### T-Medicines

#### 1] Interpretation – Medicines solely refer to physical substances.

American Heritage Dictionary of Medicine 18 The American Heritage Dictionary of Medicine 2018 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company <https://www.yourdictionary.com/medicine> //Elmer

"A **substance**, **especially a drug**, **used to treat** the signs and symptoms of a **disease**, condition, or injury."

#### 2] Violation – Genomic Medicine is not – it’s an “interdisciplinary medical specialty”.

Roth 19 Stephanie Roth J Med Libr Assoc. 2019 Jul; 107(3): 442–448. Published online 2019 Jul 1. doi: 10.5195/jmla.2019.604 (Biomedical and Research Services Librarian, Ginsburg Health Sciences Library, Temple University, Philadelphia)//Elmer

**Genomic medicine is an interdisciplinary medical specialty involving the use of genomic information** that has rapidly grown since the completion of the Human Genome Project (HGP) more than a decade ago. Definitions of basic concepts of genomic medicine are provided in Table 1.

#### Medical Specialty refers to the field, not a particular substance.

American Heritage Medical Dictionary 7 The American Heritage® Medical Dictionary Copyright © 2007 //Elmer  
A **branch of medicine** or surgery in which a physician specializes; the field or practice of a specialist.

#### Your own solvency advocate concedes it’s a medical discipline”

NHGRI 20  
At the national human genome research institute, we are focused on advances in genomics research. Building on our leadership role in the initial sequencing of the human genome, we collaborate with the world's scientific and medical communities to enhance genomic technologies that accelerate breakthroughs and improve lives. By empowering and expanding the field of genomics, we can benefit all of humankind.   
<https://www.genome.gov/health/Genomics-and-Medicine> (December 2, 2020)

**Genomic medicine is an emerging medical discipline** **that** **involves** **using genomic information** about an individual **as part of** their **clinical care** (e.g. for diagnostic or therapeutic decision-making) and the health outcomes and policy implications of that clinical use.

#### 3] The Standard is Limits – They explode the topic to include therapies, research areas, treatments, drug discovery techniques, etc. that eviscerate a stable locus of predictability. Limits is a sequencing question to Clash and in-depth Education since we’re only able to prepare if there’s stable core controversies.

#### 4] TVA Solves – reduce IP protections on gene-based medicines.

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

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

1NC Procedural o/w 1AR shells –self inflicted scope

### Consult WHO Counterplan

#### Counterplan Text – Member states of the World Trade Organization ought to consult the World Health Organization on whether or not to [do the Plan]. The World Health Organization ought to publicly declare that their decision on [the Plan] will represent their future decisions on all intellectual property protections on medicines.

#### The Plan’s unilateral action by the WTO on medical IP undermines WHO legitimacy – forcing a perception of WHO action against Patents is key to re-assert it – they say yes.

Rimmer 4, Matthew. "The race to patent the SARS virus: the TRIPS agreement and access to essential medicines." Melbourne Journal of International Law 5.2 (2004): 335-374.

<https://law.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1681117/Rimmer.pdf> (BA (Hons), LLB (Hons) (Australian National University), PhD (New South Wales); Lecturer at ACIPA, the Faculty of Law, The Australian National University)//SidK + Elmer

The WHO has been instrumental in coordinating the international network of research on the SARS virus. It has emphasised the need for collaboration between the network participants. The WHO presented the containment of the SARS virus as ‘one of the biggest success stories in public health in recent years’.206 However, it **was less active in the debate over patent law** and public health epidemics. The 56th World Health Assembly considered the relationship between intellectual property, innovation and public health. It stressed that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.207 However, there was much disagreement amongst the member states as to what measures would be appropriate. The WHO has made a number of aspirational statements about patent law and access to essential medicines. Arguably, though, the organisation could be a much more informed and vocal advocate. Initially, the WHO did not view the patent issues related to SARS as being within its field of activities. The agency didnoteven seem aware of the patent proceedings, leaving individual research institutions without guidance. Spokesman Dick Thompson said: ‘What we care about is [that] the international collaboration continues to function. Patents, they don’t really concern us’.208 The director of WHO’s Global Influenza project, Klaus Stöhr, expressed his opinion that the patent filings would not interfere with the international cooperation on the SARS research: ‘I don’t think this will undermine the collaborative spirit of the network of labs’.209 However, he believed that, after the international network of researchers had identified the coronavirus, it was necessary to rely upon companies to commercialise such research. Klaus Stöhr conceded: ‘At a certain point of time you have to give way for competitive pharmaceutical companies’.210 On a policy front, the WHO remained deferential to the WTO over the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines, observing: Owing to the inconclusive nature of the studies conducted to date, and because of the effect that potentially significant price increases could have on access to drugs in poor countries, WHO is currently monitoring and evaluating the effects of TRIPS on the prices of medicines. It is also monitoring the TRIPS impact on other important issues such as transfer of technology, levels of research and development for drugs for neglected diseases, and the evolution of generic drug markets.211 In such a statement, the WHO appears diffident, unwilling to take on more than a spectator role. Such a position is arguably too timid, given the gravity of national emergencies, such as the SARS virus. The organisation could take a much stronger stance on the impact of the **TRIPS** Agreement on public health concerns. The WHO has since enunciated a position statement on the patenting of the SARS virus. A number of high ranking officials from the organisation have commented on the need to ensure that international research into the SARS virus is not impeded by competition over patents. Arguably though, the WHO **should not be limited to a mere spectator role in such policy discussions. It** needstoplay an active advocacy role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. The WHO released a position statement on ‘Patent Applications for the SARS Virus and Genes’ on 29 May 2003.212 The organisation stressed that it had no per se objection to the patenting of the SARS virus: Some people have objected to the SARS patent applications on the ground that the virus and its genes should not be patentable because they are mere discoveries, not inventions. This distinction no longer prevents the granting of patents; the novel claim rests not with the virus itself but with its isolation, and likewise with the identification of the genetic sequence not its mere occurrence. Many patents have been issued on viruses and genetic sequences, though the appropriate policies to follow in such cases — particularly as genomic sequencing becomes more routine and less ‘inventive’ — remain matters of dispute.213 Furthermore, it recognised that public institutions could legitimately use patents as a defensive means to prevent undue commercial exploitation of the research: The “defensive” use of patents can be a legitimate part of researchers’ efforts to make their discoveries (and further discoveries derived therefrom) widely available to other researchers, in the best collaborative traditions of biomedical science.214 The WHO affirmed the need for further cooperation between research organisations in respect of the SARS virus: ‘For continued progress against SARS, it is essential that we nurture the spirit of the unprecedented, global collaboration that rapidly discovered the novel virus and sequenced its genome’.215 The WHO announced its intention to monitor the effects of patents (and patent applications) on the speed with which SARS diagnostic tests, treatments, and vaccines are developed and made available for use, and on the manner in which prices are set for these technologies. It observed: In the longer term, the manner in which SARS patent rights are pursued could have a profound effect on the willingness of researchers and public health officials to collaborate regarding future outbreaks of new infectious diseases. WHO will therefore examine whether the terms of reference for such collaborations need to be modified to ensure that the credit for any intellectual property developed is appropriately attributed, that revenues derived from licensing such property are devoted to suitable uses, and that legitimate rewards for innovative efforts do not impose undue burdens on efforts to make tests, therapies, and preventive measure available to all.216 It maintained that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.219 The Assembly requested that the Director-General continue to support Member States in the exchange and transfer of technology and research findings, according high priority to access to antiretroviral drugs to combat HIV/AIDS and medicines to control tuberculosis, malaria and other major health problems, in the context of paragraph 7 of the Doha Declaration which promotes and encourages technology transfer.220 The WHO also considered a report on the emergence of the SARS virus and the international response to the infectious disease.221 It was ‘deeply concerned that SARS ... poses a serious threat to global health security, the livelihood of populations, the functioning of health systems, and the stability and growth of economies’.222 The Committee on Infectious Diseases requested that the Director-General ‘mobilize global scientific research to improve understanding of the disease and to develop control tools such as diagnostic tests, drugs and vaccines that are accessible to and affordable by Member States’.223 The Director-General of the WHO, Dr Gro Harlem Brundtland, **told the World Health** Assembly that there was a need to build trust and forge solidarity in the face of public health epidemics: ‘**Ensuring that patent regimes stimulate research and do not hinder international scientific cooperation** is a critical challenge — whether the target is SARS or any other threat to human health’.224 Similarly, Dr Marie-Paule Kieny, Director of the WHO Initiative for Vaccine Research, said: If we are to develop a SARS vaccine more quickly than usual, we have to continue to work together on many fronts at once, on scientific research, intellectual property and patents issues, and accessibility. It is a very complicated process, involving an unprecedented level of international cooperation, which is changing the way we work.225 She emphasised that patents and intellectual property issues and their safeguards can help rather than hinder the rapid development of SARS vaccines and ensure that, once developed, they are available in both industrialised and developing countries.226 C Summary The WHO should play a much more active role in the policy debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. James Love, the director of the Consumer Project on Technology, run by Ralph Nader, is critical of the WHO statement on ‘Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation, and Public Health’.227 He maintains that the Assembly could have addressed ‘practical examples, like SARS’ and cites the report in The Washington Post that notes that a number of commercial companies are investing in SARS research.228 The non-government organisation Médecins Sans Frontières has been critical in the past of the passive role played by the WHO in the debate over access to essential medicines: ‘As the world’s leading health agency, and armed with the clear mandate of recent World Health Assembly resolutions, the WHO can and should **do much more’**.229 The WHO should become a vocal advocate for public health concerns at the WTO and its TRIPS Council — especially in relation to patent law and the SARS virus. It must staunchly defend the rights of member states to incorporate measures in their legislation that protect access to medicines — such as compulsory licensing, parallel imports, and measures to accelerate the introduction of generic pharmaceutical drugs. It needs to develop a clearer vision on global equity pricing for essential medicines. The race to patent the SARS virus seems to be an inefficient means of allocating resources. A number of public research organisations — including the BCCA, the CDC and HKU — were compelled to file patents in respect of the genetic coding of the SARS virus. Such measures were promoted as ‘defensive patenting’ — a means to ensure that public research and communication were not jeopardised by commercial parties seeking exclusive private control. However, there are important drawbacks to such a strategy. The filing of patents by public research organisations may be prohibitively expensive. It will also be difficult to resolve the competing claims between the various parties — especially given that they were involved in an international research network together. Seth Shulman argues that there is a need for international cooperation and communication in dealing with public health emergencies such as the SARS virus: The success of a global research network in identifying the pathogen is an example of the huge payoff that can result when researchers put aside visions of patents and glory for their individual laboratories and let their work behave more like, well, a virus. After all, the hallmark of an opportunistic virus like the one that causes SARS is its ability to spread quickly. Those mounting a response need to disseminate their information and innovation just as rapidly.230 There is a danger that such competition for patent rights may undermine trust and cooperation within the research network. Hopefully, however, such concerns could be resolved through patent pooling or joint ownership of patents. Furthermore, a number of commercial companies have filed patent applications in respect of research and development into the SARS virus. There will be a need for cooperation between the public and private sectors in developing genetic tests, vaccines, and pharmaceutical drugs that deal with the SARS virus. There is also a need to reform the patent system to deal with international collaborative research networks — such as that created to combat the SARS virus. Several proposals have been put forward. There has been a renewed debate over whether patents should be granted in respect of genes and gene sequences. Some commentators have maintained that the SARS virus should fall within the scope of patentable subject matter — to promote research and development in the field. However, a number of critics of genetic technology have argued that the SARS virus should not be patentable because it is a discovery of nature, and a commercialisation of life. There has been a discussion over the lack of harmonisation over the criteria of novelty and inventive step between patent regimes. As Peter Yu comments, ‘[w]hile [the] US system awards patents to those who are the first to invent, the European system awards patents to those who are the first to file an application’.231 There have been calls for the requirement of utility to be raised. There have also been concerns about prior art, secret use and public disclosure. Representative Lamar Smith of Texas has put forward the CREATE Act, which recognises the collaborative nature of research across multiple institutions. Such reforms are intended to ensure that the patent system is better adapted to deal with the global nature of scientific inquiry. The race to patent the SARS virus also raises important questions about international treaties dealing with access to essential medicines. The public health epidemic raises similar issues to other infectious diseases — such as AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, influenza, and so forth. The WHO made a public statement about its position on the patenting of the SARS virus. It has stated that it will continue to monitor developments in this field. Arguably, there is a need for the WHO to play a larger role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. Not only could it mediate legal disputes over patents in respect of essential medicines, it could be a vocal advocate in policy discussions. The WTO has also played an important role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. A number of public interest measures could be utilised to secure access to patents relating to the SARS virus including compulsory licensing, parallel importation and research exceptions. The appearance of the SARS virus shows that there should be an open-ended interpretation of the scope of diseases covered by the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. Important lessons should be learned from the emergence of the SARS virus, and the threat posed to global health. As the World Health Report 2003 notes: SARS will not be the last new disease to take advantage of modern global conditions. In the last two decades of the 20th century, new diseases emerged at the rate of one per year, and this trend is certain to continue. Not all of these emerging infections will transmit easily from person to person as does SARS. Some will emerge, cause illness in humans and then disappear, perhaps to recur at some time in the future. Others will emerge, cause human illness and transmit for a few generations, become attenuated, and likewise disappear. And still others will emerge, become endemic, and remain important parts of our human infectious disease ecology.232 Already, in 2004, there have been worries that pharmaceutical drug companies and patent rights are impeding efforts to prevent an outbreak of bird flu — avian influenza.233 There is a need to ensure that the patent system is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to cope with the appearance of new infectious diseases.234

