### 1

#### Interpretation: Medicines are substances used to prevent, diagnose, or treat harms.

**MRS 20** [(MAINE REVENUE SERVICE SALES, FUEL & SPECIAL TAX DIVISION) “A REFERENCE GUIDE TO THE SALES AND USE TAX LAW” <https://www.maine.gov/revenue/sites/maine.gov.revenue/files/inline-files/Reference%20Guide%202020.pdf> December 2020] SS

[Medicines](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/medicines) means antibiotics, analgesics, antipyretics, stimulants, sedatives, antitoxins, anesthetics, antipruritics, hormones, antihistamines, certain “dermal fillers” (such as BoTox®), injectable contrast agents, vitamins, oxygen, vaccines and other substances that are used in the prevention, diagnosis or treatment of disease or injury and that either (1) require a prescription in order to be purchased or administered to the retail consumer or patient; or (2) are sold in packaging.

#### Prefer – it’s a legal and has intent to define which proves we’re right and consistent with topic lit

#### CRISPR is a platform technology, not a medicine.

Editas Medicine [(a clinical-stage biotechnology company which is developing therapies based on CRISPR–Cas9 gene editing technology)., No Date, CRISPR Gene Editing, <https://www.editasmedicine.com/crispr-gene-editing/>] Justin

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

#### Their evidence proves the violation—it says CRISPR has the potential to treat which is distinct and the only example, CTX001, is a drug resulting from CRISPR tech, not CRISPR itself—we read blue.

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

Gene-Editing Genius

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

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

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

Even if it can be used in that way not all applications can be so it’s extra T.

#### Negate –

#### 1] Limits – their model explodes it to medical devices, any form of strategy for medical research, databases that are used to create medicines and more – only our definition creates a reasonable caselist for medicines while they make prep impossible and wreck engagement. Our unifies the literature to only medicines, not what’s used to develop medicines which skirts discussions away from big pharma’s control over medicine

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. o/w because it’s the only intrinsic to your decisionmaking

#### Education – only portable impact from debate we care about what we learn not if we’re fair

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps –

#### [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm

#### [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs –

#### a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument

#### b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

### 2

#### Permissibility, presumption, and skep negate:

#### [1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### [2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### [3] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

**Affirm: maintain as true.**

**That’s Dictionary.com**- “affirm” <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm>

#### The meta-ethic is practical reason—

#### [1] Inescapability— I can question why to follow or the validity of an ethical theory, which concedes the authority of reason as if I question reason, I use reason to question. Outweighs on validity—any other truth risks falsity Reality may be fake, our experiences may be arbitrary, and experience may be descriptive not normative, but questioning the validity of reason requires reason, conceding its validity. Any other ethic begs the question of why, meaning it’s arbitrary and nonbinding

#### [2] Action theory— Only reason can explain why we take transitional action to an overall end. For example, setting the end of tea provides me a reason to unify the necessary actions to produce tea, like getting a pot, filling it with water, etc. Any other explanation fails since it can’t give meaning to why we take transitioning action – freezing action. 2 Impacts—

#### [a] That’s a side constraint on the AC—ethics is a guide to action so it must appeal to a structure of action.

#### [b] Bindingness—reason is intrinsic to actions since only it can provide value to transitioning action, which justifies universality

#### If we are all reasoners, we must all be able to determine if an action is good. An action that maximizes my freedom at the cost of others then would have to be recognized as good by everyone, but that leads to a contradiction where everyone takes other’s freedoms to maximize theirs, making it impossible to reach my end

#### Thus, the standard is respecting a system of inner and outer freedom

#### Negate—

#### [1] Reducing intellectual property violates rights to property

Riccardo Pozzo 06 [January 2006, "Immanuel Kant on intellectual property," https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250048266\_Immanuel\_Kant\_on\_intellectual\_property] // WW DL

