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Interpretation: The affirmative must defend the hypothetical implementation and consequences of a topical plan

Brightline: Advocacy text defends some sort of expansion of free speech, I can clarify topical plans in CX

Violation: They don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1) Arbitrariness:

#### Our interpretation is the only predictable, non-arbitrary point of stasis because the resolution is determined by a neutral third party – taking the point of stasis out of the debater’s hands is the only way to ensure debate isn’t skewed to one side or another because neither the aff nor the neg picks it—it’s a procedural question because it implicates our ability to debate-independent voter

#### 2) Advocacy skills – constantly testing beliefs within debate teaches us to defend our views and persuasively provide justifications for our arguments – independently it’s key to argument testing which turns the aff – objective truth does not exist but testing ideas is necessary to come to intersubjective truths and actualizing the aff’s education

#### 3) Limits – infinite possible k affs they can read

We have no idea what they can read because it is outside the scope of the resolution, there are like thousands of critical authors and millions of possible performances. Explosion of limits destroys in depth research and clash – having a limited topic ensures we have the time to learn about the complex nature of surveillance– every area of scholarship is multifaceted but their model of debate proliferates horizontally to no end, creating shallow understandings of the literature itself and undermines debates potential to provide skills that allow debaters to dive vertically into literature

#### 4) Switch Side

#### The affirmative holds to their beliefs so tightly that they refuse to switch sides and argue against their own ideals – this is a DOGMATIC WAY OF APROACHING the world that assumes the aff has already found capital T truth

# T

#### Interp: they must defend the res and only the res

Britannica https://www.britannica.com/topic/World-Trade-Organization

**World Trade Organization6** is [international organization](https://www.britannica.com/topic/international-organization) established to supervise and liberalize world trade

Meriam webster 9 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce>

reduce9 is to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number

#### Extra T is a voter

#### Ground: They get infinite ground, fiat infinite scenarios, solve every disad, makes it possible to be the neg

#### Predictability:

#### Voter for fairness

#### TVAs: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines by requiring each member state to be invested in open science that be made available to all countries as a global common.

#### No 1AR theory a] There is a 7-6-time skew after NC, negs get 1 less minute text: do the aff tmrw b] They get new 2AR responses to 2NR counter-interps, that makes theory irresolvable because I don’t have a 3NR, and they win every theory debate because I can’t answer their responses c] AC spikes solve there aren’t that many theory issues d] deters 1NC abuse checking because of meta-theory, that means 6 minutes of aff abuse e] infinite abuse doesn’t exist, 1] 7 minutes if finite, 2] resolvability is a pre-req to checking abuse, you cant check abuse on a irresolvable issue

# Innovation DA

#### Medical innovation high now

Austin et al 21, David Austin and Tamara Hayford Joseph Kile, Lyle Nelson, and Julie Topoleski. Christopher Adams, Pranav Bhandarkar, and David Wylie, April 2021, “Research and Development in the Pharmaceutical Industry”

The pharmaceutical industry devoted $83 billion to R&D expenditures in 2019. Those expenditures covered a variety of activities, including discovering and testing new drugs, developing incremental innovations such as product extensions, and clinical testing for safety-monitoring or marketing purposes. That amount is about 10 times what the industry spent per year in the 1980s, after adjusting for the effects of inflation. The share of revenues that drug companies devote to R&D has also grown: On average, pharmaceutical companies spent about one-quarter of their revenues (net of expenses and buyer rebates) on R&D expenses in 2019, which is almost twice as large a share of revenues as they spent in 2000. That revenue share is larger than that for other knowledge-based industries, such as semiconductors, technology hardware, and software. The number of new drugs approved each year has also grown over the past decade. On average, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved 38 new drugs per year from 2010 through 2019 (with a peak of 59 in 2018), which is 60 percent more than the yearly average over the previous decade. Many of the drugs that have been approved in recent years are “specialty drugs.” Specialty drugs generally treat chronic, complex, or rare conditions, and they may also require special handling or monitoring of patients. Many specialty drugs are biologics (large-molecule drugs based on living cell lines), which are costly to develop, hard to imitate, and frequently have high prices. Previously, most drugs were small-molecule drugs based on chemical compounds. Even while they were under patent, those drugs had lower prices than recent specialty drugs have. Information about the kinds of drugs in current clinical trials indicates that much of the industry’s innovative activity is focused on specialty drugs that would provide new cancer therapies and treatments for nervous-system disorders, such as Alzheimer’s disease and Parkinson’s disease.