#### WHO Cred key to Global Right to Health – medicine access is critical.

* Note the Bottom Paragraph is at the bottom of the PDF – I put a paragraph break to indicate it as such – no words are missing.

Bluestone 3, Ken. "Strengthening WHO's position should be a priority for the new Director-General." The Lancet 361.9351 (2003): 2. (Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO))//Elmer

To meet these challenges, WHO must strengthen its resolve to maintain its **independence and lead its member states**, **even at the risk of causing controversy**. A meaningful example is the role that WHO can have in **ensuring access to medicines** for the world’s poorest people. WHO is the only global institution that has the **remit to drive this agenda forward**, yet has failed to do so convincingly. The new Director-General must support and reinvigorate the advocacy efforts of the organisation and provide a proper counterbalance to the interests of the pharmaceutical industry and wealthy member states. As the new Director-General takes office, they will face the dual challenge of **seeing that** the broadest possible public health interpretation of the World Trade Organization’s Doha Agreement on Trade Related Aspects on Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) **is not lost, and** of seizing an opportunity to bring about an international framework for sustainable and predictable tiered pricing of medicines. Without the active intervention of a public health advocate at the level of WHO, there is a risk that both of these initiatives **could founder.** Some people in positions of power still do not have high expectations of WHO or its new Director-General. But for the world’s poorest people, the overwhelming majority of whom live in developing countries, this person’s legacy could literally make the difference between life and death. Ken Bluestone Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)

New leader should re-establish WHO’s credibility The credibility of WHO’s advocacy of the right to health for all has been eroded in recent years. A large reason is WHO’s **failure to challenge the pharmaceutical** industry on access to medicines for people with HIV/AIDS and other diseases. WHO’s collaboration with the industry in the “Accelerated Access” programme on antiretroviral medicines sounds good. In fact, the programme has served as a cover for the organisation’s frequent acceptance of industry arguments for restricting treatment access. To re-establish WHO’s credibility, the new Director-General must lead the organisation to stand consistently with those most deprived of health services. Kenneth Roth, Executive Director, Human Rights Watch.

#### Right to Health solves Nationalist Populism.

Friedman 17 Eric Friedman March 2017 “New WHO Leader Will Need Human Rights to Counter Nationalistic Populism” <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2017/03/new-who-leader-will-need-human-rights-to-counter-populism/> (JD, Project Leader of the Platform for a Framework Convention on Global Health at the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, DC)//Elmer

The need for WHO leadership on human rights—and for global leadership on health and human rights beyond WHO—has always been present, yet has become ever more pressing. A reactionary, nationalist populism has been gaining momentum, particularly in the United States and parts of Europe, and some of its most disturbing features, such as xenophobia and disregard for international law and institutions, are surfacing elsewhere. Persisting health challenges—such as immense national and global health inequities, with universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals offering some hope of lessening them—and growing threats such as outbreaks of infectious disease, worsening antimicrobial resistance, and climate change demand the type of leadership that the right to health entails. In this immensely challenging environment, WHO needs to become a 21st century institution that has the gravitas and credibility to carve a path through these obstacles towards global health justice. The next WHO Director-General, to be elected in May, must lead the organization there. The right to health can light the way ahead, with reforms to, and driven by, WHO. These reforms must develop an internal governance that is far more welcoming of civil society, with WHO member states significantly increasing contributions so work on the social determinants of health can expand, and with enhanced transparency and accountability. Furthermore, reforms are needed so that WHO leads on global health equity and human rights, including through national health equity strategies and, above all, the Framework Convention on Global Health (FCGH). The FCGH could help bring the right to health to the next level by capturing core aspects of the right to health, such as: 1) participation and accountability, setting clear standards for people’s participation in health policy-making at all levels, and establishing multi-layered health accountability frameworks with standards to which all nations would be held; 2) equity, including by catalyzing national health equity strategies—which must be developed through broad participation, itself a potentially empowering process—and advancing data disaggregation and more equitable financing; 3) financial resources, with global norms on national and international health financing responsibilities; and 4) respecting and promoting the right to health in all policies, from setting standards on health impact assessments—including participatory processes in developing them, human rights standards, an equity focus, and follow-up processes—to firmly ensuring the primacy of the right to health in other legal regimes that may undermine. From an earlier WHO treaty, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, we know the power of international law to significantly advance health, with the transformative power of legally binding global health norms. As a treaty, the FCGH would increase political accountability and accountability through the courts, while helping protect health other treaty-based international regimes, such as trade. It would also be a bold assertion of global solidarity for global justice, as so urgently needed, “demonstrating that the community of nations are indeed stronger together.” One candidate for the WHO Director-General election, David Nabarro, has recognized the value and civil society support that FCGH has already received, and the need to further explore the treaty (mentioned at 1:46:38 mark). A good first step would be establishing a WHO working group on the FCGH, with broad participation, particularly from states, civil society, and representatives of communities most affected by health inequities, along with relevant international agencies. We see signs of resistance of the dangerous nationalist populism, from protests that persist and judicial checks on one of the administration’s vilest acts (an immigration and refugee travel ban, with its effects falling heaviest on Muslims) in the United States to the rejection of the far-right candidate in the elections in the Netherland. Such resistance can prevent some of the worst impacts on the right to health, from discrimination against migrants to cuts to programs vital for health. Meanwhile, let’s construct an edifice for the future of health and human rights, even as we stand against its destruction. WHO, right to health, and FCGH leadership ought to be a core part of that endeavor.

