclear deterrence could lose credibility over time. Direct threats of using the nuclear weapons is, however, completely excluded in this scenario.

### 1NC – DA

#### Big Pharma can’t withstand legalization – large cash reserves solve patent cliffs now, but legalization causes medicinal marijuana to *trade off with most dependable revenue streams* - reducing cannabis undermines results so no turns

Jackson, 2012 Lee, “Will National Legalized Marijuana Help or Hurt Big Pharma, Tobacco and Alcohol?” http://247wallst.com/investing/2012/12/11/will-national-legalized-marijuana-help-or-hurt-big-pharma-tobacco-and-alcohol/

One other big and powerful industry might have something to lose: Big Pharma. It is estimated that the global pharmaceutical market will be worth more than $1 trillion by 2014. Industry giants Merck & Co. (NYSE: MRK), Johnson & Johnson (NYSE: JNJ), Pfizer Inc. (NYSE: PFE) and Abbott Laboratories (NYSE: ABT) have warded off patent cliffs for years using their large cash reserves to acquire smaller companies with robust product pipelines. The last thing these companies want see is current product lines that are producing dependable revenue flow to be dented by legal marijuana. The big pharmaceutical firms have a lot of money to spread around, so when it comes to lobbying efforts, very few have this group’s clout. One thing it wants is for marijuana to remain illegal. There are countless maladies where the ingestion of marijuana has been believed to help alleviate or control the symptoms. These include glaucoma, multiple sclerosis, AIDS-related complications, Crohn’s disease, fibromyalgia, chemotherapy complications and others. Big pharma has tried to come up with their own pot pill. There are more than 400 chemicals in marijuana, 80 of which are called “cannabinoids.” Drug companies have tried reducing it to one chemical and results have been poor. Researchers find that when you reduce cannabis to just tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), you lose efficacy and gain side effects. In a book critical of the pharmaceutical industry called “Our Daily Meds,” author Melody Petersen offers a statistic showing more than 100,000 people die each year from prescription drugs. This includes death from abuse and overdose, side effects, misdiagnosis and interaction error. Many physicians may currently be reluctant to prescribe legalized marijuana. A national mandate would provide many physicians with the moral and ethical cover they need to be more aggressive if they feel medical marijuana may help their patients. Then it is very possible that medical marijuana prescriptions will put a dent in many currently prescribed drugs. This is not an outcome that big pharma is likely to tolerate well, unless they get in on the action themselves.

#### Profit margins determine R&D budgets --- that solves emerging existential pandemics

Engelhardt 8 “Innovation and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Critical Reflections on the Virtues of Profit” Hugo Engelhardt – PhD, MD, Professor of Philosophy at Rice, Ebrary

Many are suspicious of, or indeed jealous of, the good fortune of others. Even when profit is gained in the market without fraud and with the consent of all buying and selling goods and services, there is a sense on the part of some that something is wrong if considerable profit is secured. There is even a sense that good fortune in the market, especially if it is very good fortune, is unfair. One might think of such rhetorically disparaging terms as "wind-fall profits". There is also a suspicion of the pursuit of profit because it is often embraced not just because of the material benefits it sought, but because of the hierarchical satisfaction of being more affluent than others. The pursuit of profit in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is tor many in particular morally dubious because it is acquired from those who have the bad fortune to be diseased or disabled. Although the suspicion of profit is not well-founded, this suspicion is a major moral and public-policy challenge. Profit in the market for the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries is to be celebrated. This is the case, in that if one is of the view (1) that the presence of additional resources for research and development spurs innovation in the development of pharmaceuticals and medical devices (i.e., if one is of the view that the allure of profit is one of the most effective ways not only to acquire resources but productively to direct human energies in their use), (2) that given the limits of altruism and of the willingness of persons to be taxed, the possibility of profits is necessary to secure such resources, (3) that the allure of profits also tends to enhance the creative use of available resources in the pursuit of pharmaceutical and medical-device innovation, and (4) if one judges it to be the case that such innovation is both necessary to maintain the human species in an ever-changing and always dangerous environment in which new microbial and other threats may at any time emerge to threaten human well-being, if not survival (i.e., that such innovation is necessary to prevent increases in morbidity and mortality risks), as well as (5) in order generally to decrease morbidity and mortality risks in the future, it then follows (6) that one should be concerned regarding any policies that decrease the amount of resources and energies available to encourage such innovation. One should indeed be of the view that the possibilities for profit, all things being equal, should be highest in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries. Yet, there is a suspicion regarding the pursuit of profit in medicine and especially in the pharmaceutical and medical-device industries.