#### IP protections motivate innovators to take risks – that means long term development and prolif

Bacchus '20 (James Bacchus; James Bacchus is a member of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, the Distinguished University Professor of Global Affairs and director of the Center for Global Economic and Environmental Opportunity at the University of Central Florida. He was a founding judge and was twice the chairman—the chief judge—of the highest court of world trade, the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization in Geneva, Switzerland.; 12-16-2020; "An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines"; https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines#, Cato Institute, accessed 7-21-2021; JPark)

With the belief that medicines should be “public goods,” there is literally no support in some quarters for the application of the WTO TRIPS Agreement to IP rights in medicines. Any protection of the IP rights in such goods is viewed as a violation of human rights and of the overall public interest. This view, though, does not reflect the practical reality of a world in which many medicines would simply not exist if it were not for the existence of IP rights and the protections they are afforded. Technically, IP rights are exceptions to free trade. A long‐​standing general discussion in the WTO has been about when these exceptions to free trade should be allowed and how far they should be extended. The continuing debate over IP rights in medicines is only the most emotional part of this overall conversation. Because developed countries have, historically, been the principal sources of IP rights, this lengthy WTO dispute has largely been between developed countries trying to uphold IP rights and developing countries trying to limit them. The debate over the discovery and the distribution of vaccines for COVID-19 is but the latest global occasion for this ongoing discussion. The primary justification for granting and protecting IP rights is that they are incentives for innovation, which is the main source for long‐​term economic growth and enhancements in the quality of human life. IP rights spark innovation by “enabling innovators to capture enough of the benefits of their own innovative activity to justify taking considerable risks.”18 The knowledge from innovations inspired by IP rights spills over to inspire other innovations. The protection of IP rights promotes the diffusion, domestically and internationally, of innovative technologies and new know‐​how. Historically, the principal factors of production have been land, labor, and capital. In the new pandemic world, perhaps an even more vital factor is the creation of knowledge, which adds enormously to “the wealth of nations.” Digital and other economic growth in the 21st century is increasingly ideas‐​based and knowledge intensive. Without IP rights as incentives, there would be less new knowledge and thus less innovation. In the short term, undermining private IP rights may accelerate distribution of goods and services—where the novel knowledge that went into making them already exists. But in the long term, undermining private IP rights would eliminate the incentives that inspire innovation, thus preventing the discovery and development of knowledge for new goods and services that the world needs. This widespread dismissal of the link between private IP rights and innovation is perhaps best reflected in the fact that although the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals for 2030 aspire to “foster innovation,” they make no mention of IP rights.19

#### Innovation is k2 stopping bioterror

Marjanovic and Fejiao ‘20 Marjanovic, Sonja, and Carolina Feijao. Sonja Marjanovic, Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitive biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon. "Pharmaceutical Innovation for Infectious Disease Management: From Troubleshooting to Sustainable Models of Engagement." https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html (2020). [Quality Control]

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sci-ences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well recognized as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and compe-tition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceu-tical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sec-tor.2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing indus-try-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing com-pounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID-19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating tri-als for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accel-erate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be rela-tively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pres-sure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing com-bination product that is being tested for therapeutic poten-tial against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterror-ism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the imme-diate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infec-tious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contribu-tions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innova-tion conditions.