**\*We do not endorse the author’s gendered language**

Corpus mysticum, opus mysticum, propriété incorporelle, proprietà letteraria, geistiges Eigentum. All these terms mean intellectual property, the existence of which is intuitively clear because of the unbreakable bond that ties the work to its creator. The book belongs to whomever has written it, the picture to whomever has painted it, the sculpture to whomever has sculpted it; and this independently from the number of exemplars of the book or of the work of art in their passages from owner to owner. The initial bond cannot change and it ensures the author authority on the work. Kant writes in section 31/II of the Metaphysics of Morals: “Why does unauthorized publishing, which strikes one even at first glance as unjust, still have an appearance of being rightful? Because on the one hand a book is a corporeal artifact (opus mechanicum) that can be reproduced (by someone in legitimate possession of a copy of it), so that there is a right to a thing with regard to it. On the other hand a book is also a mere discourse of the pub 1 Lecturer (Full Professor) of History of Philosophy at University of Verona. Article received on oct/ 06 and approuved for publication on dec/06. 12 Trans/Form/Ação, São Paulo, 29(2): 11-18, 2006 lisher to the public, which the publisher may not repeat publicly without having a mandate from the author to do so (praestatio operae), and this is a right against a person. The error consists in mistaking one of these rights for the other” (Kant, 1902, t.6, p.290). The corpus mysticum, the work considered as an immaterial good, remains property of the author on behalf of the original right of its creation. The corpus mechanicum consists of the exemplars of the book or of the work of art. It becomes the property of whoever has bought the material object in which the work has been reproduced or expressed. Seneca points out in De beneficiis (VII, 6) the difference between owning a thing and owning its use. He tells us that the bookseller Dorus had the habit of calling Cicero’s books his own, while there are people who claim books their own because they have written them and other people that do the same because they have bought them. Seneca concludes that the books can be correctly said to belong to both, for it is true they belong to both, but in a different way. The peculiarity of intellectual property consists thus first in being indeed a property, but property of an action; and second in being indeed inalienable, but also transferable in commission and license to a publisher. The bond the author has on his work confers him a moral right that is indeed a personal right. It is also a right to exploit economically his work in all possible ways, a right of economic use, which is a patrimonial right. Kant and Fichte argued that moral right and the right of economic use are strictly connected, and that the offense to one implies inevitably offense to the other. In eighteenth-century Germany, the free use came into discussion among the presuppositions of a democratic renewal of state and society. In his Supplement to the Consideration of Publishing and Its Rights, Reimarus asked writers “instead of writing for the aristocracy, to write for the tiers état of the reader’s world.” (Reimarus, 1791b, p.595). He saluted with enthusiasm the claim of disenfranchising from the monopoly of English publishers expressed in the American Act for the Encouragement of Learning of May 31, 1790. Kant, however, was firm in embracing intellectual property. Referring himself to Roman Law, he asked for its legislative formulation not only as patrimonial right, but also as a personal right. In Of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing, he considered the moral faculties related to intellectual property as an “inalienable right (ius personalissimum) always himself to speak through anyone else, the right, that is, that no one may deliver the same speech to the public other than in his (the author’s) name” (Kant, 1902, t.8, p.85). Fichte went farther in the Demonstration of the Illegitimity of Pirate Publishing. He saw intellectual property as a part of his metaphysical construction of intellectual activity, which was based on the principle that thoughts “are not transmitted hand to hand, they are not paid with shining cash, neither are they transmitted to us if we take home the book Trans/Form/Ação, São Paulo, 29(2): 11-18, 2006 13 that contains them and put it into our library. In order to make those thoughts our own an action is still missing: we must read the book, meditate – provided it is not completely trivial – on its content, consider it under different aspects and eventually accept it within our connections of ideas” (Fichte, 1964, t.I/1, p.411).

## Case

### Framework

#### Util triggers permissibility—

#### Problem of induction—I predict based on past experiences, but there’s no justification for why those past experiences are true besides they worked in the past, which is based on experiences and is circular

#### Infinite consequences—each action has a consequence which leads to another consequence—if I drop a pen, that could lead to a hurricane so there is no consequence that can be predicted

#### What if we are in a simulation or dream or our experiences are controlled by monsters? Experience may not be valid

#### Pain and pleasure arbitrary and not a stasis point—people have different interps on whether 3 headaches or a migraine is worse

#### Util relies on internalism, which has no bindingness since I could say I did an action because I didn’t know that the result would be bad since no one knows my experiences

#### Off Moen—

#### [1] hijack – expressions of pain and pleasure are only possible through freedom bc we can only make those deicisons if we can reason

#### [2] hijack – conflicting desires prove there is a higher level reasoning ie people hate the taste of broccoli but eat it for health

#### [3] false – ppl hate pain but still watch horror movies

#### [4] no warrant – there’s now warrant for why pain and pleasure are intrinsic it’s just posited

#### [5] doesn’t hijack kant – our framework proves we value freedom not bc of pleasure but bc of its intrinsicness to an agent

#### [6] reject occams razor – it oversimplifies and misunderstands agents which means we can’t assign proper obligations to them.

#### Off moral uncertainty—

#### [1] infinitely regressive – we need theories to predict existential events which requires debating the best theory but then we need to prevent extinction

#### [2] turn – the longer we live the more moral uncertainty in the 1200s we didn’t have as many moral theories as we do now

#### [3] voting aff wont prevent extinction so there’s no impact

#### [4] theres infinite existential risks so we never get to debating moral theories so it’s self-defeating

#### The second Bostrom ev—

#### [1] all our indicts criticize their calculations

#### [2] this is just a reason under util why extinction is first, not under any framework

**Innovation**

**[1] CRISPR fails.**

**CUMC 17**, Columbia University Medical Center, 5-30-2017, "CRISPR Gene Editing Can Cause Hundreds of Unintended Mutations," http://newsroom.cumc.columbia.edu/blog/2017/05/30/crispr-gene-editing-can-cause-hundreds-of-unintended-mutations/

