### 1NC – T

#### Interp: Reduce is immediate---present tense

Pasttenses n.d [Reduce past tense, <https://pasttenses.com/reduce-past-tense>] RM

reduce verb forms

Infinitive Present Participle **Past Tense** Past Participle

reduce reducing reduced **reduced**

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

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

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

#### Violation: Delay means to postpone

USLegal n.d. [“Delay law and legal definition” https://definitions.uslegal.com/d/delay/] RM

Delay means the act of postponing or slowing. For example, the counsel asked continuance solely for the purpose of delaying the case. It also means an instance at which something is postponed or slowed. For example, the delay in starting the trial made it difficult for all the witnesses to attend. It also refer to the period during which something is postponed or slowed.

In Civil law delay refers to the period within which a party to a suit must take some action, such as perfecting an appeal or responding to a written-discovery request.

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – T

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

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

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

1. Generics and Logical Form

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

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

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

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

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

#### Violation: They spec

#### Net benefits -

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – DA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Grid collapse causes extinction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – K

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Neoliberal exploitation causes extinction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Case

### 1NC – Case

#### They have to prove legalization is coming now GLOBALLY, otherwise vote neg on presumption because terrorists will teal carfentanil from Philippines, India, China, etc.

#### Marijuana causes emissions

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

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

#### Increased warming causes extinction. Sliding scale – these things are already likely

McKibben 19 – Schumann Distinguished Scholar at Middlebury College; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences Bill, 4/9. "This Is How Human Extinction Could Play Out." Rolling Stone. 4-9-2019. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/bill-mckibben-falter-climate-change-817310/> recut gord0

Oh, it could get very bad.

In 2015, a study in the Journal of Mathematical Biology pointed out that if the world’s oceans kept warming, by 2100 they might become hot enough to “stop oxygen production by phyto-plankton by disrupting the process of photosynthesis.” Given that two-thirds of the Earth’s oxygen comes from phytoplankton, that would “likely result in the mass mortality of animals and humans.”

A year later, above the Arctic Circle, in Siberia, a heat wave thawed a reindeer carcass that had been trapped in the permafrost. The exposed body released anthrax into nearby water and soil, infecting two thousand reindeer grazing nearby, and they in turn infected some humans; a twelve-year-old boy died. As it turns out, permafrost is a “very good preserver of microbes and viruses, because it is cold, there is no oxygen, and it is dark” — scientists have managed to revive an eight-million-year-old bacterium they found beneath the surface of a glacier. Researchers believe there are fragments of the Spanish flu virus, smallpox, and bubonic plague buried in Siberia and Alaska.

Or consider this: as ice sheets melt, they take weight off land, and that can trigger earthquakes — seismic activity is already increasing in Greenland and Alaska. Meanwhile, the added weight of the new seawater starts to bend the Earth’s crust. “That will give you a massive increase in volcanic activity. It’ll activate faults to create earthquakes, submarine landslides, tsunamis, the whole lot,” explained the director of University College London’s Hazard Centre. Such a landslide happened in Scandinavia about eight thousand years ago, as the last Ice Age retreated and a Kentucky-size section of Norway’s continental shelf gave way, “plummeting down to the abyssal plain and creating a series of titanic waves that roared forth with a vengeance,” wiping all signs of life from coastal Norway to Greenland and “drowning the Wales-sized landmass that once connected Britain to the Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany.” When the waves hit the Shetlands, they were sixty-five feet high.

There’s even this: if we keep raising carbon dioxide levels, we may not be able to think straight anymore. At a thousand parts per million (which is within the realm of possibility for 2100), human cognitive ability falls 21 percent. “The largest effects were seen for Crisis Response, Information Usage, and Strategy,” a Harvard study reported, which is too bad, as those skills are what we seem to need most.

I could, in other words, do my best to scare you silly. I’m not opposed on principle — changing something as fundamental as the composition of the atmosphere, and hence the heat balance of the planet, is certain to trigger all manner of horror, and we shouldn’t shy away from it. The dramatic uncertainty that lies ahead may be the most frightening development of all; the physical world is going from backdrop to foreground. (It’s like the contrast between politics in the old days, when you could forget about Washington for weeks at a time, and politics in the Trump era, when the president is always jumping out from behind a tree to yell at you.)

But let’s try to occupy ourselves with the most likely scenarios, because they are more than disturbing enough. Long before we get to tidal waves or smallpox, long before we choke to death or stop thinking clearly, we will need to concentrate on the most mundane and basic facts: everyone needs to eat every day, and an awful lot of us live near the ocean.