#### Bioterror is the largest medical threat—it o/w’s pandemics on probability

Bakerlee ‘21 Chris Bakerlee is a Ph.D. candidate studying evolutionary genetics at Harvard University and a fellow in the Council on Strategic Risks’s Fellowship for Ending Bioweapons Programs. "Mother Nature is not 'the ultimate bioterrorist' - STAT." STAT, 8 Jan. 2021, www.statnews.com/2021/01/08/mother-nature-is-not-the-ultimate-bioterrorist. [Quality Control]

Taken together, these examples show that this meme no longer serves us well. It is undoubtedly a mistake to underestimate the threats from natural pathogens. At the same time, it is equally unwise to wield this 19-year-old expression like a magic wand, intending to briskly banish concerns about people causing harm with biology. We can’t afford to blind ourselves or others to the uncomfortable truth that, with each passing day, humans grow more capable of outdoing nature and harnessing biotechnology to cause harm on a staggering scale, by either cruelty or carelessness. Nature has no interests, motives, or political goals. To the extent it can be said to “want” anything, it is to perpetually enhance populations’ differential reproductive success, which only rarely aligns with causing greater harm to humans. Notably, the trillions of bacteria living in the average human’s colon appear to have adapted toward a peaceful and often mutually beneficial coexistence with their host. And even deadly pathogens may theoretically evolve toward making humans less sick if doing so opens up more opportunities for transmission between hosts. The process of natural selection, for all its power, is highly constrained in its ability to generate “superbugs” possessing a diabolical suite of traits. Like human bioengineers, natural selection must work around stubborn physiological trade-offs between traits, such as genome replication rate and mutation rate. But natural selection is also handicapped by near-sightedness, driving improvements in traits that enhance a population’s fitness in its current environment with no attention to maintaining or improving traits that enhance fitness in other environments. If creating an especially deadly pathogen were like winning a soccer match against a formidable opponent, natural selection would be competing with all the cunning of an especially persistent horde of 5-year-olds, glued to the ball and only ever capable of playing offense, defense, or goalie at any one time. By contrast, modern biologists are gaining the ability to see the whole field, develop an intuition about where the ball will be next, and play multiple positions simultaneously. Through a combination of rational design, directed evolution, breeding, and brute force trial and error, they can increasingly engineer organisms that excel in multiple desired functions at once, such as the ability to grow quickly in a massive industrial fermenter while churning out commercially valuable biomolecules. This growing capability promises tremendous benefits for agriculture, industry, and human health, but its potential application to the creation of pathogens poses serious concerns. It is worth emphasizing that trained biologists — let alone terrorists — still have difficulty one-upping natural selection’s creative output. Our understanding of biology is very much in its infancy. Yet our knowledge and capabilities are maturing rapidly, as evidenced by Twist’s prolific gene synthesis capabilities, along with recent feats in predicting protein structure, gene editing, and genome assembly. We are much closer to this exciting but frightening horizon today than we were in 2001, and this trend will likely persist. It’s also worth noting that, when it comes to weapons-grade biotechnology, states likely pose a greater risk than non-state terrorists. States have vastly more resources to support the development of biological weapons, and about 23 are known or suspected to have maintained biological weapons programs in the 20th century. Some programs, like North Korea’s, likely persist to this day. As countries jockey for advantage, state biological weapons programs remain an ever-present danger, despite the treaties and export controls designed to rein them in. Covid-19, which has exposed countries’ vulnerability to biological threats, has done little to mitigate this danger. Accidental releases pose an additional source of anthropogenic biorisk. Thanks to the U.S. government’s monitoring program, we know that dozens of agents and toxins with the potential to pose a severe threat to public health and agriculture are reported accidentally lost or released from U.S. labs every year. We also know that accidental releases around the world have already caused significant harm. Such risks increase as biotechnology expands across the world and gains in strength. Biotechnology, with all its promise and peril, is moving fast. It’s irresponsible of us to shrug off current and emerging biotechnological threats by reciting “Nature is the ultimate bioterrorist” like some article of faith. As with global warming, the cost of willful ignorance and inaction is high — and increasing. Our health security requires that we engage cautiously but honestly with the full spectrum of evolving biological risks, striving toward solutions with open eyes and moral courage

#### State-created bioweapons uniquely risk extinction in the hands of bioterrorists

Millett & Snyder-Beattie ‘17. Millett, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford; and Snyder-Beattie, M.S., Director of Research, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. 08-01-2017. “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity,” Health Security, 15(4), PubMed -CAT