As CRISPR-Cas9 starts to move into clinical trials, a new study published in Nature Methods has found that the gene-editing technology can introduce hundreds of unintended mutations into the genome. “We feel it’s critical that the scientific community consider the potential **hazards of all off-target mutations caused by CRISPR**, including **single nucleotide mutations** and mutations in **non-coding regions of the genome**,” says co-author Stephen Tsang, MD, PhD, the Laszlo T. Bito Associate Professor of Ophthalmology and associate professor of pathology & cell biology in the Institute of Genomic Medicine and the Institute of Human Nutrition at Columbia University Medical Center. CRISPR-Cas9 editing technology—by virtue of its speed and unprecedented precision—has been a boon for scientists trying to understand the role of genes in disease. The technique also has raised hope for more powerful gene therapies that can delete or repair flawed genes, not just add new genes. The first clinical trial to deploy CRISPR is now underway in China, and a U.S. trial is slated to start next year. But even though CRISPR can precisely target specific stretches of DNA, it **sometimes hits other parts of the genome**. Most studies that search for these off-target mutations use computer algorithms to identify areas most likely to be affected and then examine those areas for deletions and insertions. “These predictive algorithms seem to do a good job when CRISPR is performed in cells or tissues in a dish, but whole genome sequencing has not been employed to look for all off-target effects in living animals,” says co-author Alexander Bassuk, MD, PhD, professor of pediatrics at the University of Iowa. In the new study, the researchers sequenced the entire genome of mice that had undergone CRISPR gene editing in the team’s previous study and looked for all mutations, including those that only altered a single nucleotide. The researchers determined that CRISPR had successfully corrected a gene that causes blindness, but Kellie Schaefer, a PhD student in the lab of Vinit Mahajan, MD, PhD, associate professor of ophthalmology at Stanford University, and co-author of the study, found that the genomes of two independent gene therapy recipients had sustained more than **1,500 single-nucleotide mutations and more than 100 larger deletions and insertions**. **None** of these DNA mutations were predicted by computer algorithms that are widely used by researchers to look for off-target effects. “Researchers who aren’t using whole genome sequencing to find off-target effects may be missing potentially **important mutations**,” Dr. Tsang says. “Even a **single nucleotide** change can have a **huge impact**.”

**[2] CRISPR’s useless OR mutations are inev regardless**

**Fu et al 13** [Yanfang Fu, Molecular Pathology Unit at Mass General Hospital, Department of Pathology, Harvard Medical School.] “High-frequency off-target mutagenesis induced by CRISPR-Cas nucleases in human cells” Nature Biotechnology volume 31, pages 822–826 (2013) (https://www.nature.com/articles/nbt.2623) – MZhu

Clustered, regularly interspaced, short palindromic repeat (CRISPR) RNA-guided nucleases (RGNs) have rapidly emerged as a facile and efficient platform for genome editing. Here, we use a human cell–based reporter assay to characterize off-target cleavage of CRISPR-associated (Cas)9-based RGNs. We find that single and double mismatches are tolerated to varying degrees depending on their position along the guide RNA (gRNA)-DNA interface. We also readily detected off-target alterations induced by four out of six RGNs targeted to endogenous loci in human cells by examination of partially mismatched sites. The **off-target sites we identified harbored up to five mismatches and many were mutagenized with frequencies comparable to (or higher than) those observed at the intended on-target site**. Our work demonstrates that RGNs can be highly active even with imperfectly matched RNA-DNA interfaces in human cells, a finding that might **confound their use in research and therapeutic applications**.

#### [3] No extinction from pandemics

* Death rates as high as 50% didn’t collapse civilization
* Fossil fuel record caps risk at .1% per century
* health, sanitation, medicine, science, public health bodies, solve
* viruses can’t survive in all locations
* refugee populations like tribes, remote researchers, submarine crews, solve

Ord 20 Ord, Toby. Toby David Godfrey Ord (born 18 July 1979) is an Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities and is a key figure in the effective altruism movement, which promotes using reason and evidence to help the lives of others as much as possible.[3] He is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, where his work is focused on existential risk. BA in Phil and Comp Sci from Melbourne, BPhil in Phil from Oxford, PhD in Phil from Oxford. The precipice: existential risk and the future of humanity. Hachette Books, 2020.

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 In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk. Our population now is a thousand times greater than over most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate.17 And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), SARS (probably bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds).18 Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate.19 Modern civilization may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the last 10,000 years.20 Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. 21 It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a high extinction risk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.

### WTO Cred

**Collapse is inevitable and growth causes a laundry list of impacts**

**Foster 19** – Professor of Sociology @ the University of Oregon, Ph.D. in Political Science @ York University, editor of the Monthly Review, former critical Essay Editor/Archives Editor, Organization & Environment, editor and author of numerous books and articles about economics, environment, and capitalism [John, “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?” 2/1/2019, [https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next](https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/), DKP]

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that **capitalism has failed** as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological **“death spiral.”**1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy **are at the point of collapse**, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3 Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7 The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some **two billion people**, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13 Adequate **health care**, **housing**, **education**, and **clean water** and **air** are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by **gentrification** and **segregation**, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15 In the United States and other high-income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an **antibiotic-resistance crisis**, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18 At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to **intellectual dungeons**, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere **pipelines for prisons or the military.**21 More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, **constituting a new Jim Crow.** The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23 The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27 War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global **thermonuclear exchange**. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29 Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. **Trade and currency wars** are **being** actively **promoted** by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30 More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35 The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from **climate change** to **ocean acidification**, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that **60 percent of** the world’s **wildlife** vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) **have been wiped out** since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38 If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a **Hothouse Earth**, in which **catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible**.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40 Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and **bankrolling climate denialism**—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity. Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42 We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43