FOOD SUPPLY first. We’ve had an amazing run since the end of World War II, with crop yields growing fast enough to keep ahead of a fast-rising population. It’s come at great human cost — displaced peasant farmers fill many of the planet’s vast slums — but in terms of sheer volume, the Green Revolution’s fertilizers, pesticides, and machinery managed to push output sharply upward. That climb, however, now seems to be running into the brute facts of heat and drought. There are studies to demonstrate the dire effects of warming on coffee, cacao, chickpeas, and champagne, but it is cereals that we really need to worry about, given that they supply most of the planet’s calories: corn, wheat, and rice all evolved as crops in the climate of the last ten thousand years, and though plant breeders can change them, there are limits to those changes. You can move a person from Hanoi to Edmonton, and she might decide to open a Vietnamese restaurant. But if you move a rice plant, it will die.

A 2017 study in Australia, home to some of the world’s highest-tech farming, found that “wheat productivity has flatlined as a direct result of climate change.” After tripling between 1900 and 1990, wheat yields had stagnated since, as temperatures increased a degree and rainfall declined by nearly a third. “The chance of that just being variable climate without the underlying factor [of climate change] is less than one in a hundred billion,” the researchers said, and it meant that despite all the expensive new technology farmers kept introducing, “they have succeeded only in standing still, not in moving forward.” Assuming the same trends continued, yields would actually start to decline inside of two decades, they reported. In June 2018, researchers found that a two-degree Celsius rise in temperature — which, recall, is what the Paris accords are now aiming for — could cut U.S. corn yields by 18 percent. A four-degree increase — which is where our current trajectory will take us — would cut the crop almost in half. The United States is the world’s largest producer of corn, which in turn is the planet’s most widely grown crop.

Corn is vulnerable because even a week of high temperatures at the key moment can keep it from fertilizing. (“You only get one chance to pollinate a quadrillion kernels of corn,” the head of a commodity consulting firm explained.) But even the hardiest crops are susceptible. Sorghum, for instance, which is a staple for half a billion humans, is particularly hardy in dry conditions because it has big, fibrous roots that reach far down into the earth. Even it has limits, though, and they are being reached. Thirty years of data from the American Midwest show that heat waves affect the “vapor pressure deficit,” the difference between the water vapor in the sorghum leaf’s interior and that in the surrounding air. Hotter weather means the sorghum releases more moisture into the atmosphere. Warm the planet’s temperature by two degrees Celsius — which is, again, now the world’s goal — and sorghum yields drop 17 percent. Warm it five degrees Celsius (nine degrees Fahrenheit), and yields drop almost 60 percent.

It’s hard to imagine a topic duller than sorghum yields. It’s the precise opposite of clickbait. But people have to eat; in the human game, the single most important question is probably “What’s for dinner?” And when the answer is “Not much,” things deteriorate fast. In 2010 a severe heat wave hit Russia, and it wrecked the grain harvest, which led the Kremlin to ban exports. The global price of wheat spiked, and that helped trigger the Arab Spring — Egypt at the time was the largest wheat importer on the planet. That experience set academics and insurers to work gaming out what the next food shock might look like. In 2017 one team imagined a vigorous El Niño, with the attendant floods and droughts — for a season, in their scenario, corn and soy yields declined by 10 percent, and wheat and rice by 7 percent. The result was chaos: “quadrupled commodity prices, civil unrest, significant negative humanitarian consequences . . . Food riots break out in urban areas across the Middle East, North Africa, and Latin America. The euro weakens and the main European stock markets lose ten percent.”

At about the same time, a team of British researchers released a study demonstrating that even if you can grow plenty of food, the transportation system that distributes it runs through just fourteen major choke-points, and those are vulnerable to — you guessed it — massive disruption from climate change. For instance, U.S. rivers and canals carry a third of the world’s corn and soy, and they’ve been frequently shut down or crimped by flooding and drought in recent years. Brazil accounts for 17 percent of the world’s grain exports, but heavy rainfall in 2017 stranded three thousand trucks. “It’s the glide path to a perfect storm,” said one of the report’s authors.