In the decades to come, advanced bioweapons could threaten human existence. Although the probability of human extinction from bioweapons may be low, the expected value of reducing the risk could still be large, since such risks jeopardize the existence of all future generations. We provide an overview of biotechnological extinction risk, make some rough initial estimates for how severe the risks might be, and compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing these extinction-level risks with existing biosecurity work. We find that reducing human extinction risk can be more cost-effective than reducing smaller-scale risks, even when using conservative estimates. This suggests that the risks are not low enough to ignore and that more ought to be done to prevent the worst-case scenarios. How worthwhile is it spending resources to study and mitigate the chance of human extinction from biological risks? The risks of such a catastrophe are presumably low, so a skeptic might argue that addressing such risks would be a waste of scarce resources. In this article, we investigate this position using a cost-effectiveness approach and ultimately conclude that the expected value of reducing these risks is large, especially since such risks jeopardize the existence of all futu­­r­e human lives. Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity's favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and the Western Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).9 In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-21 Although these experiments had scientific merit and were not conducted with malicious intent, their implications are still worrying. This is especially true given that there is also a long historical track record of state-run bioweapon research applying cutting-edge science and technology to design agents not previously seen in nature. The Soviet bioweapons program developed agents with traits such as enhanced virulence, resistance to therapies, greater environmental resilience, increased difficulty to diagnose or treat, and which caused unexpected disease presentations and outcomes.22 Delivery capabilities have also been subject to the cutting edge of technical development, with Canadian, US, and UK bioweapon efforts playing a critical role in developing the discipline of aerobiology.23,24 While there is no evidence of state-run bioweapons programs directly attempting to develop or deploy bioweapons that would pose an existential risk, the logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction could create such incentives in more unstable political environments or following a breakdown of the Biological Weapons Convention.25 The possibility of a war between great powers could also increase the pressure to use such weapons—during the World Wars, bioweapons were used across multiple continents, with Germany targeting animals in WWI,26 and Japan using plague to cause an epidemic in China during WWII.27 Non-state actors may also pose a risk, especially those with explicitly omnicidal aims. While rare, there are examples. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan sought biological weapons for the express purpose of causing extinction.28 Environmental groups, such as the Gaia Liberation Front, have argued that “we can ensure Gaia's survival only through the extinction of the Humans as a species … we now have the specific technology for doing the job … several different [genetically engineered] viruses could be released”(quoted in ref. 29). Groups such as R.I.S.E. also sought to protect nature by destroying most of humanity with bioweapons.30 Fortunately, to date, non-state actors have lacked the capabilities needed to pose a catastrophic bioweapons threat, but this could change in future decades as biotechnology becomes more accessible and the pool of experienced users grows.31,32 What is the appropriate response to these speculative extinction threats? A balanced biosecurity portfolio might include investments that reduce a mix of proven and speculative risks, but striking this balance is still difficult given the massive uncertainties around the low-probability, high-consequence risks. In this article, we examine the traditional spectrum of biosecurity risks (ie, biocrimes, bioterrorism, and biowarfare) to categorize biothreats by likelihood and impact, expanding the historical analysis to consider even lower-probability, higher-consequence events (catastrophic risks and existential risks). In order to produce reasoned estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreats, we bring together relevant data and theory and produce some first-guess estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreat, and we use these initial estimates to compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing existential risks with more traditional biosecurity measures. We emphasize that these models are highly uncertain, and their utility lies more in enabling order-of-magnitude comparisons rather than as a precise measure of the true risk. However, even with the most conservative models, we find that reduction of low-probability, high-consequence risks can be more cost-effective, as measured by quality-adjusted life year per dollar, especially when we account for the lives of future generations. This suggests that despite the low probability of such events, society still ought to invest more in preventing the most extreme possible biosecurity catastrophes.
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#### Counterplan: The workers of the world should unite to create dual power political alternatives to capitalism. We must build independent communist institutions capable of surviving and defending themselves against the capitalist world. Not only does the alt solve for material violence in the transition period, it also eliminates the material and ideological dependences on capital that prevent revolution.