**Turn – econ decline reduces risk of conflict**

**Clary 15**. Cristopher Clary has a PhD in political science from MIT, MA in national security affairs, postdoctoral fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University [“Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries”, 4/25/15, *MIT Political Science*, URL: <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2597712>]

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns encourage austerity and economizing behavior in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with **conciliatory policies** between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the **biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation** is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on **data from 109 distinct rival dyads** since 1950, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately **twice as likely** to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true **controlling for all of the main alternative explanations** for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may result from economic troubles. I define a rivalry as the perception by national elites of two states that the other state possesses conflicting interests and presents a military threat of sufficient severity that future military conflict is likely. Rivalry termination is the transition from a state of rivalry to one where conflicts of interest are not viewed as being so severe as to provoke interstate conflict and/or where a mutual recognition of the imbalance in military capabilities makes conflict-causing bargaining failures unlikely. In other words, rivalries terminate when the elites assess that the risks of military conflict between rivals has been reduced dramatically. This definition draws on a growing quantitative literature most closely associated with the research programs of William Thompson, J. Joseph Hewitt, and James P. Klein, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl.1 My definition conforms to that of William Thompson. In work with Karen Rasler, they define rivalries as situations in which “[b]oth actors view each other as a significant politicalmilitary threat and, therefore, an enemy.”2 In other work, Thompson writing with Michael Colaresi, explains further: The presumption is that decisionmakers explicitly identify who they think are their foreign enemies. They orient their military preparations and foreign policies toward meeting their threats. They assure their constituents that they will not let their adversaries take advantage. Usually, these activities are done in public. Hence, we should be able to follow the explicit cues in decisionmaker utterances and writings, as well as in the descriptive political histories written about the foreign policies of specific countries.3 Drawing from available records and histories, Thompson and David Dreyer have generated a universe of strategic rivalries from 1494 to 2010 that serves as the basis for this project’s empirical analysis.4 This project measures rivalry termination as occurring on the last year that Thompson and Dreyer record the existence of a rivalry. Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to downplay the seriousness of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to consider threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international economic cooperation. Leaders seek foreign aid, enhanced trade, and increased investment from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as capable of resolving economic difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. **Collectively**, these mechanisms make it much more likely that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this causal logic in greater detail, while also providing historical examples that these mechanisms recur in practice. **Economic Crisis Leads to Austerity** Economic crises generate pressure for austerity. Government revenues are a function of national economic production, so that when production diminishes through recession, revenues available for expenditure also diminish. Planning almost invariably assumes growth rather than contraction, so the deviation in available revenues compared to the planned expenditure can be **sizable**. When growth slowdowns are prolonged, the cumulative departure from planning targets can grow even further, even if no single quarter meets the technical definition of recession. Pressures for austerity are felt most acutely in governments that face difficulty borrowing to finance deficit expenditures. This is especially the case when this borrowing relies on international sources of credit. Even for states that can borrow, however, intellectual attachment to balanced budgets as a means to restore confidence—a belief in what is sometimes called “expansionary austerity”—generates incentives to curtail expenditure. These incentives to cut occur precisely when populations are experiencing economic hardship, making reductions especially painful that target poverty alleviation, welfare programs, or economic subsidies. As a result, mass and elite constituents strongly resist such cuts. Welfare programs and other forms of public spending may be especially susceptible to a policy “ratchet effect,” where people are very reluctant to forego benefits once they have become accustomed to their availability.6 As Paul Pierson has argued, “The politics [of welfare state] retrenchment is typically treacherous, because it imposes tangible losses on concentrated groups of voters in return for diffuse and uncertain gains.”7 Austerity Leads to Cutbacks in Defense Spending At a minimum, the political costs of pursuing austerity through cutbacks in social and economic expenditures alone make such a path unappealing. In practice, this can spur policymakers to curtail national security spending as a way to balance budgets during periods of economic turmoil. There is often more discretion over defense spending than over other areas in the budget, and it is frequently distantly connected to the welfare of the mass public. Many militaries need foreign arms and foreign ammunition for their militaries, so defense expenditures are doubly costly since they both take up valuable defense budget