### 1

#### The affirmative is a futile compromise in the battlefield of capitalism. Even softening ip protections will not resolve contradictions and inequalities in society but only preserve laborers needed for the capitalist economy to function.

Rikowski 2006 (“A Marxist Analyhsis of the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.” By Ruthe Rikowski (Lecturer at London South Bank University. Senior Edoitor for Chandos Information Processional Series, and author of multiple books and journal articles.) Volume 4, Number 4 2006 of Policy Futures in Education. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2304/pfie.2006.4.4.396>) 0:24

Fundamentally, it will be impossible to implement TRIPS in a way that will significantly benefit the developing world, because of the inherent inequalities and contradictions that are built into the very fabric of global capitalism itself. Furthermore, the drives of capital are infinite; it will never be satisfied. So, there will never come a point where it will be decided that the inequalities need to be lessened in any fundamental way. Instead, TRIPS, as a tool which aids the furtherance of global capitalism, is likely to increase the inequalities. Furthermore, inequalities and poverty will only ever be lessened (and largely on a temporary basis) when pressure is placed on those in positions of power. In regard to TRIPS this rests on putting pressure on the WTO through organisations such as the Third World Network and various NGOs in order to soften some of the most worrying of the implications of TRIPS for the poor and those in the developing world.

However, capitalism is a battlefield upon which various compromises are and can only ever be made, but it can never ultimately be for the benefit of the labourer and the poor. To change the situation on a permanent basis, we need to terminate capitalism and replace it with socialism and eventually with communism in my opinion.

#### Modern capitalism is fueled directly by its relationship with militarism. War is just an opportunity for profit from the military-industrial complex to export technology overseas and post-war is just an opportunity for businesses to “rebuild” regions. The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the team that best challenges capitalism

Mezaros 2003 (“Militarism and the Coming Wars” by Istvan Mesaros at Monthly Review January 2003 <http://monthlyreview.org/2003/06/01/militarism-and-the-coming-wars/>) 0:31

The dangers and immense suffering caused by all attempts at solving deep-seated social problems by militaristic interventions, on any scale, are obvious enough. If, however, we look more closely at the historical trend of militaristic adventures, it becomes frighteningly clear that they show an ever greater intensification and an ever-increasing scale, from local confrontations to two horrendous world wars in the twentieth century, and to the potential annihilation of humankind when we reach our own time.

It is most relevant to mention in this context the distinguished Prussian military officer and practical as well as theoretical strategist, Karl Marie von Clausewitz (1780-1831), who died in the same year as Hegel; both of them killed by cholera. It was von Clausewitz, director of the Military School of Berlin in the last thirteen years of his life, who in his posthumously published book—Vom Kriege (On War, 1833)—offered a classic definition of the relationship between politics and war that is still frequently quoted: “war is the continuation of politics by other means.”

This famous definition was tenable until quite recently, but has become totally untenable in our time. It assumed the rationality of the actions which connect the two domains of politics and war as the continuation of one another. In this sense, the war in question had to be winnable, at least in principle, even if miscalculations leading to defeat could be contemplated at the instrumental level. Defeat by itself could not destroy the rationality of war as such, since after the—however unfavorable—new consolidation of politics the defeated party could plan another round of war as the rational continuation of its politics by other means. Thus the absolute condition of von Clausewitz’s equation to be satisfied was the winnability of war in principle, so as to recreate the “eternal cycle” of politics leading to war, and back to politics leading to another war, and so on ad infinitum. The actors involved in such confrontations were the national states. No matter how monstrous the damage inflicted by them on their adversaries, and even on their own people (just remember Hitler!), the rationality of the military pursuit was guaranteed if the war could be considered winnable in principle.