#### New diseases cause extinction – uniquely probable due to environmental changes.

Mooney 21 — (Tom Mooney, Senior Communications & Advocacy Manager for the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, “Preparing for the next “Disease X””, CEPI, 2-1-21, Available Online at <https://cepi.net/news_cepi/preparing-for-the-next-disease-x/>, accessed 9-10-21, HKR-AM)

Disease X represents the knowledge that a serious international pandemic could be caused by a pathogen currently unknown to cause human disease. It was first included in the WHO’s list of priority pathogens in 2018. COVID-19 represents the first occurrence of Disease X since its designation was established, emerging much sooner than anticipated.

While the world battles to control COVID-19, we know that future outbreaks of Disease X are inevitable. Our interconnected world has made us more vulnerable than ever to the rapid spread of new emerging infectious diseases. Rapid urbanisation, deforestation, intensive agriculture, livestock rearing practices, climate change and globalisation are increasing opportunities for animal-to-human contacts and for human-to-human transmission of disease on a global scale. The threat of Disease X infecting the human population, and spreading quickly around the world, is greater than ever before.

COVID-19: CEPI’s first Disease X

When CEPI was established in 2017 we classed Disease X as a serious risk to global health security, for which the world needed to prepare. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, CEPI had initiated a rapid response programme—including mRNA vaccines—against novel pathogens. Our goal was to be able to start safety testing of vaccines within months of a new pathogen being genetically sequenced.

In January 2020—within 2 weeks of the publication of the genome sequence of the COVID-19 virus, and with just 141 confirmed cases of COVID-19 globally—CEPI began work on developing vaccine candidates against the virus. CEPI was able to move with such agility because it had already identified coronaviruses as serious threats and invested over $140 million in the development of vaccines against MERS. Within a few weeks of the COVID-19 outbreak, most of CEPI’s MERS vaccine development partners had pivoted to work on the new virus.

Just one year later, two CEPI-supported vaccine candidates are amongst the first in the world to be approved by regulatory authorities and deployed to protect people from the virus; and potentially over one billion doses of vaccine enabled by CEPI investment will be available to the COVAX Facility in 2021.

The speed of the scientific progress has been astounding, compressing vaccine development—which typically takes a decade into the space of 12 months—yet over 2 million lives have been lost to COVID-19 already and economies the world over have been devastated.

So, could we move even faster next time?

What next for Disease X?

We don’t know where or when the next Disease X will emerge, only that it will. As COVID-19 has demonstrated, diseases do not respect borders so we need to be prepared on a global scale to respond to future outbreaks of Disease X, and we need to do it fast.

In many ways COVID-19 is a proof of concept for rapidly developing a vaccine against a new viral threat. Scientists were already working on vaccines against MERS and SARS—pathogens from the same virus family as COVID-19—which gave us a crucial head start this time around.

25 viral families are known to infect humans, and over 1.6 million yet-to-be-discovered viral species from these viral families are estimated to exist in mammal and bird hosts—the most important reservoirs for viral zoonoses.

We cannot develop vaccines against all potential viral threats, but we could produce a library of prototype vaccines and other biological interventions against representative pathogens from each of these 25 viral families. Having such a library of prototype vaccines, which could be ‘pulled off the shelf’, and advanced into clinical testing as soon as a related threat emerges would dramatically accelerate the development of vaccines.

We also know that beta coronaviruses that cause SARS and MERS are associated with case fatality rates of 10-35% (25-88 times worse than COVID-19) and that coronaviruses circulate widely in animal reservoirs. The emergence of a coronavirus variant combining the transmissibility of COVID-19 with the lethality of SARS or MERS would be utterly devastating. We must minimise this threat as a matter of urgency. One way to do this in the long-term would be to develop a vaccine that provides broad protection against coronaviruses in general.

If we can produce vaccines against Disease X in a matter of months instead of a year or more, we could revolutionise the world’s ability to respond to epidemic and pandemic diseases. Disease X and other emerging infectious diseases pose an existential threat to humanity. But for the first time in history, with the right level of financial commitment and political will, we could credibly aim to eliminate the risk of epidemics and pandemics.