space while also sending hard currency overseas, rather than constituencies at home. Pursuing defense cuts may also conform to the preferences of the financial sector, which shows a **strong aversion** to military conflict even if that means policies of appeasement and conciliation.8 During periods of economic expansion, the opportunity costs associated with defense expenditure—the requirement for higher taxes or foregone spending in other areas—are real but acceptable. Economic contraction heightens the opportunity costs by forcing a choice between different types of spending. There is a constituency for defense spending in the armed services, intelligence agencies, and arms industries, but **even in militarized economies** this constituency tends to be numerically much smaller than those that favor social and economic expenditures over military ones. Defense Cutbacks Encourage Rapprochement An interest in defense cutbacks can lead to conciliatory behavior through two paths. **First**, the cutbacks themselves serve as a **concrete signal** to adversaries that the military threat posed by the economically distressed state is declining. This permits the other state to halt that portion of defense spending dedicated to keeping up, **breaking the back of ongoing arms races** through reciprocated, but non-negotiated moves. Unilateral conventional force reductions were a major element of Gorbachev’s foreign policy in the late 1980s, alongside negotiated strategic arms control, and diplomatic efforts to achieve political understandings with the United States.9 Gorbachev similarly used force reductions in Afghanistan, Mongolia, and the Soviet Far East to signal to China in 1987 that he was serious about political negotiations.10 Elsewhere, non-negotiated, tit-for-tat military redeployments facilitated Argentina-Brazil rapprochement.11 **Second**, leaders may believe cutbacks are necessary, but would be dangerous in the absence of negotiated improvements with traditional foes. Economic downturns can serve as **motivation to pursue arms control** or political settlement. During periods of normalcy, such outcomes would be positives, but are viewed as “too hard” by political leaders that move from one urgent problem to the next. During periods of economic crisis, however, arms control or political improvements might allow for much needed cuts in defense spending, and are **pursued with greater vigor**. The Johnson administration attempted both unilateral and negotiated arms limitations because of budgetary concerns as President Johnson and Secretary McNamara struggled to pay for the “Great Society” domestic programs and the increasingly costly Vietnam War. They first attempted unilateral “caps” on costly nuclear forces and anti-ballistic missile defenses and when this failed to lead to a reciprocal Soviet response they engaged in formal arms control talks. Détente continued in the Nixon administration, accelerating in 1971 and 1972, simultaneous with rising budget deficits and inflation so serious that Nixon instituted price controls. Nixon’s decision to sharply limit anti-ballistic missile defenses to enable arms control talks was **contrary to his strategic views, but necessitated by a difficult budgetary environment** that made paying for more missile defense emplacements unrealistic.12 As Nixon told his national security advisor Kissinger in an April 1972 discussion of ballistic missile and anti-ballistic missile developments: “You know we've got a hell of a budget problem. We've got to cut it down, we've got to cut 5 billion dollars off next year's defense budget. So, I don't want to [inaudible: do it?] unless we've got some settlement with the Russians.”13 In practice, unilateral defense cuts and force reductions are frequently combined with negotiated political agreements in a sequential, iterative fashion, where a unilateral reduction will **signal seriousness** that opens the way for political agreement, which in turn permits **even deeper reductions**. Defense cuts and force reductions are not only a means to achieve rivalry termination, but also a goal in and of themselves that rivalry termination helps secure. Leaders are seeking resources from defense they can use elsewhere. Thus when Argentine leader Raul Alfonsín campaigned for the need for drastic budgetary austerity, his specific “platform was the reduction of military spending to use it for the other ministries, connected with the concept of eliminating the hypothesis of conflict” with Argentinian rivals, according to Adalberto Rodríguez Giavarini, who served in Alfonsín’s ministry of defense (and later was Argentina’s foreign minister).14 Similarly, Gorbachev was motivated to reduce arms in the late 1980s because he determined it was necessary to cut Soviet defense spending and defense production, and repurpose part of the defense industry to make consumer and civilian capital goods, according to contemporary U.S. Central Intelligence Agency classified assessments.15 Thus the “**main reason**” why strategic arms control breakthroughs occurred from 1986 to 1988 and the Soviet Afghan intervention concluded in 1989 was a realization within the Politburo of “excessively high expenditures on defense,” according to Nikolai Ryzhkov, Gorbachev’s prime minister.16 **Economic Downturns Provoke Strategic Reassessment**: Threat Deflation and Prioritization Economic downturns encourage leaders to seek new ideas to use to frame their policy problems. During periods of economic difficulty, elites can come to realize that their problems are not amenable to old solutions, and search for new ideas.17 During an economic crisis, politics and policy are “**more fluid**,” as old answers seem stale and insufficient.18 An ideational entrepreneur that can link economic **lemons** to foreign policy **lemonade** can find a patron when leaders are casting about for ways to reframe the world in acceptable ways to their peers and publics. The behavior of an old foe is often ambiguous, and can be viewed as either injurious to one’s interests or neutral toward them. During periods of normalcy, the motivation of defense establishments is tilted toward threat and danger. During periods of economic crisis, national