Five weeks after that, another report raised an even deeper question. What if you can figure out how to grow plenty of food, and you can figure out how to guarantee its distribution, but the food itself has lost much of its value? The paper, in the journal Environmental Research, said that rising carbon dioxide levels, by speeding plant growth, seem to have reduced the amount of protein in basic staple crops, a finding so startling that, for many years, agronomists had overlooked hints that it was happening. But it seems to be true: when researchers grow grain at the carbon dioxide levels we expect for later this century, they find that minerals such as calcium and iron drop by 8 percent, and protein by about the same amount. In the developing world, where people rely on plants for their protein, that means huge reductions in nutrition: India alone could lose 5 percent of the protein in its total diet, putting 53 million people at new risk for protein deficiency. The loss of zinc, essential for maternal and infant health, could endanger 138 million people around the world. In 2018, rice researchers found “significantly less protein” when they grew eighteen varieties of rice in high–carbon dioxide test plots. “The idea that food became less nutritious was a surprise,” said one researcher. “It’s not intuitive. But I think we should continue to expect surprises. We are completely altering the biophysical conditions that underpin our food system.” And not just ours. People don’t depend on goldenrod, for instance, but bees do. When scientists looked at samples of goldenrod in the Smithsonian that dated back to 1842, they found that the protein content of its pollen had “declined by a third since the industrial revolution — and the change closely tracks with the rise in carbon dioxide.”

Bees help crops, obviously, so that’s scary news. But in August 2018, a massive new study found something just as frightening: crop pests were thriving in the new heat. “It gets better and better for them,” said one University of Colorado researcher. Even if we hit the UN target of limiting temperature rise to two degrees Celsius, pests should cut wheat yields by 46 percent, corn by 31 percent, and rice by 19 percent. “Warmer temperatures accelerate the metabolism of insect pests like aphids and corn borers at a predictable rate,” the researchers found. “That makes them hungrier[,] and warmer temperatures also speed up their reproduction.” Even fossilized plants from fifty million years ago make the point: “Plant damage from insects correlated with rising and falling temperatures, reaching a maximum during the warmest periods.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Continued biodiversity loss causes extinction -turns water scarcity bc ecosystem services

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### No resource wars from water scarcity

Allouche, 11 - Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex (Jeremy,. "The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade" Food Policy, Volume 36, Supplement 1, January 2011, Science Direct)

Water/food resources, war and conflict The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change **and greater inputs of capital** have **dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture.** More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries **humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable**. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an **instrumental purpose**; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level. In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none **of these declarations have been followed up by military action**. The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems. None **of the** various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18). As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, **more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale** (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 ([FAO, 1978] and [FAO, 1984]). The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however **no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict**. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example [Allouche, 2005], [Allouche, 2007] and [Rouyer, 2000]). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians ([Dinar and Dinar, 2005] and [Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006]). In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity **does not make much sense in the light of the recent** historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable. The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict ([Brauch, 2002] and [Pervis and Busby, 2004]). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, **the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin** ([Barnett and Adger, 2007] and [Kevane and Gray, 2008]).

#### Cannabis causes ag loss from plant diseases

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

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

#### Ag key to food security

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### A swath of research proves that increased marijuana devastates educational competitiveness

Bennett and White 15—former Secretary of Education and Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, currently Washington Fellow of the Claremont Institute and Senior Advisor to Project Lead The Way AND Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Environmental and Community Medicine, University of Medicine and Dentistry, Rutgers University Medical School, and Adjunct Instructor at Seton Hall University School of Law

(William and Robert, *Going to Pot: Why the Rush to Legalize Marijuana Is Harming America*, pg 3-7, kindle edition, dml)