#### Populism is an existential threat.

de Waal 16 Alex de Waal 12-5-2016 “Garrison America and the Threat of Global War” <http://bostonreview.net/war-security-politics-global-justice/alex-de-waal-garrison-america-and-threat-global-war> (Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School at Tufts University)//Elmer

Polanyi recounts how economic and financial crisis led to global calamity. Something similar could happen today. In fact we are already in a steady unpicking of the liberal peace that glowed at the turn of the millennium. Since approximately 2008, the historic decline in the number and lethality of wars appears to have been reversed. Today’s wars are not like World War I, with formal declarations of war, clear war zones, rules of engagement, and definite endings. But they are wars nonetheless. What does a world in global, generalized war look like? We have an unwinnable “war on terror” that is metastasizing with every escalation, and which has blurred the boundaries between war and everything else. We have deep states—built on a new oligarchy of generals, spies, and private-sector suppliers—that are strangling liberalism. We have emboldened middle powers (such as Saudi Arabia) and revanchist powers (such as Russia) rearming and taking unilateral military action across borders (Ukraine and Syria). We have massive profiteering from conflicts by the arms industry, as well as through the corruption and organized crime that follow in their wake (Afghanistan). We have impoverishment and starvation through economic warfare, the worst case being Yemen. We have “peacekeeping” forces fighting wars (Somalia). We have regional rivals threatening one another, some with nuclear weapons (India and Pakistan) and others with possibilities of acquiring them (Saudi Arabia and Iran). Above all, today’s generalized war is a conflict of destabilization, with big powers intervening in the domestic politics of others, buying influence in their security establishments, bribing their way to big commercial contracts and thereby corroding respect for government, and manipulating public opinion through the media. Washington, D.C., and Moscow each does this in its own way. Put the pieces together and a global political market of rival plutocracies comes into view. Add virulent reactionary populism to the mix and it resembles a war on democracy. What more might we see? Economic liberalism is a creed of optimism and abundance; reactionary protectionism feeds on pessimistic scarcity. If we see punitive trade wars and national leaders taking preemptive action to secure strategic resources within the walls of their garrison states, then old-fashioned territorial disputes along with accelerated state-commercial grabbing of land and minerals are in prospect. We could see mobilization against immigrants and minorities as a way of enflaming and rewarding a constituency that can police borders, enforce the new political rightness, and even become electoral vigilantes. Liberal multilateralism is a system of seeking common wins through peaceful negotiation; case-by-case power dealing is a zero-sum calculus. We may see regional arms races, nuclear proliferation, and opportunistic power coalitions to exploit the weak. In such a global political marketplace, we would see middle-ranking and junior states rewarded for the toughness of their bargaining, and foreign policy and security strategy delegated to the CEOs of oil companies, defense contractors, bankers, and real estate magnates. The United Nations system appeals to leaders to live up to the highest standards. The fact that they so often conceal their transgressions is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. A cabal of plutocratic populists would revel in the opposite: applauding one another’s readiness to tear up cosmopolitan liberalism and pursue a latter-day mercantilist naked self-interest. Garrison America could opportunistically collude with similarly constituted political-military business regimes in Russia, China, Turkey, and elsewhere for a new realpolitik global concert, redolent of the early nineteenth-century era of the Congress of Vienna, bringing a façade of stability for as long as they collude—and war when they fall out. And there is a danger that, in response to a terrorist outrage or an international political crisis, President Trump will do something stupid, just as Europe’s leaders so unthinkingly strolled into World War I. The multilateral security system is in poor health and may not be able to cope. Underpinning this is a simple truth: the plutocratic populist order is a future that does not work. If illustration were needed of the logic of hiding under the blanket rather than facing difficult realities, look no further than Trump’s readiness to deny climate change. We have been here before, more or less, and from history we can gather important lessons about what we must do now. The importance of defending civility with democratic deliberation, respecting human rights and values, and maintaining a commitment to public goods and the global commons—including the future of the planet—remain evergreen. We need to find our way to a new 1945—and the global political settlement for a tamed and humane capitalism—without having to suffer the catastrophic traumas of trying everything else first.

### WTO Advantage

#### Low WTO causes regional trade – yes trade-off

Isfeld 14 Gordon Isfeld 3-17-2014 business.financialpost.com/2014/03/17/with-rise-of-shot-gun-trade-agreements-is-the-wto-even-relevant-anymore/ “With the rise of 'shot-gun' trade agreements, is the WTO even relevant anymore” //Elmer

OTTAWA — It’s getting awfully crowded out there in the free-trading world. The seemingly endless hunt for new global partners is redefining the traditional and hard-fought rules of engagement between nations. So much so, observers say, the old world order — remember the WTO, and GATT before it — has increasingly become a sideshow to the proliferation of bilateral, **trilateral** **and**, often, **multi-lateral** agreements. Even the term “free trade” no longer accurately describes the “new world” of negotiations — one that encompasses far more than what and how products are permitted to slide under domestic tariff radars. For Canada, we can now add South Korea and the European Union — deals long in the making but only weeks in the signing — after a string of minor agreements since the landmark free trade act 25 years ago with the United States, and later to include Mexico. Now, as the growing mass of country-to-country, region-to-region agreements has made apparent, it’s open season on anything that moves between borders — not only products, investments and intellectual property, but also new rules on competition, and the inclusion of labour laws and environmental guidelines. These are just some of the areas of possible disputes that the World Trade Organization “does not deal with,” said Debra Steger, a professor of law at University of Ottawa, specializing in international trade and development. “These are new models. These are not traditional trade agreements, per se.” Ms. Steger, who worked for the federal government on the Uruguay Round of negotiations that led to formation of the WTO, said the framework of recent deals goes “way beyond subjects that NAFTA dealt with.” “Trade, even in the WTO, isn’t only about tariffs. It’s not just about customs and border measures,” she said. “But it’s not about behind-the-border regulatory matters, like environmental regulation and labour standards, competition policy and human rights, corruption, and on and on it goes.” Free trade, between where ever, has become the go-to issue for politicians, business leaders, public-policy makers and private interest groups. Note, this month’s sudden but long-rumoured announcement by the Harper government of a free-trade deal with South Korea, nearly 10 years after talks began and stumbled, and resumed again. Arguably, the deal was finally done as a result of the resolution to Canada’s drawn-out dispute with Seoul over our beef exports — the so-called “mad cow” disease leading to a ban in that county and others. Of course, the United States, the European Union and Australia, among others, already had agreements in hand with South Korea. A few months earlier, Ottawa inked its EU deal — the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement — which was again the outcome of a seemingly endless circle of negotiations that still left Canada trailing similar pacts by the U.S. and others. Even so, these pacts “affect the WTO and WTO negotiations for a number of reasons. That’s a major problem,” said Ms. Steger. “The major developed countries have gone off and started these efforts to negotiate these big FTAs [free trade agreements] as a response to the declining situation in the Doha Round. The WTO — reborn in 1995 out of the General Agreement and Tariffs and Trade, the original body created in 1948 — has been struggling to maintain its relevance as the global arbiter of trade agreements and dispute resolution. The cachet of the 159-member body, however, has been diminished in recent years as countries moved to seal their own free-trade deals with major partners in the absence, some would argue, of any significant movement by the WTO on its own 2001 trade liberalization initiative, launched in Doha, Qatar. Late last year, members managed to agree to only limited movement on trade under the Doha Round of talks. Even now, details remain to be worked out. “One of the reasons why we’re seeing this sort of shot-gun approach [to trade agreements outside of the WTO] is because a number of countries are concerned that the big global deals are probably next to impossible at this stage, given how the Doha Round went and what we ended up with there, which was next to nothing,” said Douglas Porter, chief economist at BMO Capital Markets in Toronto. “They did manage to reach a tiny deal when all was said and done, but it was very modest in terms of its scope.” The move toward bilateral or multi-lateral agreements “is a symptom of the problems that we were running into at the WTO,” Mr. Porter said. “Important players are probably quietly questioning the future for the WTO…. Is it that death knell for the WTO? I don’t think so. [But] it just means we might not be able to accomplish grand, global deals in the future.” However, “there’s really no other way to approach trade disputes with, say, a country like China, then through that body at this point.” “Even 10 years ago, I think it was more straightforward to come to global trade rules. You had two major players, Europe and the U.S., and a few next tier players, including Japan,” Mr. Porter said. “Now, though, you have all kinds of important big players that have a huge chunk of global trade, and have very different goals and aims, and it might be the nature of the global economy now — the reality that we have many different groups in many different regions. “It might be impossible to square that circle.” Over the course of 25 years, Canada has piled on more than a dozen free trade agreements. The first — taking effect on Jan. 1, 1989 — was with the United States. A heated political issue in the 1988 federal election, which Brian Mulroney’s Conservatives won, the FTA was expanded in 1994 to include Mexico and rebranded as NAFTA. Other free trade deals, though much smaller, were signed in subsequent years, some yet to take effect: Israel, Jordan and Chile, followed later by Costa Rica, Peru, Panama, Honduras and Colombia, leading up to the pacts with EU and South Korea. Negotiations are ongoing for at least another dozen agreements. For countries such as Colombia, which has had an agreement in effect with Canada since 2011, the goal is “to insert our economy into the world economy,” said Alvaro Concha, trade commissioner of Proexport Colombia, based in Toronto. “At the beginning of this decade, we had only our preferential access to over 500 million consumers,” Mr. Concha said. “With all the potential FTAs we’ve been signing with potential markets and with potential partners, we believe that not just the potential buyers of our products, but also the potential investors in our country, we have opened our preferential access to over 1.5 billion consumers.” Likely to push the WTO further into the shadows of global trade will be the Trans Pacific Partnership. “In many ways, the Trans Pacific Partnership will be, if it is successful, an updating of the NAFTA, because the U.S. and Mexico are involved, as well as some [trading] partners we already have within Latin America, like Peru,” said Ms. Steger, at the University of Ottawa. “But [there are] also some key countries in Asia that we don’t have agreements with yet. And some other developed countries in that regional, New Zealand and Australia, that we don’t have agreements with,” she adds. “So that [TPP] agreement is very, very important. It’s also the first major plur-lateral agreement that the world has seen.”