leaders have a counteracting motivation to **downplay such dangers**, so that the threats faced by a nation are manageable through available resources. Economic difficulties provide a motivation for leaders to view equivocal signals from the international system in a way that is benign. To the extent that rivalries are perpetuated because of threat inflation, economic downturns provide incentives to deflate the threat, potentially **disrupting cycles of competition and enmity**. South Korean president Kim Dae-jong came to power in the aftermath of the 1998 Asian economic crisis, pursued a “sunshine policy” toward the North, cut South Korean defense spending in nominal and real terms, and pursued a policy toward North Korea that political scientist Dong Sun Lee called “threat deflation” despite the growing North Korean nuclear weapons threat.19 Economic crises can also spur strategic reassessment through another channel. If leaders view economic problems as structural, rather than a temporary gale, they may come to question whether available national resources are sufficient to confront all of the national threats identified in the past. This creates incentives to economize threats, seeking political settlements where possible in order to focus remaining resources on competitions that can be won. A concrete example: in 1904, the chancellor to the Exchequer wrote his cabinet colleagues: “[W]e must frankly admit that the financial resources of the United Kingdom are inadequate to do all that we should desire in the matter of Imperial defense.”20 The result was a British decision to minimize political disagreement with the United States and focus on other defense challenges. While such a decision is in line with realist advice, it occurred not when the power trajectories were evident to British decisionmakers but when the budget situation had reached a crisis that could no longer be ignored. Economic Downturns Increase Incentives for International Economic Cooperation Economic downturns not only create incentives to cut spending, they encourage **vigorous pursuit** of opportunities for economic cooperation. This, too, can engender conciliatory behavior. Economic downturns can **increase motives to pursue trade** and investment. Rivalries with old foes often directly impinge on trade and investment with the adversary and may indirectly impinge on trade and investment with third parties, especially if the rivalry is viewed as being likely to generate disruptive military conflict. Additionally, economic aid is sometimes used as an inducement for adversaries to set aside a political dispute. This aid can either serve as a side payment from one rival to another, or it can be offered by a third party to one or both rivals as an incentive to set aside lingering disputes. Such aid is more attractive during periods of economic turmoil than during periods of comparative normalcy. In South Asia, India and Pakistan struggled from 1947 to 1960 with how to manage water resources in the Indus Rivers basin, inheriting a canal system meant to service pre-partitioned India. Pakistan, suffering an economic downturn, and India, reliant on foreign aid to avert economic crisis, agreed to an Indus Waters Treaty in 1960 to resolve the lingering dispute, made possible in substantial part because of World Bank financing that was especially attractive to the struggling economies. In the Middle East, Egypt and Israel made the hard choices necessary for the Camp David accord in 1979 precisely because the Sadat and Begin governments faced difficult economic situations at home that made the U.S. aid guarantee in exchange for a peace agreement especially attractive.21 In 1982, the Yemen’s People’s Republic agreed to stop its attempts to destabilize Oman, because otherwise Yemen would not receive economic assistance from Arab oil producing states that it desperately needed.22 In the late 1990s, El Niño-induced flooding devastated Ecuador and Peru, spurring reconciliation as leaders sought to increase trade, secure investment, and slash military expenditures so they could be used at home.23 As one Western diplomat assessed at the time, Ecuador and Peru “have decided it's better to see reason…. They see foreign companies eager to invest in South America, and if Peru and Ecuador are in conflict, it makes them less attractive than, say, Argentina or Brazil or Chile for investment purposes. That's the last thing either country wants.”24 **Economic Downturns Can Cause Meaningful Leadership Change** The above mechanisms have identified how economic difficulties can alter the preferences of an incumbent leader. Additionally, economic crises can lead to leadership turnover and, during periods of difficulty, the selection process that determines new leadership can **loosen ideological strictures** that relate to extant rivalries. Leaders may be selected based on judgments about their ability to cope with economic problems, with greater elite acceptance of ideological heterogeneity in foreign policy beliefs than in periods of normalcy.25 In Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth’s words, “If everything is going well or is stable, then why select leaders who might subvert the triedand-true identity? But if that identity is leading to increased material difficulties, pressure for change will likely mount. In these circumstances, those who are willing to alter or adjust the hallowed precepts of the existing identity and its associated practices are more likely to assume power.”26 Economic crisis, then, can spur incumbent leaders to either **abandon the “baggage” of rivalry** or facilitate the selection of new leaders that do not carry such baggage. The most well-known example of an incumbent selectorate looking for a reformer, even one without much foreign policy experience, involves Mikhail Gorbachev’s ascension to the Soviet premiership. In political scientist Jerry Hough’s words, “If the rate of economic growth continued to decline, if administrative and labor efficiency continued to fall, if corruption was not punished, these conditions would have dangerous consequences for the [Soviet Union in the] 1980s and 1990s…. Gorbachev’s promotion was an answer to these concerns.”27