Escalante 19 [Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach" in Regeneration. March 26, 2019. [https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/] KZaidi](https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/%5d%20KZaidi) //LK [RCT 12/10/19]

Much has been written over the last few years about a dual power approach to communist strategy. I have written extensively about it at The Forge News, and discussed in video format in my YouTube video, Climate Change, Imperialism, and The End of The World. I will not be using this article to give a comprehensive recap on what dual power strategy is, so I suggest checking out those two links. In short: dual power strategy is an approach to communist revolution which seeks to build independent socialist institutions which exist in parallel to the currently existing capitalist state, in order to serve the masses. The goal of a dual power strategy is not to compete with capitalism or reform it out of existence, but rather to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, to recognize and politicize capitalist crisis as it occurs, and to have a real infrastructure in place for a revolutionary movement to self-sustain at the point that it must inevitably combat the capitalist state. This strategy focuses on building counter-institutions like tenants’ unions, agricultural cooperatives, radical labor unions, and Serve the People programs that not only demonstrate on-the-ground worker power but can provide for the needs of the masses without an appeal to reforming the currently existing capitalist state. I previously argued that a crucial advantage to dual power strategy is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis. Socialist agricultural and food distribution programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism. One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have twelve years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly. In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market-based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the left-wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends. The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that “Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis. The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the US can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the US. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the US military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change. Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever-shrinking twelve-year time frame. There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves? Revolution and Dual Power If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America-backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well-funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the US, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within twelve years. While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the meantime? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the US today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a harsh truth, but it is true. Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next twelve years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these twelve years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development. Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society. To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle. What I want to suggest here is that the production of food through dual power institutions should be a central project for this revolutionary movement. There are several reasons why I think this is the case. First, food production allows us to meet the most immanent needs of the masses. The US is plagued by food deserts which deprive huge portions of the population access to fresh food. Poverty exacerbates this further, and the devastating effects of lack of access of healthy food due to poverty are well documented. This is an urgent need that socialists can meet in order to demonstrate to the masses that it is socialists who can serve them where the capitalist state has failed. Second, food production is a major contributor to climate change. Large-scale meat production produces massive amounts of greenhouse gas, and the transportation of food from rule agricultural areas to urban populations centers is a major contributor as well. Urban agricultural projects and the development of sustainable permaculture are not sufficient to fix these problems, as they are not able to overthrow the capitalist system of agricultural production. However, paired with a broader revolutionary movement, these projects allow us to undertake scientific experimentation with meeting food needs, in order to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative food production methods that can eventually replace the current unsustainable capitalist model. After all, if our revolution cannot replace unsustainable production models, we will not be able to resolve climate change any better than the capitalists. Given these considerations, I think it is crucial that the revolutionary socialist movement begin to investigate and develop food production strategies that are part of a broader dual power project. If we hold that revolution is the only way to resolve climate crisis within the next twelve years, we need to have tested, demonstrably superior methods of food production ready to go. A revolutionary movement which cannot demonstrate an ability to meet the needs of the masses does not deserve their support, and food production is a crucial need. I am incapable of providing a comprehensive strategy here, I want to look at the ongoing organopónicos in Cuba, in order to demonstrate that the successes of Cuban urban agriculture can be of great a source of insight and strategy for our dual power projects. Learning from Cuba: Organopónicos Thankfully, we do not have to start from scratch when developing food production strategies. The development of urban agriculture in Cuba provides some important insights that can inform our own projects. In the 1990s, the collapse of the Soviet Union had a devastating effect on Cuba. The loss of a major trade partner paired with an ongoing imperialist embargo forced the