## Case

### 1NC – Case

#### Top level – no reason Cannabis is key to drug cartels or why drug cartels are the only cause of Mexican instability – assign 1AC solvency at 0, that was CX

#### Their examples from monopolies in cartels are in places that aren’t Mexico like Thailand – cartels in Thailand aren’t going to cause Mexican instability

#### Their impact cards about Mexican instability are about lack of water and list tons of alt causes that aren’t cartels – Mexico has been teetering on the edge of instability for years – even if cartels disappeared Mexico would be equally unstable

#### Their internal link ev is from 2013, should’ve been triggered by now – means no risk of the aff

#### No Latin-America war

Sanchez 2/7/**19** [Wilder Alejandro Sanchez, Defense IQ researcher who focuses on geopolitical, military and cyber security issues. Are main battle tanks obsolete? The view from Latin America. Feb 7, 2019. https://www.defenceiq.com/armoured-vehicles/articles/is-heavy-armour-obsolete-the-view-from-latin-america]

While there are ongoing border disputes (e.g. Bolivia and Chile or Guyana and Venezuela) and tensions (mostly coming out of Venezuela these days), security threats in the region are generally insurgent in nature. For example, terrorist movements like Colombia’s ELN and EPL, Peru’s Shining Path, or Paraguay’s EPP; narco-cartels in Mexico; or organised gangs such as the Maras in Central America or the Primero Comando da Capital in Brazil. These entities are highly mobile and operate in isolated regions or in urban areas.

Latin American governments continue to acquire new (or used) platforms for their armed forces, but heavy armour is not purchased particularly often. Some recent deals worth noting are:

In December 2018, the Brazilian Army completed the transfer of 25 M41C light tanks to the Uruguayan army. “Of the 25 vehicles, 15 were completely refurbished by Brazil while the remaining 10 will be used for parts. Those that will remain intact will be assigned to armoured infantry units, which currently use M24 light tanks,” Jane’s explains.

In 2016, Russia delivered 50 T-72B1 tanks to Nicaragua. The platforms are “an upgrade of the 1970s-era main battle tank and feature explosive reactive armour and thermal weapon sights, among other improvements.”

Venezuela has received a plethora of Russian weaponry over the past couple of decades, though these deals have been quite scarce in recent years due to Caracas’ financial crisis. Amongst the acquisitions are T-72 tanks, as well as infantry fighting vehicles like the BMP-3M, and an array of transport vehicles.

"Latin American governments continue to acquire new (or used) platforms for their armed forces, but heavy armour is not purchased particularly often"

As for other nations, while no other major sales have occurred, there are ongoing reports about armoured vehicles in need of modernization or replacement. For example, Chile possesses Leopard 2A4 tanks, and it will be interesting if they will be upgraded anytime soon, given that the Chilean government is replacing the famous Copper Law, which helps fund the Ministry of Defence. Meanwhile, Peru has yet to find a replacement for its old T-55 tanks, while Ecuador recently upgraded several AML and M113 A2 Plus armoured vehicles, as the country does not possess heavy armour.

As for Mexico, its fleet consists of light and medium armoured vehicles. Finally, Colombia also possesses light armoured vehicles; for example, media reports published in late January show vehicles that appear to be the EE-09 Cascavel, a 6x6 light tank, on patrol in urban areas close to the border with Venezuela.

Latin American Armoured Vehicle Requirements

The intrastate conflict that has plagued many Latin American countries is one of the strongest drivers for defence spending. Many countries continue to acquire new (or refurbished) platforms, such as Brazil’s new carrier Atlantico, Chile’s new Sikorsky S-70i Blackhawk helicopters, Argentina’s used AB-206 helicopters, or Mexico’s new patrol vessel Reformador. As for Peru, the Andean state has commenced the construction of a second landing platform vessel, BAP Paita. However, when it comes to heavy armour (or even medium armour) new contracts have been quite scarce in recent years.

One argument in favour of procuring heavy armour is so that nations can maintain minimal deterrence capabilities. While interstate warfare is very unlikely, it does not mean that the scenario is impossible. The Venezuelan government’s behaviour, particularly during the 2008 crisis in the Andes is an example of this ever-present possibility. Nevertheless, given the region’s current peaceful status, limited defence budgets and other security threats, it is understandable that regional governments have other priorities. Moreover, the focus for Latin American governments is the acquisition of multipurpose platforms, which can be utilized not solely for war.