#### Regionalism promotes trade and stops war – avoids their impact because our regionalism is different than protectionist blocs.

Brkić 13, Snježana, and Adnan Efendic. "Regional Trading Arrangements–Stumbling Blocks or Building Blocks in the Process of Global Trade Liberalization?." 5th International Conference «Economic Integration, competition and cooperation», Croatia, Opatija. 2013. papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2239275 (Economics Prof at U of Sarajevo) //Elmer

Besides those advocating the optimistic or pessimistic view on regionalism effect on global trade liberalization, some economists, such as Frankel and Wei, hold a neutral position, in a way. Frankel and Wei believe that forms and achievements of international economic integrations can vary and that, for this reason, regionalism can be – depending on circumstances – linked to greater or smaller global trade liberalization. In the years-long period of regional integration development, four periods have been identified during which the integration processes were becoming particularly intensive and which have therefore been named "waves of regionalism". The first wave was taking place during the capitalism development in the second half of the 19th century, in the course of British sovereign domination over the world market. Economic integrations of the time primarily had the form of bilateral customs unions; however, owing to the comparative openness of international trading system based on the golden standard automatism, this period is called the "era of progressive bilateralism". The next two waves of **regionalism** occurred in the years following the world wars. Since the disintegration processes caused by the wars usually spawned economic nationalisms and autarchic tendencies, it is not surprising that post-war regionalisms were marked by discriminatory international economic integrations, primarily at the level of so-called negative integration, with expressedly “beggar-thy-neighbor” policies that resulted in considerable trade deviations. This particularly refers to the regionalism momentum after the First World War, which was additionally burdened by the consequences of Big Economic Crisis. The current wave of regionalism started in late 1980s and spread around the world to a far greater extent than any previous one did: it has covered almost all the continents and almost all the countries, even those which have mis to join all earlier regional initiatives, such as the USA, Canada, Japan and China. Integration processes, however, do not show any signs of flagging. Up till now, over 200 RTAs have been registered with GATT/WTO, more than 150 of them being still in force, and most of these valid arrangement have been made in the past ten years. Specific in many ways, this wave was dubbed "new regionalism". The most specific **characteristics** of new regionalism **include: geographic spread** **of RTAs** **in** terms of **encompassing entire continents;** **greater speed**; integration forms success; deepening of integration processes; **and**, the most important for this theoretical discussion, generally **non-negative impact on outsiders, world economy as a whole, and** the **multilateral liberalization** process. Some theorists (Gilpin) actually distinguish **between** the "**benign**" **and** "**malign**" **regionalism**. On the one hand, **regionalism can advance** the **international economic stability**, multilateral liberalization **and world peace**. On the other, it can have mercantilist features leading to economic well-being degradation and increasing international tensions and conflicts. Analyses of trends within the contemporary integration processes show that they mainly have features of "benign" regionalism. Reasons for this are numerous. **Forces driving** the **contemporary** **regionalism** development **differ from** those that used to drive **earlier** regionalism periods in the 20th century. The **present regionalism emerged in** the period characterized by the **increasing economic inter-dependence** between different world economy subjects, countries attempts to resolve trade disputes and multilateral framework of trade relations. As opposed to the 1930s episode, contemporary regional initiatives represent **attempts to make** the members' **participation in the world economy easier**, rather than make them more distant from it. As opposed to 1950s and 1960s episode, new **initiatives** are **less frequently motivated** **exclusively by political interests**, and are **less frequently** being used **for mercantilist purposes**. After the Second World War, more powerful countries kept using the economic integration as a means to strengthen their political influence on their weaker partners and outsiders. The examples include CMEA and European Community arrangements with its members' former colonies. As opposed to this practice, the new regionalism, mostly driven by common economic interests, yielded less trade diversion than previous one, and has also **contributed to** the **prevention of military conflicts of greater proportions**. Various analyses have shown that many regional integrations in earlier periods resulted in trade deviations, particularly those formed between less developed countries and between socialist countries. In recent years, however, the newly formed or revised regional **integrations** primarily seem to **lead to trade creation**. Contrary to the “beggar thy- neighbor” model of former international economic integrations, the integrations now offer certain advantages to outsiders as well, by stimulating growth and spurring the role of market forces. The analyses of contemporary trends in world economy also speak in favor of the "optimistic" proposition. The structural analysis shows that the world trade is growing and that this growth results both from the increase in intra-regional and from the increase in extra-regional trade value (Anderson i Snape 1994.)28. Actually, the intraregional trade has been growing faster, both by total value and by its share in world GDP. The extra-regional trade share in GDP was increasing in some regions – in North America, Asia-Pacific and Asian developing countries. However, the question arises as to whether the extra-regional trade would be greater without regional integrations or not? The answer would primarily depend both on the estimate of degree of some countries' trade policy restrictedness in such circumstances, and on factors such as geographic distance, transport communications, political relations among states. One should also take into account certain contemporary integration features – the primarily economic, rather than strategic motivation, and continuous expansion, which mostly includes countries that are significant economic partners. With respect to NAFTA, many believe that the negative effects on outsiders will be negligible, since the USA and Canada have actually been highly integrated economies for a long time already, while the Mexican economy is relatively small. The same view was pointed out by the EU, with respect to its expansion. It particularly refers to the inclusion of the remaining EFTA countries, because this will actually only complete, in institutional terms, the EU strong economic ties with these countries. Most EFTA countries have been part of the European economic area (EEA), i.e. the original EC-EFTA agreement, for a few years already, and conduct some 70% of their total international exchange with the Union countries. EU countries are also the most significant foreign-trade partners of Central and East Europe countries, and the recent joining the Union of several of them is not expected to cause a significant trade diversion. Besides, according to some earlier studies, during the previous wave of regionalism, in the 1967-70 period, the creation of trade in EEC was far greater than trade diversion: trade creation ranged from 13 to 23% of total imports, while trade diversion ranged from 1 to 6%. In Latin America, the new regionalism resulted in the faster growth of intra-regional trade, while the extra-regional exports and imports also continued to grow. Since early 1990s, the value of intra-regional imports registered the average annual growth of 18%. In the same time, the extra-regional exports were also growing, although at a lower rate of 9% average a year; its share in the total Latin America exports at the end of decade amounted to 18% as compared to 12% in 1990. In the 1990-1996 period, the intraregional imports grew by some 18% a year. The extra-regional imports were also growing very fast, reaching the 14% rate. These data reflect a great unbalance in the trade with extra-regional markets, since the imports from countries outside the region grew much faster the exports.30 Since the described trends point to the continued growth of extra-regional imports and exports, they also show that regional integration in Latin America has had the open regionalism character. Besides, the pending establishment of FTAA – Free Trade Area of Americas will gather, in the same group, the so-called "natural" trade partners – countries that have had an extremely extensive mutual exchange for years already, and the outsiders are therefore unlikely to be affected by strengthening of regionalism in this part of the world. Contemporary research shows that intra-regional trade is growing, however, same as interdependence between North America and East Asia and between the EU and East Asia. It can also be seen that the biggest and the **most powerful** countries, i.e. **blocs**, **are extremely dependent** **on the rest of the world in terms of trade.** For the EU, besides the intra-European trade, which is ranked first, foreign trade has the vital importance since it accounts for 10% of European GDP. In early 1990s, EU exchanged 40% of its foreign trade with non-members, 16% out of which with North America and East Asia together. EU therefore must keep in mind the rest of the world as well. The growing EU interest in outsiders is confirmed by establishing "The Euro-Med Partnership", which proclaimed a new form of cooperation between the EU and the countries at its South periphery32. Besides, the past few years witnessed a series of inter-regional agreements between the EU on the one hand, and certain groups from other regions on the other (MERCOSUR, CARICOM, ASEAN and GCC). In case of North America the ratio between intra-regional and inter-regional trade is 40:60, and in East Asia, it is 45:55. Any attempt to move towards significantly closed blocs ("fortresses") would require overcoming the significant inter-dependence between major trading blocs. Besides the analysis of contemporary trends in extra- and intra-regional trade, other research was conducted that was supposed to point to the reasons why the **new regionalism has** mainly a **non-negative impact on** outsiders and **global liberalization**. The distinctive features of new regionalism were also affected to characteristics of international economic and political environment it sprouted in. In the 1980s, economic nationalisms were not so expressed as in the interventionism years following the Second World War; however, the neo-liberalism represented by GATT activities did not find the "fertile ground” in all parts of the world. Regionalism growth in the circumstances of multilateral system existence is, among other things, the consequence of distrust in multilateralism. „The revival of the forces of regionalism stemmed from frustration with the slow pace of multilateral trade liberalization... If the world trade regime could not be moved ahead, then perhaps it was time for deeper liberalization within more limited groups of like-minded nations... Such efforts would at least liberalize some trade... and might even prod the other nations to go along with multilateral liberalization.“33 Kennedy's round and Tokyo round of trade negotiations under GATT auspices brought a certain progress in the global trade liberalization. However, the 1980s witnessed significant changes in the world economy that the GATT trade system was not up to. Besides. GATT had not yet managed to cover the entire trade in goods, since there were still exceptions in the trade in agricultural and textile products that particularly affected the USA and developing countries. GATT system of conflict resolutions, and its organizational and administrative mechanism in general also required revision. In this vacuum that was created in promoting trade and investment multilateralism from the point when GATT inadequacy became obvious until the start of the Uruguay round and the establishment of World Trade Organization, the wave of regionalism started spreading across the world again. Prodded by the Single European Act and the success of European integration, many countries turned to an alternative solution – establishment of new or expansion and deepening of the existing economic integrations. Even the USA, the multilateralism bastion until then, made a radical turn in their foreign-trade policy and started working on designing a North American integration.