Today the situation is qualitatively different for two principal reasons. First, the objective of the feasible war at the present phase of historical development, in accordance with the objective requirements of imperialism—world domination by capital’s most powerful state, in tune with its own political design of ruthless authoritarian “globalization” (dressed up as “free exchange” in a U.S. ruled global market)—is ultimately unwinnable, foreshadowing, instead, the destruction of humankind. This objective by no stretch of imagination could be considered a rational objective in accord with the stipulated rational requirement of the “continuation of politics by other means” conducted by one nation, or by one group of nations against another. Aggressively imposing the will of one powerful national state over all of the others, even if for cynical tactical reasons the advocated war is absurdly camouflaged as a “purely limited war” leading to other “open ended limited wars,” can therefore be qualified only as total irrationality.

The second reason greatly reinforces the first. For the weapons already available for waging the war or wars of the twenty first century are capable of exterminating not only the adversary but the whole of humanity, for the first time ever in history. Nor should we have the illusion that the existing weaponry marks the very end of the road. Others, even more instantly lethal ones, might appear tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. Moreover, threatening the use of such weapons is by now considered an acceptable state strategic device.

Thus, put reasons one and two together, and the conclusion is inescapable: envisaging war as the mechanism of global government in today’s world underlines that we find ourselves at the precipice of absolute irrationality from which there can be no return if we accept the ongoing course of development. What was missing from von Clausewitz’s classic definition of war as the “continuation of politics by other means” was the investigation of the deeper underlying causes of war and the possibility of their avoidance. The challenge to face up to such causes is more urgent today than ever before. For the war of the twenty first century looming ahead of us is not only “not winnable in principle.” Worse than that, it is in principle unwinnable. Consequently, envisaging the pursuit of war, as the Bush administration’s September 17, 2002 strategic document does, make Hitler’s irrationality look like the model of rationality.

#### Capitalism created international law to spread capitalism. Any agreements on an international level by countries comes with it expanding their interest to other parties yet large power players can disregard those same laws as there is an unequal relationship between states, altering how institutional organizations function

Chimni 17 (“Towards an Integrated Marxist Approach to International Law (IMAIL) In International Law and World Order: A Critique of Contemporary Approaches (pp. 440-550). by B.S. Chimni (Legal scholar, Distinguished Professor of International Law at Jindal Global Law School and served on the Academic Advisory Committee of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees from 96-00) ambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781107588196.009) 0:43

First, he noted that ‘the spread and development of international law occurred on the basis of the spread and development of the capitalist mode of production’. 109 That is to say, ‘the victory of the bourgeoisie, in all the European countries, had to lead to the establishment of new rules and new institutions of international law which protected the general and basic interests of the bourgeoisie, i.e., bourgeois property’. 110 But Pashukanis recognized that while ‘as a separate force which set itself off from society, the state only finally emerged in the modern capitalist bourgeois period’ it by no means followed that ‘the contemporary forms of international legal intercourse, and the individual institutions of international law, only arose in the most recent times’. 111 Since exchange relations existed among tribes and communities, international law was prevalent among the earliest ancient legal institutions that existed. In this period international law helped resolve disputes, including territorial disputes, between tribes. 112 In these contexts Pashukanis went on to touch upon developments in Greek and Roman law. 113 However, he emphasized that it is only in the capitalist period ‘having subordinated itself to the state machine, the bourgeoisie brought the principle of the public nature of authority to its clearest expression’, and therefore ‘the state only fully becomes the subject of international law as the bourgeois state ’. 114 In the same way as an individual assumed the quality of a legal subject only under capitalism, the state becomes the subject of international law only as a capitalist state.