Alt causes to cartels  
1AC Soumaya 20 [Paula Soumaya, 2-7-2020, "The Role of Global Governance in Curtailing Mexican Cartel Violence," E-International Relations, https://www.e-ir.info/2020/02/07/the-role-of-global-governance-in-curtailing-mexican-cartel-violence/ || belle]

* DTOs = drug trafficking organizations

The reach of Mexican cartels’ dealings has expanded as the world has become more globalized. Globalization and digitalization have facilitated international communication which is imperative to the international trafficking of drugs. Mexican cartels notoriously transport drugs to the United States through their shared border. According to the 2018 National Drug Threat Assessment, **Mexico is the primary source of heroin, methamphetamine, fentanyl, and other synthetic opioids** in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice and Drug Enforcement Administration 2018, pp.vi). To facilitate the movement of product, cartels maintain a domestic presence within countries of destination. DTOs, such as the Sinaloa Cartel, have a pervasive reach in the USA which can bring cartel related violence into foreign countries. Competition for drug routes into the United States has expanded cartel violence into foreign land. Border cities between Mexico and the United States, such as Tijuana and Ciudad Juarez, constituted the most violent municipalities in Mexico in 2018 due to competition for dominance over smuggling routes (Justice in Mexico 2019: 4, Teixeira 2016:7, 33-35). Violence instigated by cartels expands southward to Central and South America as well. Mexican DTOs use Central American corridors to move South American drugs, further destabilizing the region as their dominance over the continent’s narcotics trade grows (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 2007: 44-48, Global Governance and the challenge of transnational organized crime: the role of the constructive Powers, 2012: 5-8, Reveles, Lara Klahr and Spiller, 2013: 149-153) . The reach of Mexican cartels and the violence they instigate raises international peace and security concerns.

#### Mexico is stable – Sinaloa primacy has dampened violence

Bates 14 (Theunis, "A Mexican drug cartel's rise to dominance," The Week, January 25, theweek.com/article/index/255503/a-mexican-drug-cartels-rise-to-dominance)

The Mexican crime syndicate is the world's most powerful drug trafficking organization, and the biggest supplier of illegal narcotics in the U.S. About half of the estimated $65 billion worth of cocaine, heroin, and other illegal drugs that American users buy each year enters the U.S. via Mexico. Sinaloa — which is named after its home state in western Mexico — controls more than half of that cross-border trade, from which it earns at least $3 billion a year. U.S. law--enforcement officials say the group has a presence in all major American cities, and a near monopoly on the wholesale distribution of heroin and cocaine in Chicago. The city's Crime Commission has branded Sinaloa's elusive leader, Joaquín Guzmán, also known as El Chapo (or Shorty), Public Enemy No. 1 — a title last held by Al Capone. "What Al Capone was to beer and whiskey," said commission member Arthur Bilek, "Guzmán is to narcotics."¶ How did the cartel get started?¶ Mexican smugglers have long trafficked homegrown heroin and marijuana to the U.S. But in the 1980s, Mexico also became the primary route for Colombian cocaine bound for the U.S. At the time, U.S. law enforcement was cracking down on the Colombian drug producers' attempts to ship the lucrative drug into Florida by boats and planes. So the Colombians hired Mexico's Guadalajara cartel to smuggle drugs across the border, and paid them in cocaine, which allowed the Mexicans to build their own drug networks in the U.S. Before long, the Mexicans were the senior partners in the relationship. When Guadalajara's leader was arrested in 1989, the group's remaining capos, including a young Guzmán, divided up its trafficking routes, creating the Sinaloa, Juárez, and Tijuana cartels. These gangs soon became locked in a series of turf wars that have killed more than 60,000 people. But throughout the bloodshed, El Chapo's organization has continued to grow.