#### That outweighs—multilateral trade causes wars with a larger impact

Thoma 7 Mark Thoma July 2007 “Trade Liberalization and War” <http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2007/07/trade-liberaliz.html> (Economics Professor at the University of Oregon)//Elmer

Globalisation is by construction an increase in both bilateral and multilateral trade flows. What then was the net effect of increased trade since 1970? We find that it **generated an increase in the probability of a bilateral conflict by** around **20%** for those **countries separated by less than 1000kms,** the group of countries for **which the risk of disputes that can escalate militarily is the highest.** The effects are much smaller for countries which are more distant. Contrary to what these results (aggravated by our nationality) may suggest, we are not anti-globalisation activists even though we are aware that some implications of our work could be (mis)used in such a way. The result that bilateral trade is pacifying brings several more optimistic implications on globalisation. First, if we think of a world war as a war between two large groups or coalitions of countries, then globalisation makes such a war less likely because it increases the opportunity cost of such a conflict. Obviously, this conclusion cannot be tested but is a logical implication of our results. From this point of view, our work suggests that globalisation may be at the origin of a change in the nature of conflicts, less global and more local. Second, our results do confirm that increased trade flows **created by regional trade agreements** (such as the EU) are indeed **pacifying** as intended. Given that most military conflicts are local, because they find their origins in border or ethnic disputes, **this is not a small achievement**. These beneficial political aspects of regional trade agreements are not usually considered by economists who often focus on the economic distortions brought by their discriminatory nature. Given the huge human and economic costs of wars, this political effect of regional trade agreements should not be discounted. This opens interesting questions on how far these regional trade agreements should extend – a topical issue in the case of the EU. The entry of Turkey in the EU would indeed pacify its relations with EU countries (especially Greece and Cyprus), but also increase the probability of a conflict between Turkey and its non-EU neighbours. However, our simulations suggest that in this case, the first effect dominates the second by a large margin. More generally, our results should be interpreted as a word of caution on some political aspects of globalisation. As it proceeds and weakens the economic ties of proximate countries, those with the highest risk of disputes that can escalate into military conflicts, local conflicts may become more prevalent. Even if they may not appear optimal on purely economic grounds, regional and bilateral trade agreements, by strengthening local economic ties, may therefore **be a necessary political counterbalance to economic globalisation**.

#### Economy Impact

#### Group the Trade Impact:

#### 1] Current Regional Trade isn’t Great Power Competition – it’s regional integration that’s far more open which takes out their Exclusion I/L – that’s 1NC Brkic.

#### 2] Regionalism solves – it’s a building block – prefer gradual change to immediate ones.

Brkić 13, Snježana, and Adnan Efendic. "Regional Trading Arrangements–Stumbling Blocks or Building Blocks in the Process of Global Trade Liberalization?." 5th International Conference «Economic Integration, competition and cooperation», Croatia, Opatija. 2013. papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2239275 (Economics Prof at U of Sarajevo) //Elmer

There are **over 180 independent states** in the modern world, most of which **differ** enormously **in economic development and power**. World economy is therefore a battlefield of varied interests expressed in the action of different national economic policies. In such conditions, **attempts to integrate** world **economy** **by global liberalization of** international **trade cannot yield** significant **results overnight.** Global free trade is considered the first best solution, but is not feasible immediately and at once, since too many people believe that they would lose with global liberalization. According to the view believed to be optimistic, creation of international economic integrations could be a distinctive inter-step in the process of free world market creation. Lester Thurow points out: "In the long run, **regionalism** development **could be favorable** for the world. **Free trade within regions** and regulated trade between regions **could be** the **proper road to free world trade in a long term**. The shift from national to world economy at once would be too big a jump. One should first make a few smaller inter-steps, and pseudo-trading blocs coupled with regulated trade could be such a necessary inter-step." The essential rationale of this view is actually the speed of reforms - the gradual versus “big bang” approach. Many contemporary economists, in their analyses of world economy trends, conclude that political forces behind regional integration show signs of consistency with those acting towards global world trade. According to the optimistic view, the multilateralization process is slowed down by different standpoints on the free trade usefulness, by economic nationalisms, even by varying political interests, and therefore another way had to be found in order to achieve the world market integration – a slower one, but more effective in the existing constellation of international economic relations. This view denies the opposition between regionalism and multilateralism, and explains it as follows: Since integration improves economic relations between members through removing trading and other barriers, and since all these integrated regions are part of the world territory, the advancement of economic relations within regions can be understood as the advancement of global economic relations. Regional trading, i.e. economic blocs would in this case be only a bypass towards the creation of unified world market. "... What could not be achieved in global relations was achieved within regions, through multilateralization of the European economic area. These achievements were later followed by many countries in other world regions, in their mutual relations practice. Practically, we thus got regional multilateralisms." Regionalism advocates also point out that the formation of economic integrations could facilitate the pending WTO negotiation rounds. Actually, the Uruguay round was partly protracted due to a great number of participants and the "free riders" issue. Viewed in broader context, one could say that regionalism contributes to overall globalization as well, since these are processes motivated from the same source. Both regionalism and globalization are driven by big capital interests, and that these two phenomena are actually ways to make the centuries-long capitalism aspiration – unified world market - come true. According to this view, the globalization process as a process of world economy functional integration under the circumstances of imperfect market and hegemony weakening early in the 20th century has to be supported by the institutional component, either on a multilateral basis through international organizations and institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and WTO, or on regional scale through regional trading arrangements.

#### The Lake Evidence - Their card concedes a] the impact isn’t inevitable BUT driven by contingent choices which we control the U/Q that countries won’t by driven by those Great Power competitions and b] protectionism is driven by domestic forces – if that’s true, then WTO credibility doesn’t matter and they’ll defy the WTO anyways – here’s a re-highlighting.

1AC Lake 18. [(David Lake is a Professor of Social Sciences and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. "Economic Openness and Great Power Competition: Lessons for China and the United States,” April 30, 2018. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3171196/>] TDI