The ancient Greeks believed that societies’ views were often shaped by the leadership of their regime. If this is true, even in part, we can see why public opinion has moved the way it has , toward de-stigmatization and legalization. Should we not be asking, is marijuana as innocent as these and other leaders say? Enter this query into a search engine: “Marijuana teen brain.” As of this writing, this is but a small sampling of what we found: Marijuana May Hurt the Developing Teen Brain Heavy Marijuana Use Alters Teenage Brain Structure Marijuana: Why It’s Still a Big Deal If Your Teen Smokes Pot Perception of Marijuana as a “Safe Drug” Is Scientifically Inaccurate Teen Pot Use Could Hurt Brain and Memory, New Research Suggests Marijuana Use Linked to Concerning Brain Changes in Teens Teen Marijuana Use Linked to Lower IQ in Later Life Study Says Smoking Marijuana Worse for Lungs Than Cigarettes Pot Increases Heart Attack Risks Teenagers Who Smoke Cannabis Damage Their Brains for Life Smoking Marijuana as Teen May Have Lasting Brain Effects 4 These stories come from a wide variety of sources, including NPR, Psychology Today, Science Daily, NBC, CBS , and the Daily Mail of London. A sampling of these stories’ researchers and sources? The brain imaging and neuropsychology lab at the University of Wisconsin– Milwaukee, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, the University of Montreal, New York’s Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, the National Academy of Sciences, Boston’s Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Harvard Medical School, and the University of Maryland School of Medicine. Now perform one other Internet search for us: “marijuana psychosis.” Again, a modest sampling of what came up with the search engine we used: The Cannabis-Psychosis Link Marijuana May Both Trigger and Suppress Psychosis How Marijuana May Drive the Brain into Psychosis Prolonged Cannabis Use Linked to Psychosis Marijuana Use Linked to Risk of Psychotic Symptoms Teens Who Smoke Pot at Risk for Later Schizophrenia, Psychosis Marijuana Use Precedes Psychosis 5 Some of the sources include Psychiatric Times, Time magazine, LiveScience, Medical News Today, WebMD, and Reuters, and they are based on studies and analysis from such esteemed entities as the Department of Psychosis at King’s College London; the Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, Australia; the South Limburg Mental Health Research and Teaching Network of Maastricht University Medical Centre; Children’s National Medical Center in Washington, D.C.; Harvard Medical School; the University of Wisconsin; Duke University; Northwestern University; University of Montreal; New York’s Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; Oxford University Press’s Schizophrenia Bulletin; the New England Journal of Medicine; the University of Maryland; the Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology; the Imperial College London; University College London; the Journal of Psychoactive Drugs; and the Archives of General Psychiatry, to list a sampling. Any number of reasons have been used to justify legalization. Some people simply do not know of the current research on marijuana use or marijuana potency. But even dismissing the long-lasting and permanent serious health effects, if brain, lung, and heart function are not a worry for some, what of Governor Jerry Brown’s point: decreased motivation and ambition? Do our students today— from elementary and secondary schools to colleges and universities— have the motivation and ambition, never mind health and brain power, to establish themselves, participate, and contribute to the increasingly competitive economy? Is there a single economist or corporate leader today who looks at the next generation’s work ethic, schooling, and brainpower and sees no problem? Is this not the reason so many argue for more funding for early childhood education programs, as well as more money for our schools generally? The science is in on this, making every dollar spent on improving our children’s education **a waste** when it is countered by marijuana use. To wit: “The stereotype of pot smokers as lackadaisical loafers is supported by new research: People who smoke marijuana regularly over long periods of time tend to produce less of a chemical in the brain that is linked to motivation.” 6 The study, out of one of Great Britain’s finest schools of medicine, reveals what was self-evident. Nevertheless, here’s the science: “Long-term cannabis users tended to produce less dopamine, a ‘feel good’ chemical in the brain that plays an important role in motivation and reward-driven behavior.” This effect on dopamine levels will have other consequences for marijuana users as well—changing the developing brain in its pleasure reception and transmission. It is this effect that leads marijuana users to higher doses, higher concentrations of THC, and other, harder, drugs. Similarly, it leads marijuana users to an ignorance of their self-destruction. As psychiatrist Robert DuPont, the president of the Institute for Behavior and Health, has written: The fact that marijuana does not cause a hangover the way alcohol commonly does after heavy use is not an advantage at all. Marijuana stays in the brain for a long time so that the brain is still experiencing the effects from pot smoking days after the drug use has stopped, in contrast to alcohol use… Unlike cocaine, which often brings users to their knees, marijuana claims its victims in a slower and more cruel fashion. It robs many of them of their desire to grow and improve, often making heavy users settle for what is left over in life… Marijuana makes its users lose their purpose and their will, as well as their memory and motivation. Marijuana smokers do not often come into treatment for their addiction simply because neither they nor those around them can differentiate their true selves from the effects of their drug use. They commonly just sink lower and lower in their performance and in their goals in life as their pot smoking continues. Their hopes and lives literally go up in marijuana smoke. 7

#### Maintaining an educational edge is the linchpin of economic leadership

Gordon 13—distinguished fellow at the Council on Competitiveness, former Chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee

(Bart, “U.S. Competitiveness: The Education Imperative”, <http://issues.org/23-3/gordon/>, dml)