¶ Why has Sinaloa succeeded?¶ The 5-foot-6 Guzmán may be a grade school dropout, but he's also "a logistical genius," said Jack Riley, the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration's Chicago division. He's trafficked cocaine from Colombia to Mexico in small private planes, in the luggage of airline passengers, and on the cartel's own 747s. Sinaloa has also moved cocaine on custom-built $1 million submarines. El Chapo, 56, has shown similar ingenuity moving drugs from Mexico to the U.S. He's built scores of tunnels under the border, some of which are air-conditioned and boast half-mile-long trolley lines. He's sent drugs through U.S. checkpoints in hidden car compartments, in cans of jalapeños, and in the bellies of frozen shark carcasses. Once in the U.S., the drugs are ferried to warehouses in Chicago — which Guzmán has called his "home port" — before being divided up and distributed across the nation.¶ Why Chicago?¶ It's the transportation hub of America. The city is located within a day's drive of 70 percent of the nation's population, and is crisscrossed by major interstate highways and railway lines. Chicago is also a huge drug market in its own right. Some 86 percent of people arrested in Cook County in 2012 tested positive for at least one illegal narcotic — the highest percentage of any big U.S. city. With his monopoly in the city, Guzmán doubled wholesale heroin prices, thus cutting profit margins for street dealers. That fueled greater competition for turf and exacerbated Chicago's epidemic of gang violence. "It used to be honor among thieves," said Harold Ward, a former gang member turned anti-violence campaigner. "Now, it's by any means necessary."¶ How violent is the cartel?¶ Sinaloa can be exceedingly brutal — it left 14 severed heads in iceboxes outside a mayor's office in the northern Mexican city of Nuevo Laredo in 2012. But compared with other cartel leaders, El Chapo is a practical businessman who prefers "bribe over bullet." He invests millions in corrupting police and government officials in Mexico rather than intimidating them with violence. "There is a level-headedness about [Sinaloa's] leadership that the other groups lack," said Malcolm Beith, author of a book on Guzmán titled The Last Narco. Some observers claim that this fact has led both Mexican and U.S. authorities to go easy on Sinaloa.¶ Is that allegation true?¶ A 2010 National Public Radio investigation of Mexican arrest records noted that Sinaloa had suffered notably fewer arrests than other cartels. U.S. court documents also show that top Sinaloa officials regularly met with DEA agents between 2006 and 2012 and fed them intelligence about rival cartels, helping law enforcement crush their competitors. U.S. and Mexican officials have denied showing any favoritism toward Sinaloa, and the DEA has arrested several high-ranking cartel members in recent years, including Jesús Vicente Zambada Niebla, the son of the organization's No. 2 leader, Ismael Zambada. In a rare 2010 interview, the senior Zambada said that such arrests had no effect on the cartel, and that its drugs would keep flowing north even if El Chapo were brought down. "When it comes to the capos, jailed, dead, or extradited," he said, "their replacements are ready."