I develop two central arguments. First, historically, great power competition has been driven primarily by exclusion or fears of exclusion from each power’s international economic zone, including its domestic market. Great powers in the past have often used their international influence to build zones in which subordinate polities – whether these be colonies or simply states within a sphere of influence – are integrated into their economies. These economic zones, in turn, are typically biased in favor of the great power’s firms and investors, with the effect of excluding (in whole or part) the economic agents of other great powers. These other great powers, in response, are then compelled to develop or expand their own exclusive economic zones. The “race” for economic privilege can quickly divide the world up into economic blocs. Like the security dilemma, great powers need not actually exclude one another from their zones; the fear of exclusion alone is enough to ignite the process of division. The race for privilege then draws great powers into over-expanding into unprofitable regions and, more important, militarized competition. Economic and military competition are thus linked, with the former usually driving the latter. The most significant military crises have, historically, been over where to draw the boundaries between economic zones and subsequent challenges to those boundaries. Economic closure and fear of closure have been consistent sources of great power conflict in the past – and possibly will be in the future. The **major exception** to this trend **was** the **peaceful transfer of** **dominance** **in Latin America** from Britain to the United States in the late nineteenth century. This suggests that **economic closure and great power competition** **is not inevitable**, **but a choice of the great powers themselves**. Second, this **international competition is driven**, in turn, **by domestic**, rent-seeking groups and their economic **interests**. In all countries, scarce factors of production, import competing sectors, and domestically-oriented firms have concentrated and intense preferences for market restricting policies, including tariffs and the formation of exclusive economic zones. Consumers and free trade-oriented groups have diffuse preferences for market enhancing policies, and thus tend to lose at the ballot box and in the making of national policy. This inequality in preference intensity does not mean protectionists always win; after 1934, the United States insulated itself by shifting authority to the executive and negotiating reductions through broad, multi-product international agreements.8 Yet, as the recent return to economic nationalism of the Trump administration suggests, protectionism often wins out. Rent-seeking is **a central tendency, not an inevitable success.** Contemporary great power relations are at a critical juncture. As China’s influence expands, the role of special economic interests in China is especially worrisome. In pursuit of stability, political support, or private gains, the government will always be tempted to create economic zones that favor its nationals. In this way, China will be no different than the majority of great powers before it. But, given the expansive role of the state in the Chinese economy, especially its backing of outward foreign investments by its state-owned enterprises (SOEs), and the close ties between business elites and its authoritarian political leaders, however, it will be even harder for China to resist biasing any future economic zone to benefit its own firms. Although China has gained greatly from economic openness, its domestic political system will be prone to rent-seeking demands by important constituents in areas of future influence. Critically, the United States is also moving toward economic closure with the election of President Trump on a platform of economic nationalism. Demands for protection against Chinese goods have been growing over time.9 The “China shock” that followed Beijing’s joining the World Trade Organization was a huge disruption to the international division of labor, U.S. comparative advantage, and especially U.S. industry.10 The Trans-Pacific Partnership, though now defunct, was “marketed” by President Barak Obama as a means of “containing” China, both economically and militarily, but was opposed by virtually all of the candidates in the 2016 presidential election for its trade-enhancing potential. President Trump has already signaled a much more hostile and protectionist stance toward China – as well as calling for the repeal of NAFTA and even questioning the utility of the European Union. Not only has he imposed tariffs on washing machines, solar panels, steel and aluminum, dangerously declaring the latter two issues of national security, he is making exceptions on these tariffs for friends and allies. 11 Implicitly targeting China, these protectionist moves by the administration risk creating preferential trading blocs not seen since the 1930s. He has also now proposed punitive tariffs on over $60 billions of imports from China into the United States.12 Acknowledging his inconsistencies on many policy issues, Trump’s economic nationalism has remained the core of his political agenda. The threat to the liberal international economy is not only that China might seek an economic bloc in the future, but that the United States itself is turning more exclusionary. For each great power to fear that the other might seek to exclude it from its economic zone is not unreasonable. If so, great power competition could break out in the twenty-first century not because of bipolarity or any inevitable tendency toward conflict, but because neither great power can control its own protectionist forces nor signal to the other that it would not exclude it from its economic zone. The British-U.S. case, again, suggests that exclusion and competition are not inevitable, but the current danger of economic closure is real and increasing. This article is synthetic in its theory and merely suggestive in its use of historical evidence. The theory aims to integrate current work on political economy and national security, not to develop a completely original take on this relationship. In turn, rather than testing the theory in any rigorous sense or delving into particular cases to show the theoretical mechanisms at work, so to speak, it surveys selected historical episodes to illustrate central tendencies. It is the recurring pattern across multiple cases that suggests why we should worry today. The remainder of this essay is divided in three primary sections. Section I briefly outlines the analytics of economic openness and great power competition. Section II focuses on historical instances of great power competition, highlighting the role of economic openness as a central cleavage in international politics. Section III examines contemporary policies in and between China and the United States. The conclusion suggests ways that the potential for conflict may be mitigated. The Open Economy Politics of Great Power Competition All states have a tendency towards protectionism at home and exclusive economic zones abroad. A tendency, though, is not an inevitability. The pursuit of protection and economic zones by domestic interests is conditioned by the political coalition in power at any given time and institutions that aggregate and bias the articulation of social groups. 13 The tendency is also influenced, however, by the actions of other countries. Protectionism can sour great power relations, but it is the desire for exclusive economic zones that drives great power competition and, given the possibility of coercion, influences grand strategy. Thus, the theory sketched here integrates insights from international political economy (see below), the literature on domestic politics and grand strategy,14 and systemic theories of international relations.15

### CRISPR Advantage

#### Top-Level:

#### 1] No solvency – 1AC Sherkow isolates the reason for lack of CRISPR research as lack of funding, but the aff removes all potential for revenue because there aren’t any more patents

#### 2] No impact – the patent disputes will be resolved, at which point all the 1AC innovation begins – make them prove that it’s try or die now

#### The Aff causes Bioterrorism – two internal links –

#### 1] Biohacking.

Zettler 19, Patricia J., Christi J. Guerrini, and Jacob S. Sherkow. "Regulating genetic biohacking." Science 365.6448 (2019): 34-36. (Ohio State University Moritz School of Law)//Elmer

Genetic **biohacking** is also potentially **subject to U.S. laws that are enforced by private** rather than government **actors**. These may fill some of the gaps in public regulators’ ambit (9). **Patent owners**, for example, **can impose ethical restrictions on licensees,** such as the Broad Institute’s licenses for its CRISPR patents to Bayer (formerly Monsanto), **with conditions that** Bayer **avoid research activities that are potentially harmful to public health**, **including** **tobacco research and germline editing** (10). **Such license restrictions can**—and should—**be used to police commercial manufacturers of genome-editing kits and reagents popular in biohacking communities**, just as they have previously been used to prevent activities that pose national security, environmental, or public health risks (11). Even without a license in place, **patent owners can enforce restrictions through threats of patent infringement litigation against any recalcitrant biohackers or manufacturers of biohacking products**. A similar model was proposed as an attempt to restrict the use of “gene drive technology”—inheritable versions of CRISPR designed to drive a specific allele through generations of a population (12). Beyond patents, people injured by genetic biohacking materials could potentially bring tort law claims against biohackers and component suppliers to seek compensation for their injuries. A person injured while using a DIY CRISPR kit, for example, would likely be able to sue the seller of the kit —a potentially strong deterrent to marketers of unsafe biohacking materials.

#### Expanded Biohacking risks Bioterrorism.

Wikswo 14, J., S. Hummel, and V. Quaranta. "The Biohacker: A Threat to National Security." CTC Sentinel 7.1 (2014). (a biological physicist at Vanderbilt University. He was born in Lynchburg, Virginia, United States. Wikswo is noted for his work on biomagnetism and cardiac electrophysiology.)//Elmer

The **ability of non-scientists to create** and deploy **a biological weapon** highlights the emergence of **a new threat, the “biohacker.”** “Biohacking” is not necessarily malicious and could be as innocent as a beer enthusiast altering yeast to create a better brew. Yet the **same technology** **used by** a benign **biohacker** **could** easily **be transformed into** a tool for the disgruntled and disenfranchised12 to modify existing or emerging **biological warfare agents** **and employ them as bioterrorism**. A 2005 Washington Post article by Steve Coll and Susan Glasser presciently stated that “one can find on the web how to inject animals, like rats, with pneumonic plague and how to extract microbes from infected blood…and how to dry them so that they can be used with an aerosol delivery system, and thus how to make a biological weapon. If this information is readily available to all, is it possible to keep a determined terrorist from getting his hands on it?”13 This article argues that the biohacker is a real and existing threat by examining evasive biohacking strategies and limitations of current detection methods. The article finds that more active measures are required to stem the growing, long-term threat of modified BW agents employed by individuals. The **biohacker is** not only **a credible threat**, but also one that can be checked through improved detection and by disrupting BW agent delivery methods.

#### 2] CRIPR access leads to democratization of biotech – makes bioweapons more available.

Antonio Regalad. February 9, 2016. Top U.S. Intelligence Official Calls Gene Editing a WMD Threat. https://www.technologyreview.com/2016/02/09/71575/top-us-intelligence-official-calls-gene-editing-a-wmd-threat/

Gene editing refers to several novel ways to alter the DNA inside living cells. The most popular method, CRISPR, has been revolutionizing scientific research, leading to novel animals and crops, and is likely to power a new generation of gene treatments for serious diseases (see “Everything You Need to Know About CRISPR’s Monster Year”). It is gene editing’s relative ease of use that worries the U.S. intelligence community, according to the assessment. “Given the broad distribution, low cost, and accelerated pace of development of this dual-use technology, its deliberate or unintentional misuse might lead to far-reaching economic and national security implications,” the report said. The choice by the U.S. spy chief to call out gene editing as a potential weapon of mass destruction, or WMD, surprised some experts. It was the only biotechnology appearing in a tally of six more conventional threats, like North Korea’s suspected nuclear detonation on January 6, Syria’s undeclared chemical weapons, and new Russian cruise missiles that might violate an international treaty. The report is an unclassified version of the “collective insights” of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and half a dozen other U.S. spy and fact-gathering operations. Although the report doesn’t mention CRISPR by name, Clapper clearly had the newest and the most versatile of the gene-editing systems in mind. The CRISPR technique’s low cost and relative ease of use—the basic ingredients can be bought online for $60—seems to have spooked intelligence agencies. “Research in genome editing conducted by countries with different regulatory or ethical standards than those of Western countries probably increases the risk of the creation of potentially harmful biological agents or products,” the report said. The concern is that biotechnology is a “dual use” technology—meaning normal scientific developments could also be harnessed as weapons. The report noted that new discoveries “move easily in the globalized economy, as do personnel with the scientific expertise to design and use them.” Clapper didn’t lay out any particular bioweapons scenarios, but scientists have previously speculated about whether CRISPR could be used to make “killer mosquitoes,” plagues that wipe out staple crops, or even a virus that snips at people’s DNA. “Biotechnology, more than any other domain, has great potential for human good, but also has the possibility to be misused,” says Daniel Gerstein, a senior policy analyst at RAND and a former under secretary at the Department of Homeland Defense. “We are worried about people developing some sort of pathogen with robust capabilities, but we are also concerned about the chance of misutilization. We could have an accident occur with gene editing that is catastrophic, since the genome is the very essence of life.”