**Crisis is a catalyst for transition**
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The good news is that **the inability of traditional politics and policies to address fundamental challenges has fueled an extraordinary amount of experimentation in communities** across the United States and around the world. It has also generated increasing numbers of sophisticated and thoughtful proposals that build from the bottom and begin to suggest new systemic possibilities beyond the failed systems of the past and present. **It is becoming possible to bring together and extend elements of innovative thinking and real world practice in key areas** to define the underlying structural building blocks of a range of alternatives capable **of rebuilding the basis for** democracy, liberty, equality, **sustainability**, and community in the United States in the twenty-first century. Unbeknownst to many, literally **thousands of on the ground efforts have been developing**. These include cooperatives, worker-owned companies, neighborhood corporations, and many little known municipal, state, and regional efforts. These **emerging economic alternatives suggest different ways in which capital can be held** in common **by small and large publics.** They include **nonprofit community corporations and land trusts that develop low income housing**, as well **as community development financial institutions** (CDFIs) that have over $108 billion in assets under their management.56 Employee ownership is also on the rise, involving three million more workers than are members of private sector unions. 57 A third of Americans belong to cooperatives, including credit unions that serve 107 million people and manage $1.3 trillion in assets, almost as much as is managed by Citi. 58 In the public sector, local government economic development programs invest in local businesses, while municipal enterprises build infrastructure and provide services, raising revenue and creating employment, diversifying the base of locally controlled capital. Public utilities, together with co-ops, make up nearly 90 percent of all electricity providers and generate over 20 percent of America’s electricity.59 From California to Alabama, public pension assets are being channeled into job creation and community development.60 Cities and states are looking to the creation of public banking systems like that of North Dakota. Trusts that allow for public ownership and management of natural resources provide revenue streams from capital, recalling the unjustly neglected ideas of James Meade.61 From parks and blood banks to libraries and the internet, commons management systems can provide an expanding zone of decommodification to buffer against the market. Public trusts can be extended into additional domains, from dry land to the electromagnetic spectrum, underwriting public services or issuing a citizen dividend. Community land trusts can ensure affordable housing and prevent disruptive gentrification and speculative real estate bubbles. New public strategies encompass both democratic public ownership and new planning capacities and functions. Even experts working on such matters rarely appreciate the sheer range of activity. Practical and policy foundations have been established that offer a solid basis for future expansion. A body of hard won expertise is now available in each area, along with support organizations, and technical and other experts who have accumulated a great deal of direct problem-solving knowledge. **The idea that we need a “new economy”**—that the entire economic system must be radically restructured if critical social and environmental goals are to be met—**runs directly counter to the American creed that capitalism as we know it is the best, and only possible, option.** Most of the new **projects, ideas, and research efforts have thus gained traction slowly and with little** national **attention. But in the wake of the financial crisis, they have proliferated and earned a surprising amount of support**—and not only among advocates on the left. New terms have begun to gain currency in diverse areas with activist groups and constituencies, an indication that the domination of traditional thinking may be starting to weaken. Thus we encounter the sharing economy, the caring economy, the provisioning economy, the restorative economy, the regenerative economy, the sustaining economy, the collaborative economy, the solidarity economy, the gift economy, the resilient economy, the steady state economy, the new economy, and many, many more. **There are calls for a Great Transition**, or for a reclamation of the Commons. **Creative thinking by researchers and engaged scholars is also contributing to the ferment, and policies at the state and local level can help move projects to much more powerful scale and community-wide impact**. Larger scale strategic options that build on what is being learned locally are beginning to be sketched as the basis for longer-term national strategies. The press covers very little of this, but the various institutional efforts have begun to develop new strategies that suggest broader possibilities for change. One promising model builds on work in Cleveland, Ohio, where a linked group of worker owned companies has developed, supported in part by the massive purchasing power of local hospitals and universities. These cooperative firms include a solar installation and weatherization company, an industrial scale ecologically advanced laundry, and a greenhouse capable of producing over three million heads of lettuce and 300,000 pounds of herbs a year.62 This effort, modeled in part on the 74,000-person Mondragón cooperative network in the Basque region of Spain, will create new businesses, as time goes on.63 However, its goal is not simply worker ownership, but the democratization of wealth and sustainable community building in general in an extremely poor neighborhood of what was once a thriving industrial city. Linked by a community-serving non-profit corporation and a revolving fund, the companies cannot be sold outside the network; they also return ten percent of their profits to help develop additional worker-owned firms and grow the network. Cities across the United States—and overseas as well—are looking to the Cleveland Model as an inspiration for their own community wealth building efforts. A critical element of the overall sustainability strategy points to what is essentially a quasi-public community stabilizing planning model. Hospitals and universities in the area currently spend $3 billion a year on goods and services—none, until recently, purchased from the immediately surrounding neighborhood. The Cleveland Model is supported in part by decisions of these substantially publicly financed institutions to allocate part of their procurement to the worker-coops in support of a larger community-building agenda. The taxpayer funds that support institutions of this kind thereby do double duty by helping to support the broader community through the new localized purchasing arrangements. The same is true for a range of municipal, state, and other federal policies available to local businesses, including employee-owned firms. Note carefully that such stabilization also undercuts the growth imperative—and suggests principles that can also be applied at higher levels. Such approaches cannot claim to provide all the answers. But a number of exploratory efforts emphasize fundamental changes in underlying political-economic institutions. **Developing detailed and sophisticated alternatives that can be refined over time is a prerequisite if we are to stimulate a serious and wide-ranging debate around a broader menu of institutional possibilities** for future development than the narrow range of choices commonly discussed. The need for a major change of direction is increasingly obvious. **Efforts to cobble together “solutions” to today’s challenges commonly draw upon the very same institutional arrangements and practices that gave rise to the problems in the first place. What is required is a self-conscious effort to face the fact that the system itself has to be changed and a different kind of political economy created.** Although precisely what “changing the system” means is obviously a matter of debate, certain key points are clear. The **new movements seek a cooperative, caring and community-nurturing economy that is ecologically sustainable, equitable, and socially responsible**—one that is based on rethinking and democratizing the nature of ownership at every level and, along with this, **challenging the growth paradigm that is the underlying assumption of all conventional policies.** In short, these **movements seek an economy that gives true priority to people, place, and planet.** Such an economy, so different from our own, requires a new vocabulary, beyond the narrow choice between “capitalism” and “socialism.” It’s easy to overestimate the possibilities. Emerging ideas and institutional explorations are limited compared with the power of Wall Street banks and the other corporate giants of the American economy. On the other hand, precisely because the existing structures of power have created enormous economic problems and fueled public anger, the opportunity for a more profound shift exists. **Unexpectedly rapid change is not out of the question.** We have already seen how, in moments of crisis, the nationalization of auto giants like General Motors and Chrysler can suddenly become a reality. Such crises are likely to be repeated in the future, possibly with more far reaching outcomes over time. **When the next financial breakdown occurs, huge injections of public money may well lead to the breakup or de facto takeover of major financial institutions.** At the same time, various forms of larger **institutional experimentation**—and pressure for further experimentation—**are also clearly in the cards.**