#### Increased weed innovation and reduced weed prices don’t shut down cartels, but make them transform to worse markets – meth, coke, sex trafficking, and heroin

Ioan Grillo 15, 2-9-2015, [Based in Mexico City, Ioan Grillo was GlobalPost senior correspondent covering Mexico and Latin America. "As US marijuana legalization spreads, Mexican 'mota' takes a dive," World from PRX, https://www.pri.org/stories/2015-02-09/us-marijuana-legalization-spreads-mexican-mota-takes-dive]//anop

MEXICO CITY — As President Barack Obama trumpets that the United States economy is back on track, industry groups are shouting over who’s growing faster. The accounting sector boasted 2014 growth of 11 percent; computer systems of 14 percent; and real estate of a whopping 23 percent, says financial information group Sageworks. However, one industry may have beaten those hands down: legal marijuana. 2/4 According to a new report by The ArcView Group, a cannabis industry investment and research firm based in California, legal marijuana sales rocketed 74 percent in 2014 to a new high of $2.7 billion. And with more states legalizing weed — Alaska, Oregon and Washington, DC, voted to join the legal stoners in November — it predicts this growth pace could continue for several more years straight. However, winners in some places often mean losers in others. And the losers appear to be south of the Rio Grande: Mexican marijuana growers, who’ve provided the lion’s share of cannabis for American smokers for decades. In 2014, the US Border Patrol saw a plunge in seizures of pot heading northward. Its agents nabbed 1.9 million pounds of ganja, a 24 percent reduction compared with the 2.5 million seized in 2011 — before Colorado and Washington State first voted to legalize recreational marijuana. Capturing less drugs doesn’t necessarily mean less drugs are coming over. Agents could be working less or focusing more on other problems. Yet one sign they are as vigilant as ever is that they made increased seizures of some other drugs, especially crystal meth, which was busted in record quantities. More from GlobalPost: Here’s a meth cook who’s helping boost Mexico’s drug traffic to the US Mexican security forces have also noted a dive in marijuana production. In the most recent figures released in September, the Mexican government said that it had seized 971 metric tons (1,070 US tons) of cannabis inside Mexico in 2013, the lowest amount since 2000. “It looks like the US market for illegal Mexican marijuana will keep shrinking.” “In the long run, it looks like the US market for illegal Mexican marijuana will keep shrinking,” says Alejandro Hope, a drug expert in Mexico. “The logic of the legal marijuana market is that it will force prices down. This would take out the big profits from the illegal market. A good way to make some money could be to short the prices of marijuana.” As well as price problems, Mexican producers also have to compete with quality. The legal US suppliers focus on high-grade weed, selling brands with glamorous names like “Skunk Red Hair,” “Sky Dog” and “Super Haze” in the S section of the shelves, to “Hypno,” “Hindu Kush” and “Himalayan Gold” if you look under H. They are often labeled with their exact amount of THC, the ingredient that gets you intoxicated. They are also graded for their mix of indica, the strain that makes users stoned in a more knockout way, and sativa, which hits people in a more psychedelic way. 3/4 On the other hand, Mexican marijuana, known here as “mota,” is a mass-produced lowergrade crop, grown mostly outdoors in the mountains. It doesn’t have a fancy brand name, or tell you how spaced out or sleepy you will feel; it will just get you wasted. Hitting the cartels Drug smugglers, some wearing life vests, carry loads of marijuana, according to US federal agents, as seen from a helicopter flown by the US Office of Air and Marine in September near Rio Grande City, Texas. When advocates campaigned to legalize weed in Colorado and Washington states in 2012, they argued it was better to take the cash away from Mexican cartels and put it into taxes. Former President Vicente Fox also made this case after leaving office when he visited a university in Boulder, Colo., in 2011. “The drug consumer in the US yields billions of dollars, money that goes back to Mexico to bribe police and money that buys guns,” Fox said. “So when you question yourselves [sic] about what is going on in Mexico, it depends very much on what happens in this nation.” If Mexican marijuana is now sinking, it could indeed be reducing cartels’ budgets to commit mass murder. Mexico’s total homicides have gone down during the time that some US states legalized grass. Killings reached a peak in 2011 of 22,852, and then dropped to 15,649 last year, according to the Mexican government’s numbers. However, other aspects could have played a role, too. Among them are the capture or killing of some of the most brutal drug lords, including Heriberto “The Executioner” Lazcano, the head of the Zetas cartel whom Mexican marines gunned down in 2012. Mexican gangs also have a range of other businesses. Not only do they traffic crystal meth, heroin and cocaine, they have also diversified into crimes from sex trafficking to illegal iron mining. More from GlobalPost: How Mexico’s cartel crackdown smashed its iron industry Mexican meth and heroin appear to have gone up as marijuana has dropped — at least, if narcotics seizures are the gauge. Last year, the US seized a record 34,840 pounds of methamphetamine at the Mexican border. Still, longtime experts in illegal markets say there may not be any correlation between the hikes in some drugs and dives in others. “There are lots of variables at play here, complicated factors of both demand and supply that create the markets in these drugs,” says Sanho Tree, director of the Drug Policy Project at Washington’s Institute of Policy Studies. 4/4 “One reason for the rise in heroin use is that many doctors have over-prescribed opiate drugs to patients,” he adds, referring to legal pain treatments. “The patients have got hooked and have later turned to the illegal heroin.” But there’s another factor that could seriously affect marijuana market trends: Mexico could itself legalize it. In 2009, the country decriminalized the possession of small amounts of drugs, including marijuana. And citizens here as elsewhere were amazed when Uruguay became the first entire country to legalize weed in 2013. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto has spoken against legalization but says he’s open to debate. Former President Fox is an advocate and even said he would like to team up with an American entrepreneur to import it to the United States. If Mexico did legalize the plant, its cheaper labor costs could give it an edge over US producers. And while some consumers could want the higher-grade California strains, others could still choose the cheapest price. “Cannabis is not unlike wine,” Tree says. “I can buy a $200 bottle of wine, if that is what I am after. But many people will prefer the cheaper, mass-market product. And if all the prohibition factors are taken out, then marijuana is really just an herb that can be produced very cheaply.” Want a seat at the table? Every morning, the editorial team at public radio’s international news show The World meets to plan what they'll cover that day. Want to see what's on deck? Sign up for our daily newsletter TOP OF THE WORLD and get the big stories we’re tracking delivered to your inbox every weekday morning.