#### Bioterrorism causes Extinction – overcomes any conventional defense.

Walsh 19, Bryan. End Times: A Brief Guide to the End of the World. Hachette Books, 2019. (Future Correspondent for Axios, Editor of the Science and Technology Publication OneZero, Former Senior and International Editor at Time Magazine, BA from Princeton University)//Elmer

I’ve lived through disease outbreaks, and in the previous chapter I showed just how unprepared we are to face a widespread pandemic of flu or another new pathogen like SARS. But a deliberate outbreak caused by an engineered pathogen would be far worse. We would face the same agonizing decisions that must be made during a natural pandemic: whether to ban travel from affected regions, how to keep overburdened hospitals working as the rolls of the sick grew, how to accelerate the development and distribution of vaccines and drugs. To that dire list add the terror that would spread once it became clear that the death and disease in our midst was not the random work of nature, but a deliberate act of malice. We’re scared of disease outbreaks and we’re scared of terrorism—put them together and you have a formula for chaos. As deadly and as disruptive as a conventional bioterror incident would be, an attack that employed existing pathogens could only spread so far, limited by the same laws of evolution that circumscribe natural disease outbreaks. But a virus engineered in a lab to break those laws could spread faster and kill quicker than anything that would emerge out of nature. It can be designed to evade medical countermeasures, frustrating doctors’ attempts to diagnose cases and treat patients. If health officials manage to stamp out the outbreak, it could be reintroduced into the public again and again. It could, with the right mix of genetic traits, even wipe us off the planet, making engineered viruses a genuine existential threat. And such an attack may not even be that difficult to carry out. Thanks to advances in biotechnology that have rapidly reduced the skill level and funding needed to perform gene editing and engineering, what might have once required the work of an army of virologists employed by a nation-state could soon be done by a handful of talented and trained individuals. Or maybe just one. When Melinda Gates was asked at the South by Southwest conference in 2018 to identify what she saw as the biggest threat facing the world over the next decade, she didn’t hesitate: “A bioterrorism event. Definitely.”2 She’s far from alone. In 2016, President Obama’s director of national intelligence James Clapper identified CRISPR as a “weapon of mass destruction,” a category usually reserved for known nightmares like nuclear bombs and chemical weapons. A 2018 report from the National Academies of Sciences concluded that biotechnology had rewritten what was possible in creating new weapons, while also increasing the range of people capable of carrying out such attacks.3 That’s a fatal combination, one that plausibly threatens the future of humanity like nothing else. “The existential threat that would be most available for someone, if they felt like doing something, would be a bioweapon,” said Eric Klien, founder of the Lifeboat Foundation, a nonprofit dedicated to helping humanity survive existential risks. “It would not be hard for a small group of people, maybe even just two or three people, to kill a hundred million people using a bioweapon. There are probably a million people currently on the planet who would have the technical knowledge to pull this off. It’s actually surprising that it hasn’t happened yet.”

#### Gene editing causes extinction

Christian Wolfe 9, Associate Editor for American Association of Inside Sales Professionals, "Human Genetic Diversity and the Threat to the Survivability of Human Populations", https://www.ohio.edu/ethics/2003-conferences/human-genetic-diversity-and-the-threat-to-the-survivability-of-human-populations/