#### Economic growth causes global disease spread—turns advantage 1.
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Today, an increasingly urban and interconnected world faces growing threats from emerging infectious diseases (McMichael 2004; Kapan et al. 2006; Bradley and Altizer 2007). This is of particular concern in the developing world, where managing fast-spreading epidemics in the growing number of megacities is a pressing challenge (Rees 2013). Recent epidemics have underscored the importance of linkages between host habitats and the global network of cities. The Ebola virus, for example, has long survived among wildlife reservoirs in the hinterlands of Africa, ‘‘breaking out’’ in towns and cities in conspicuous but otherwise local epidemics. As in earlier outbreaks, the 2014 epidemic is thought to have origins in the consumption of wild animal protein, while its spread occurred in densely populated African cities. The international threat it posed stemmed from the increasing air travel connections between these and other cities around the world. In the case of arboviruses like Zika, dengue, chikungunya, West Nile, and malaria, whose vectors have found ready habitat in urban areas, the primary mechanism for the spread of disease from one city to the next is international trade and travel (Hay et al. 2005; Tatem et al. 2006; Alirol et al. 2011; Weaver 2013; Kraemer et al. 2015). The same is true of coronaviruses such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS). The latter emerged in Saudi Arabia in 2012, having been transmitted between animal reservoirs such as camels and their human handlers. It has since spread throughout the surrounding region, and travel-related human infections have been recorded in Europe, North America, and East and Southeast Asia (Parlak 2015; Zumla et al. 2015). Urbanization and globalization have made outbreaks of these diverse zoonoses difficult to control, even with unprecedented levels of international cooperation (Khan et al. 2013; Weaver 2013; Chan 2014; Kraemer et al. 2015). For most emerging infectious diseases, prevention is better than cure—ex ante mitigation of disease risk is more economically efficient than ex post adaptation to an outbreak (Murphy 1999; Graham et al. 2008; Voyles et al. 2014; Langwig et al. 2015). Among mitigation strategies, vaccination has been a widespread and long-established practice for many DNA viruses such as chicken pox or small pox. However, vaccination remains problematic for most RNA viruses, including Ebola, SARS, and avian influenza, due to their higher mutation rate; vaccination is simply not a feasible way to prevent the emergence of many novel zoonoses, which will inevitably encounter immunologically naïve populations. Therefore, mitigating the risks from emerging and reemerging zoonoses requires preemptive measures against their socioecological drivers (Pike et al. 2014). Identifying areas where the convergence of risk factors is occurring with greatest intensity, and at the largest scales, is a logical first step in the development of a mitigation strategy. In this regard, China may be an important outlier among countries. Assessment of the risks posed by zoonotic diseases requires an understanding of how socioeconomic, and ecological conditions affect two phenomena: emergence (the irruption of a pathogen originating in wildlife or livestock into human populations) and spread (the transmission of disease among both animals and people). In this article, we review the evidence for changes in zoonotic risks in China. More particularly, we show how income growth, urbanization, and globalization affect the likelihood of emergence and spread, using SARS and avian influenza as topical and representative examples, but also referring to other diseases when relevant. We discuss the policy implications of changes in the epidemiological environment in China, and consider how the mitigation of zoonotic risk in China could benefit the global risk environment.

### Innovation

#### [1] Framing issue – ALL of their internal links are from YEARS ago and their cards are talking about events that have already happened which should mean their impact is terminally non-unique & they’re missing an internal link to patent disputes from tons of new patents.

#### [2] No reverse Causality on any of their impacts – why does the aff increase genomic innovation. Hold the line since it wasn’t in the 1AC so don’t let them make new responses in the 1AR it makes the aff a shifting target

#### [3] The Stramiello ev

#### [a] no impact – they’re missing an internal link as to why disputes deter the development of tech – patent disputes don’t mean innovation comes to a halt

#### [b] it’s only about disputes on “foundational patent rights” which is not the kind of patents Mischel is about

#### [c] Their ev is SUPER SPECIFIC to 2018 – any other interpretation would be a terrible misreading of their evidence which you should reject

#### [4] The Sherkow ev

#### [a] no link- is about a specific dispute between UC & MIT+Harvard

#### [b] don’t solve – universities could dispute about anything which would implicate research sharing & their ev is only ab formal sharing which means alternative methods solve

#### [c] isn’t a problem with patents in general, but only giving patents to singular researchers when multiple participated

#### [5] Reader proves even if patents disincentivize some scientists – massive innovation is still possible from scientists that do hold the patents