#### Laundry list of alt causes – other more potent drugs, still importing cannabis even though it’s legalized which turns case, and controlling and killing public officials which independently causes Mexican instability.

CFR ’21 [The Council on Foreign Relations, founded in 1921, is a United States nonprofit think tank specializing in U.S. foreign policy and international affairs, “Mexico’s Long War: Drugs, Crime, and the Cartels”, 02-26-2021, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/mexicos-long-war-drugs-crime-and-cartels]//pranav

Mexican drug trafficking groups—sometimes referred to as transnational criminal organizations—dominate the import and distribution of cocaine, fentanyl, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine in the United States. Mexican suppliers are responsible for most heroin and methamphetamine production, while cocaine is largely produced in Colombia and then transported to the United States by Mexican criminal organizations. Mexico, along with China, is also a leading source of fentanyl, a synthetic opioid many times more potent than heroin. The amount of fentanyl seized by Mexican authorities nearly quintupled between 2019 and 2020. At the same time, the cartels smuggle vast quantities of marijuana into the United States, even though some U.S. jurisdictions have legalized it. Mexico’s drug cartels are in a constant state of flux. Over the decades, they have grown, splintered, forged new alliances, and battled one another for territory. The cartels that pose the most significant drug trafficking threats [PDF] to the United States, according to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), are: Sinaloa Cartel. Formerly led by Joaquin “El Chapo” Guzman, Sinaloa is one of Mexico’s oldest and most influential drug trafficking groups. With strongholds in the northwest and along Mexico’s Pacific coast, it has a larger international footprint than any of its Mexican rivals. In 2017, Mexican authorities extradited Guzman to the United States, where he is serving a life sentence for multiple drug-related charges. Jalisco New Generation Cartel. Also known as CJNG, Jalisco splintered from Sinaloa in 2010 and is among Mexico’s swiftest-growing cartels, with operations in more than two-thirds of Mexico’s states. According to the DEA, the “rapid expansion of its drug trafficking activities is characterized by the organization’s willingness to engage in violent confrontations” with authorities and other cartels. U.S. officials link the cartel to more than one-third of the drugs in the United States. Juarez Cartel. A long-standing rival of Sinaloa, Juarez has its stronghold in the north-central state of Chihuahua, across the border from New Mexico and Texas. Gulf Cartel. Its base of power is in the northeast, especially the state of Tamaulipas. In the past decade, Gulf has splintered into various factions, diluting its strength as it battles for territory with Los Zetas. Los Zetas. Originally a paramilitary enforcement arm for the Gulf Cartel, Los Zetas was singled out by the DEA in 2007 as the country’s most “technologically advanced, sophisticated, and violent” group of its kind. It splintered from Gulf in 2010 and held sway over swaths of eastern, central, and southern Mexico. However, it has lost power in recent years and fractured into rival wings. Beltran-Leyva Organization. The group formed when the Beltran-Leyva brothers split from Sinaloa in 2008. Since then, all four brothers have been arrested or killed, but their loyalists operate throughout Mexico. The organization’s splinter groups have become more autonomous and powerful, maintaining ties to Jalisco, Juarez, and Los Zetas. Experts point to both domestic and international forces. In Mexico, the cartels use a portion of their vast profits to pay off judges, police, and politicians. They also coerce officials into cooperating; assassinations of public servants are relatively common. The cartels flourished during the decades that Mexico was ruled by a single party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI). Within this centralized political structure, drug trafficking groups cultivated a wide network of corrupt officials through which they were able to gain distribution rights, market access, and protection. The PRI’s unbroken reign finally ended in 2000 with the election of President Vicente Fox of the National Action Party (PAN). With new politicians in power, cartels ramped up violence against the government in an effort to reestablish their hold [PDF] on the state. At the international level, Mexican cartels began to take on a much larger role in the late 1980s, after U.S. government agencies broke up Caribbean networks used by Colombian cartels to smuggle cocaine. Mexican gangs eventually shifted from being couriers for Colombian criminal organizations to being wholesalers. The U.S. government, despite waging a “war on drugs” and conducting other counternarcotics efforts abroad, has made little progress in reducing the demand for illegal drugs. In 2016, Americans spent almost $150 billion on cocaine, heroin, marijuana, and methamphetamine, 50 percent more than in 2010. Meanwhile, growing use of synthetic opioids, including fentanyl, has contributed to a public health crisis.