Through advances in reproductive technologies humans will eventually have the ability to utilize nearly fully artificial selection on human populations. These technologies raise many ethical and theological concerns. I will address one of the pragmatic ethical concerns, the potential loss of genetic diversity. Genetic diversity has a direct relation to the fitness and survivability of various species and populations; as genetic diversity decreases within a population, so does the fitness and survivability of that population. An examination of the genetic diversity argument (GDA) reveals that there is not strongly persuasive evidence regarding the effects on genetic diversity of the reproductive technologies on human populations. The only method available to produce the required evidence is through a very complex form of human experimentation. The type of human experiment that would produce the evidence is incompatible with present ethical codes of conduct. Therefore, any implementation of these technologies on human populations should be banned. There are many emerging technologies that could potentially affect genetic diversity. These include genetic testing and screening, selective breeding, population control, sterilization, selective abortion, embryo testing and selection, sperm donation, egg donation, embryo donation, surrogate pregnancy, fertility drugs, contraception, cloning embryos, and germ line or somatic cell manipulation (Resnik 2000, 454). Each of these reproductive technologies affects the composition of the human gene pool by increasing or decreasing the frequency of different genotypes or combinations of genotypes (Resnik 2000, 454). The germ-cell line, or just germ-line, constitutes a cell line through which genes are passed from generation to generation (World of Genetics 322). Germ-line therapy is often differentiated from somatic cell therapy, which is the alteration of non-reproductive cells. This distinction is not as clear as much of the literature supposes, but the problems with the germ-line/somatic cell distinction are beyond the scope of this paper. The focus of this paper includes the screening of embryos with the possibility of destruction of certain embryos, the modification of DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) of early stage embryos through in-vitro fertilization (IVF), and the modification of parent gametes (Zimmerman 594-5). These technologies pose the clearest threat to genetic diversity of human populations. Genetic testing and screening examines the genetic information contained in a person’s cells to determine whether that person has or will develop a certain disease, is more susceptible to certain environmental risks, or could pass a disease on to his or her offspring (World 305). Parents could subject themselves to testing to determine whether or not to reproduce based on the likelihood of their potential children inheriting their genetic maladies. Also, embryos can be subjected to testing and screening to determine the likelihood that the future individual will develop a genetic disease. From that information, parents can decide to destroy the embryo, alter the embryo, or leave the embryo unmodified and risk that the child will develop a genetic disease. Germ-line gene therapy (GLGT) is germ-line manipulation on the genetic level in order to prevent genetic diseases in future persons (Richter and Bacchetta 304). The goal of GLGT is to treat human diseases by correcting the genetic defects that underlie the genetic disorders (Anderson and Friedmann 907). Therapy presents an alternative to destroying embryos likely to develop genetic disease by actually correcting genetic defects. Also available is the alteration of parent gametes in order to eliminate the possibility of passing on genetic disease to their offspring. GLGT allows for the alteration of either the early stage embryo or the parent gametes to prevent genetic disease. By either eliminating those genotypes that are likely to produce genetic disease or by altering the genome to actually prevent the genetic disease from developing, these technologies have great potential to affect the genetic diversity of a population. Genetic diversity is the variety and frequency of different genotypes or combinations of different genotypes within a population. A population is a geographically, socially, or culturally linked group whose reproductive decisions affect those within the group. Genetic diversity is measured by genetic variability, which diminishes in a population when the number of different phenotypes or the number of different combinations of genotypes decreases. Since populations are composed of individuals that carry genotypes, individual reproductive outcomes affect the genetic variability within specific populations (Resnik 2000, 452). Genetic diversity provides the resource for phenotypic variation that is integral in determining the rate of evolutionary change in an environment. A population that lacks genetic diversity will be poorly equipped to meet environmental changes and demands (Resnik 2000, 452). The importance of genetic diversity is undeniable; the survivability of a population is directly related to genetic diversity. While genetic diversity has no intrinsic value, genetic diversity has a clear instrumental value. Humans place positive value in genetic diversity as it promotes the extrinsic value of survivability. There is an ethical duty to prevent decreases in the genetic diversity of populations because of its importance in the survivability of those populations. Decreases in genetic diversity in populations are ethically undesirable because actions that reduce the survivability of the population are unethical. The genetic diversity argument (GDA) starts from the fact that scientific and technological developments in the realm of genetics and human reproduction will greatly affect the genetic diversity of human populations. There are both pessimistic and optimistic versions of the argument. I will briefly describe both versions of the GDA. The pessimistic version of the argument contends that the increased ability to control human reproduction will result in a loss of genetic diversity that will threaten the health and survivability of human populations (Resnik 2000, 451). This threat to health and survivability is due to a decrease in the populations’ ability to adapt to environmental changes and demands. In effect, these technologies have the potential to make the pool of available phenotypic traits limited enough so that human populations will not be able to respond to changes in environmental demand. This version of the GDA warns that germ-line altering reproductive technologies will reduce populations’ gene pools and eliminate potentially useful genes. Genetic diversity provides a resource of these useful genes. Evolutionary change is blind and has no way to know which genes are useful, therefore it is potentially damaging to population survivability to eliminate genes of any sort. As Glenn McGee notes, “The point of the GDA is that human beings also have no way of knowing which genes will be useful in the future or in different environments” (cited in Resnik 2000, 456). For instance, genetically homogenous populations of corn face problems with blight due to lack of genetic diversity. Although human populations have an ever-increasing level of control over the environment, the pessimistic response still turns on the inability to determine which genes will be useful in the future. The optimistic version of the genetic diversity argument contends that these reproductive technologies could lead to increases in human health and survivability resulting in an improvement of the well being of populations (Resnik 2000, 457). The basis for this response rests on the historical fact that advances in technology increase humans’ ability to control nature. The ability to control nature often leads to positive changes in the adaptability and survivability of human populations. The optimistic GDA relies on this historical fact and the seemingly obvious inference that the above technologies will increase the ability to affect the genetic diversity of human populations (Resnik 2000, 457). A commonly cited example of how genetic diversity can be increased with the implementation of such technologies is the incredible diversity of canines. Of course, there are important dissimilarities such as the explicit intention to increase phenotypic diversity. A major factor in whether these reproductive technologies will increase or decrease genetic diversity is what model they are implemented under, free market or state control. Each model addresses the concerns and motivations of those affected differently. The free market model is based upon the reproductive decisions of a diverse group of potential parents with separate interests, motivations, and means. The free market is the method by which many consumer decisions are made in the United States. This model is fundamentally based on the interaction between supply and demand. If a market demands diversity of a product, then the market will often supply the desired diversity. If the market demands the standardization of goods, such as building supplies, then that homogeneity is likely to be supplied. Also, markets create new preferences and demands by introducing new goods and services to the market. Most often, advancements in technology increase market variability, except of course if that development results in the formation of a monopoly. The diversity of goods in the free market system of America seemingly justifies the inference that a free market model for reproductive technologies would lead to increases, not decreases, in the genetic diversity of human populations. Both J. Glover and W. Gardner’s individual studies conclude, “Increases in our ability to control human reproduction will result in more genetic diversity in the human population because parents will have a variety of preferences and values that they can use in selecting offspring” (cited in Resnik 2000, 458). Just as technological advancements have increased the availability of diverse consumer products, germ-line altering technologies could increase the available options in reproduction and therefore increase the diversity of human populations. Nevertheless, confounding factors such homogeneity of desirable characteristics makes the above inference much more dubious than it first appears. The major problem with the free market model is the potential emergence of the homogeneity of desirable characteristics. Many characteristics such as intelligence, athleticism, and health, are almost universally accepted as desirable. Other characteristics such as height, eye color, and hair color, also have particular value attached to them. Genetic homogeneity could arise if the consumers of reproductive technologies have similar preferences for traits. As Resnik states, “If most people want tall, intelligent, healthy children with blonde hair and blue eyes, then parental choices could produce a phenotypically and genetically homogeneous population” (2000, 459). This problem is only exacerbated when one considers the phenomenon of fads. Societal pressures and obligations may also produce conformity. While these social effects may not take hold immediately, it seems possible, if not probable that these pressures would eventually affect reproductive decisions. Genetic homogeneity may be an unintended consequence of a population sharing common values (Resnik 2000, 459). If most people within a population have similar characteristic preferences and a desire to conform, genetic homogeneity is almost inevitable. Of course much of this line of reasoning depends on genetic determinism, which is incredibly naïve and misinformed. Environmental factors often play a decisive role in which phenotypes are displayed. If certain desirable traits, such as intelligence or health, were strongly linked to environmental factors regardless of genotype, then the inference from individual choices to phenotypic characteristics would be dramatically weakened (Resnik 2000, 465). On the other hand, if certain genes or series of genes are linked to a trait, and that genotype is most frequently selected, it would still poses the potential threat of a genetically homogeneous population, although not phenotypically homogeneous. There are good reasons to believe that the free market system will create greater genetic diversity within human populations. On the other hand, the influences of societal pressures and expectations should not be underestimated or ignored (Resnik 2000, 459). State control involves the local or federal government dictating the standards of practice in certain industries, such as the power industry, education, and mass transit. This model of control in implementing genetic technologies appears likely to lead to decreases in genetic diversity within a population. It is imaginable that the government would develop specific standards to which all human beings produced in that state would be subject. The effects of state control of reproductive technologies are not clearly predictable. A state controlled system could lead to a genetic caste system. For instance, if the state determined that all people should be a certain height, weight, IQ, color, sexual orientation, etc., then those who diverge from those state determined standards could be forced into different strata of the genetic caste system. Such scenarios are certainly plausible, if not likely under state controlled conditions. Under free market conditions, reproductive technologies could lead to increases or decreases genetic diversity. On the other hand, state control would almost inevitably lead to decreases in genetic diversity, but the extent of such effects is not clear. As David Resnik claims, “the consequences of not exerting social or governmental control over human genetics may be just as troubling, since parents will in all likelihood attempt to provide their children with genetic advantages, and the long-term results of parental control over human genetics may further exacerbate existing social and economic inequalities and create a genetic caste system” (1997, 428). The inability to produce definitive evidence of the effects of reproductive technologies under either control model points to urgency of the issue and the minimal knowledge of these technologies’ implications for the future of humanity. Each version of the GDA provides ground for arguments that could support or undermine the utilization of germ-line altering reproductive technologies. The most obvious conclusion from examining both versions is that there is no definitive evidence that implementing the above technologies will have positive or negative consequences for the survivability of human populations. Furthermore, an examination of the two most plausible options for methods of implementing the technologies within a population does not produce strong evidence that implementation will result in either increases or decreases in genetic diversity. This leaves medical science at an ethical crossroads between either continuing with the technologies and dealing with the results afterwards, or abstaining from research, or at least clinical trials, until such evidence arises. Neither of these paths seems to be positive, or even tenable. The only method for producing clear evidence about the potential threat to survivability that these reproductive technologies pose would be to continue research and perform a massive clinical trial. Animal experimentation is not a viable alternative to human experimentation because it completely eliminates many of the confounding factors such as social influences. Since the arguments on either side of the GDA cannot produce conclusive results, and given the potential harm done to populations if the reproductive technologies are implemented and genetic diversity does decrease, some form of human experimentation seems necessary before the technologies should be implemented. Of course, there are many questions that arise in response to such a claim, including the justification of the inference to the necessity of human experimentation. I will discuss these concerns below. To clarify the inference, one should be reminded of what is at stake with respect to genetic diversity. The cautionary tales of the GDA describe potentially analogous situations, such as the effects of artificial selection on the survivability of maize and the variety of canines that have been produced by artificial selection. It is not at all clear what effects the above reproductive technologies will have on a population’s genetic diversity. Their implementation could result in increases in disease susceptibility like the result of artificial selection on maize, or it could result in populations with incredible arrays of genetically distinct individuals, such as in the canine example. What is clear though is that genetic diversity has an inverse relationship with the adaptability and survivability of populations. Since human populations value their own survivability, it is clear that technologies that pose a great potential threat to genetic diversity should be closely examined before being implemented. Due to the great potential threat these technologies present to humans, it is necessary to produce very strong, if not definitive, evidence about the effects of these technologies on genetic diversity. The only way to produce such evidence is human experimentation. There are many factors that must be accounted for in a human experiment that would produce definitive evidence. The number and diversity of subjects would have to emulate a population that would be affected by the technologies. The experiment would have to be extensive enough to determine the effects on future generations. To account for potential homogeneity of desirable characteristics, the experiment should account for both diverse cultural and societal pressures. Furthermore, the experiment should be carried out under the two control models mentioned above, free market and state control. Also, there would have to be a method of curtailing influences from the non-experimental population. Finally, in the event that something goes awry with the experiment, there must be a method of destroying the test subjects. Given present ethical standards concerning human experimentation, the ethics of such an experiment are, at best, deeply problematic. While ethical norms can dramatically change with time through changes in societal norms and beliefs, the means necessary to employ such an experiment are almost incomprehensible. For instance, it is not at all clear how the experiment would quarantine the subjects or how to handle the necessity of multiple generations of researchers. The role of informed consent is unclear with such an experiment. In the proposed experiment, an unethical researcher could use informed consent in a manner to produce the results that the researcher desires and undermine the purpose of the experiment. Additionally, an integral part of informed consent is the ability to withdraw from the experiment at any time. This element could pose a serious problem for this type of research. Therefore informed consent must either be eliminated or be drastically altered. Under present ethical norms it is clear that the kind of experiment necessary to provide strongly persuasive evidence of the effects of germ-line altering reproductive technologies would be unethical. Ethical considerations aside, the pragmatics of such an experiment are daunting to say the least. The use of germ-line altering technologies should not be implemented until strongly persuasive evidence regarding the effects on genetic diversity is concretely established. Decreases in the genetic diversity of a population would put at risk the survivability of that population. Humans place a clear value in the survivability of populations. Therefore anything that threatens the survivability of populations is unethical. Germ-line altering reproductive technologies may potentially decrease genetic diversity within a population. Until there is concrete evidence demonstrating that such technologies will not lead to decreases in a population’s genetic diversity, those technologies should not be utilized. The only method of assessment to produce such evidence is through human experimentation. The nature of the necessary experimentation involves unacceptable ethical violations and unavoidable pragmatic difficulties. Without strong proof that such technologies do not pose a threat to genetic diversity, and therefore population survivability, those technologies should not be implemented. Due to the fact that such evidence is not possible, germ-line altering technologies should be banned.

#### The Disease Impact –

#### 1] They can’t solve it – their impact is about future pandemics BUT their CRISPR I/L is about prior-known disease that we can find genetic cures to.

#### 2] The Aff will say “CRIPSR solves their turns” – that’s incorrect – CRISPR isn’t a silver bullet for Disease.

Radcliffe 17 Shawn Radcliffe 8-26-2017 "Will Gene Editing Allow Us to Rid the World of Diseases?" <https://www.healthline.com/health-news/will-gene-editing-allow-us-to-rid-world-of-diseases> (Shawn Radcliffe is a science writer and yoga teacher in Ontario, Canada.)//Elmer

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

#### 3] No Impact

#### a] Inverse relationship between infection and lethality AND decreasing virulency

Ord 20 Dr. Toby Ord 20, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10

The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11

When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox.

During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13

Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined.

Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15

[FOONOTE]

In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biological observations and theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extreme rarity of diseases that kill more than 75%