U.S. competitiveness and the country’s standing among our global counterparts have been persistent issues in public policy debates for the past 20 years. Most recently they have come to prominence with the publication of reports from the National Academies, the Electronics Industries Alliance, and the Council on Competitiveness, each of which argues that the United States is in danger of losing out in the economic competition of the 21st century. There is no single cause for the concerns being raised, and there is no single policy prescription available to address them. However, there is widespread agreement that one necessary condition for ensuring future economic success and a sustained high standard of living for our citizens is an education system that provides each of them with a solid grounding in math and science and prepares students to succeed in science and engineering careers. Unless the United States maintains its edge in innovation, which is founded on a well-trained creative workforce, the best jobs may soon be found overseas. If current trends continue, along with a lack of action, today’s children may grow up with a lower standard of living than their parents. Providing high-quality jobs for hard-working Americans must be our first priority. Indeed, it should be the central goal of any policy in Congress to advance U.S. competitiveness. The United States is in direct competition with countries that recognize the importance of developing their human resources. The numbers and quality of scientists and engineers being educated elsewhere, notably in China and India, continue to increase, and the capabilities of broadband communications networks make access to scientific and engineering talent possible wherever it exists. The result is that U.S. scientists and engineers must compete against their counterparts in other countries, where living standards and wages are often well below those of the United States. Policies for maintaining U.S. competitiveness must consider how to ensure that U.S. scientists and engineers are educated to have the skills and abilities that will be in demand by industry and will allow them to command salaries that will sustain our current living standards.

#### International armed conflict is existenial

Richard N. Haass 13, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, 4/30/13, “The World Without America,” <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass>

Let me posit a radical idea: The most critical threat facing the United States now and for the foreseeable future is not a rising China, a reckless North Korea, a nuclear Iran, modern terrorism, or climate change. Although all of these constitute potential or actual threats, the biggest challenges facing the US are its burgeoning debt, crumbling infrastructure, second-rate primary and secondary schools, outdated immigration system, and slow economic growth – in short, the domestic foundations of American power. Readers in other countries may be tempted to react to this judgment with a dose of schadenfreude, finding more than a little satisfaction in America’s difficulties. Such a response should not be surprising. The US and those representing it have been guilty of hubris (the US may often be the indispensable nation, but it would be better if others pointed this out), and examples of inconsistency between America’s practices and its principles understandably provoke charges of hypocrisy. When America does not adhere to the principles that it preaches to others, it breeds resentment. But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America’s imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. America’s failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price. Indeed, the rest of the world’s stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself. Part of the reason is economic. The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America’s capacity to consume other countries’ goods and services will increase, thereby boosting growth around the world. At a time when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US (or, more broadly, North America) has the potential to drive global economic recovery. The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world’s citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. This technology is now making its way around the globe, allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions. The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish. People and governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding. Finally, the world faces many serious challenges, ranging from the need to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fight climate change, and maintain a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace, improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts. These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out. While Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” may ensure the success of free markets, it is powerless in the world of geopolitics. Order requires the visible hand of leadership to formulate and realize global responses to global challenges. Don’t get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world’s problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding. But multilateralism is much easier to advocate than to design and implement. Right now there is only one candidate for this role: the US. No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook. This brings me back to the argument that the US must put its house in order – economically, physically, socially, and politically – if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world. Everyone should hope that it does: The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all. Such a world would almost certainly be characterized by chronic crisis and conflict. That would be bad not just for Americans, but for the vast majority of the planet’s inhabitants.

#### 5) No LA prolif – constitution and reputation.

Oppenheimer ’9 [Andres; October 2009; Miami Herald writer; “Brazil a nuclear power? Probably not”; http://npsglobal.org/eng/component/content/article/147-articles/741-brazil-a-nuclear-power-probably-not-andres-oppenheimer.html] Dhruv

Last week, I interviewed Brazil Defense Minister Nelson Jobim, and asked him whether his country is planning to build nuclear weapons. ``No, it was a mistake on the part of the vice president,'' Jobim said. ``There are two reasons why it's prohibited for Brazil to develop nuclear weapons: The Brazilian Constitution bans the use and production of nuclear weapons and international agreements signed by Brazil prohibit it as well.'' He added that Brazil will develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, which is allowed under international treaties. That will include construction of a nuclear-fueled submarine that will be faster than conventional submarines, but that will have no nuclear weapons, he said. Asked about Gen. Barros Moreira's 2007 statements, the defense minister said, ``The general you are talking about was also speaking for himself.'' I asked several academics which Brazilian officials we should believe. Cristina Eguizabal, director of Florida International University's Latin American and Caribbean Center, said she believes that the defense minister speaks for the government and for Brazil's political establishment. ``Brazil's foreign policy project is one of becoming a respected regional power, but not an anti-systemic pariah power,'' she said. ``Developing nuclear weapons would put it alongside `undesirable' states, such as Iran or North Korea.'' Jose Azel, a senior research associate at the University of Miami, said that Brazil's top foreign policy priority is to obtain a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. ``Perhaps this talk about developing nuclear weapons is a way of creating some political buzz to obtain that position,'' he said.