Cuban state to pursue experimental solutions to food shortages. The loss of trade not only produced a food shortage but also ended import of agricultural machinery and pesticides needed for large-scale industrial farming. Access to gasoline also diminished, forcing the Cuban state to prioritize urban agriculture which did not need to be transported long distances. This crisis led to Cuba, almost incidentally, developing a sustainable and ecologically-oriented project of urban agriculture. Over the course of many years, this led to a system of civilian controlled organopónicos. This system of urban gardens, run by community members, has since grown to significant proportions. By 2003, Havana produced 90% of the fresh produce within the city because of the success of the organopónicos, largely without pesticides and with minimal fossil fuel expenditure for transportation. That same year, the Cuban Ministry of Agriculture reported a 50% decrease in fossil fuel usage. The system is made up of a variety of institutions, from state owned and operated plots, to cooperatively purchased and maintained gardens. In total, 87,000 acres of land are now being used for urban agriculture in Havana. Although the organopónicos are largely run by communities themselves, they receive support and funding from the Cuban state. For an incredibly in-depth analysis of the organopónico system, I highly recommend this impressively thorough report from Monthly Review. We must now ask: how might the development of the organopónico system inform dual power projects today? First, it is worth noting that the system cannot be directly copied and pasted into urban centers within the US. Subsidies from the Cuban state are crucial to maintaining the system at such a large-scale. Any projects undertaken in a dual power context will necessarily be smaller, due purely to funding for land acquisition. One other complication is that the population of US urban centers is largely unfamiliar with agriculture, a problem that was not so serious in Cuba. As such, application of lessons learned from the organopónico system will require socialist organizations in the US to develop agricultural education alongside actual food production. Despite these differences, the organopónico system proves that socialist approaches to food production are viable, and more importantly, environmentally sustainable. Not only has the socialist Cuban state found a way for its urban centers to collectively produce much of their food, it has done so without using environmentally destructive pesticides, and while driving down fuel consumption by a huge margin. There is more learning and experimenting to be done, as organopónicos do not yet provide complete self-sustenance for the cities in which they exist, but they demonstrate that socialist solutions can move us in that direction. For socialists in the US who are invested in dual power, the organopónico system ought to inspire us to begin our own collective production of food. For those who can acquire access to land in urban areas, it is possible to begin to develop small-scale projects integrating the lessons learned from the organopónico system. This not only allows us to combat the effects of food deserts by producing fresh produce within those deserts themselves but allows us to begin to further investigate and experiment with agricultural models that can be scaled up in a revolutionary socialist society to meet the needs of the populace. For those who cannot access sizable plots of land, small-scale permaculture can still be developed in yards, with windowsill gardens, and with public gardening spaces. The development of permaculture skills should be prioritized even if it can only occur at a small-scale. We must take a scientific, not a utopian, approach to socialism, and that means beginning to experiment and develop socialist infrastructure here and now. A climate catastrophe is on the horizon now. Even if we manage to achieve the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism within the twelve-year window, we will still see many devastating effects of climate change. Unfortunately, it is likely that global capitalism will survive much longer than twelve more years, so learning how to meet needs in a state of crisis will be crucial for socialist projects of the future. We will be forced to begin developing socialist projects in less than ideal conditions. As such, the lessons learned from organopónicos are of extra importance. Cuba’s urban agriculture is a product of crisis and demonstrates that even under conditions of intense crisis, socialist states can create solutions to meet the needs of the masses. I have not offered a particularly thorough investigation into the organopónico system in this article. For that, I really do recommend the Monthly Review piece linked above. Regardless, I hope that I have demonstrated that climate change poses a serious challenge for socialist organizing. It creates an intense urgency and requires us to develop strategies which can respond to horrific instances of crisis. I truly believe that dual power remains the best strategy for responding climate change, but it must be scientifically informed, and capable of actually providing sustainable socialist alternatives. We should be grateful for the Cuba’s experiments with organopónicos, and should commit to investigation and study of their experiments in order to inform our own projects. We are running out of time to act, and the stakes have never been higher.

# Case

## FWK

ROB is to vote for the better debater. Anything else is arbitrary, self-serving, and shifts the goal post.

#### The standard is maximizing expecting well being.

#### 1] Actor specificity

#### ---A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### ---B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments actively decide not to act so there is no omission

#### 2] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis – that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose.

#### 3] Extinction matters under any framework:

#### ---A] It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value – we can’t confer value onto anything if we’re not alive.

#### ---B] Future generations means infinite magnitude – we have to look towards future lives too