#### 6) No war with Russia in LA

Trenin 19 Dr. Dmitri Vitalyevich Trenin, PhD is the director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, a think tank and regional affiliate of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, former senior research fellow at NATO Defense College. [Fears of World War III are overblown, 5-3-2019, [https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-vladimir-putin-nato-crimea-fears-of-world-war-iii-are-overblown/]//BPS](https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-vladimir-putin-nato-crimea-fears-of-world-war-iii-are-overblown/%5d//BPS)

NATO is still very much exerting pressure on Russia. It's considered more of an annoyance than an immediate threat in Moscow, but also keeps the country in permanent "war mode" vis-à-vis the U.S. Because Moscow is focused on Washington, this means Europeans usually get a pass. As for Russia’s own intentions, two things are clear. There is no interest in Moscow in attacking the Baltic states or Poland. These countries are as safe now as they were before 2014. Suggestions otherwise simply point to the deep wounds in both nations' psyche, which will not be healed for many decades. Should Ukraine's leaders decide to repeat Mikheil Saakashvili’s mistake in 2008 and launch a major offensive to retake Donbas — however unlikely — the Russian response could indeed be devastating and lead to Ukraine's loss of sovereignty, as Putin recently stated. But does this mean Russia will move on Ukraine unprovoked? Most certainly not. Putin's main concerns are largely domestic. He has an ambitious program that logically calls for more economic ties with the West. To move forward, he is looking to ease tensions with the EU and the U.S. What Putin wanted to get out of Helsinki was mainly to start a dialogue with Washington. Those hopes are now visibly going up in smoke. It is safe to bet that Russia will continue to face the same opposition from a coalition of U.S. and EU interests. The first détente in the hybrid war between Russia and the West was indeed nipped in the bud by Trump's behavior and the vehemence of his domestic critics. So be it. Moscow will not capitulate, and will indeed push back. But it's not likely to take the form of an aggressive, overt military attack. Fears of new wars are far from accurate. Moscow's strategy should now be one of patience, leaving America and Europe to their own devices and focusing on relations with countries far more relevant to its future: Asia and the Middle East.

#### no great power intervention in Latin America

Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich 13, \* President of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. 21-year career in the U.S. Army. Formerly served the Department of Defense Office of Net Assessment; for three secretaries of defense; the National Defense Panel; the Defense Science Board Task Force on Joint Experimentation, and the Defense Policy Board. West Point graduate, he holds an M.P.A. and a Ph.D. from Harvard University—AND—\*\*Eric Lindsey analyst at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments B.A. in military history and public policy from Duke University and is pursuing an M.A. in strategic studies and international economics from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS). “Hemispheric Defense in the 21ST Century, 2013, DOA: 7-30-14

Implications for the U.S. and Other Major Powers The preceding narrative suggests that the combat potential of irregular forces is likely to increase dramatically in the coming years. As this occurs, the cost of operating conventional forces—especially ground forces—and defending key military support infrastructure is likely to rise substantially. Given these considerations the United States and other major powers external to the Western Hemisphere will have strong incentives to avoid the use of conventional forms of military power, particularly large ground forces, in favor of employing irregular proxy forces to advance their interests. Moreover, the high cost and questionable bene􀂿t of the campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq are likely to create strong domestic opposition in the United States to such operations for some time to come. This must be added to the United States’ greatly diminished 􀂿scal standing that has led to large cuts in planned investments in defense. These factors suggest that Washington will be much less likely to engage in direct military action in Latin America in the coming years than historically has been the case. At the same time, rivals of the United States like China and Russia may be incentivized by these trends, as well as the United States’ overwhelming military dominance in the Western Hemisphere, to avoid the direct use of force to expand their influence in Latin America. Instead, like some of the Bolivarian Alliance members, they appear likely to follow the path taken by the Soviet Union during the Cold War and Iran today: supporting non-state proxies to impose disproportionate costs on the United States and to distract Washington’s resources and attention from other parts of the world.