Second, responding to the eternal question as to whether international law is law, Pashukanis noted that ‘bourgeois jurisprudence has devoted a great amount of fruitless effort in solving this contradiction’. 115 According to Pashukanis, the answer to the question whether international law is law lies in – here he anticipates classical realists like Hans Morgenthau – ‘the real balance of forces’ between bourgeois states. 116 He, of course, recognized that ‘within the limit set by a given balance of forces, separate questions may be decided by compromises and by exchange i.e., on the basis of law’. 117 But international law was likely to be disregarded when the interests of a state so demanded. 118 This was especially so in periods of crisis when the balance of forces ‘fluctuated seriously’ and when ‘vital interests’ or the ‘very existence of a state’ was threatened. 119 Pashukanis mentioned in this regard the period of 1914– 1918  ‘during which both sides continuously violated international law’. 120 However, he went on to make the acute observation that ‘every state in violating international law also tries to depict the matter as if there has been no violation whatsoever’. 121 The reason is that ‘the open denial of international law is politically unprofitable for the bourgeoisie since it exposes them to the masses and thus hinders preparations for new wars. It is much more profitable for the imperialists to act in the guise of pacifism and as the champions of international law’. 122

Third, Pashukanis rejected technical definitions of international law advanced by bourgeois international lawyers from which ‘the class character of international law’ was absent. 123 In his view, ‘bourgeois jurisprudence consciously or unconsciously strives to conceal the element of class’. 124 On his part he noted the links between capitalism and imperialism, and inter- imperialist competition, and observed that the capitalist countries divided the world into civilized and semi- civilized revealing ‘modern international law as the class law of the bourgeoisie ’. 125 According to Pashukanis, international law of his times was ‘the totality of norms which the capitalist bourgeois states apply in their relations with each other, while the remainder of the world is considered as a simple object of their completed transactions’. 126 Pashukanis was certainly right as ‘the real historical content of international law’ in this period was ‘the struggle between capitalist states’. 127 In fact international law owed ‘its existence to the fact that the bourgeoisie exercise(d) its domination over the proletariat and over the colonial countries’. 128 It was therefore indeed the class law of the bourgeoisie.

Fourth, he noted with respect to the assertion of basic or equal rights of states under international law that ‘it is most obvious that we are dealing here with ideas drawn from the sphere of civil law relationships with a basis in equality between the parties’. 129 He conceded that ‘to a certain degree the analogy may be extended. Bourgeois private law assumes that subjects are formally equal yet simultaneously permits real inequality in property, while bourgeois international law in principle recognizes that states have equal rights yet in reality they are unequal in their signifi-cance and their power’. 130 Therefore, at the level of political economy there was only ‘a difference in degree’ between domestic law and international law. 131 But he also went on to observe that the ‘dubious benefits of formal equality are not enjoyed at all by those nations which have not developed capitalist civilization and which engage in international intercourse not as subjects, but as objects of the imperialist states’ colonial policy’. 132 In other words, he recognized that in the instance of colonized states the analogy between domestic law and international law collapsed.

Fifth, he criticized Marxist scholars such as Karl Renner for stressing the ‘peaceful functions of international law’. 133 Pashukanis pointed out that ‘even those agreements between capitalist states which appear to be directed to the general interest are, in fact, for each of the participants a means of jealously protecting their particular interests, preventing the expansion of their rivals’ influence, thwarting unilateral conquest, i.e., in another form continuing the same struggle which will exist for as long as capitalist competition exists’. 134 He extended this logic to international organizations and wrote that ‘the struggle among imperialist states for domination of the rest of the world is thus a basic factor in defining the nature and fate of the corresponding institutions’. 135

#### Cap causes extinction – nuclear war, environmental destruction, and social inequality.

**Brown, 05** (Charles, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 05/13/2005, <http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm>) 0:26

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or **exacerbates all major social ills of our times**. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, **which can destroy all humanity, grows** with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian a nd Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. Racist violence and the poison of racist ideas victimize all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and **male supremacist** ideology perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

**The alternative is the communist hypothesis! Thought experiments like the alt allow us to hollow out capitalist spaces and destroy faith in the system.**

**Herod 04** – James Herod author of several books on capitalism and social activist since 1968 Getting Free 2004 http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm (0:26)

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, **a strategy for destroying capitalism**. This strategy, at its most basic**, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization**. The image then is **one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells**. This is definitely **an aggressive strategy.** It **requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order.** **The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed,** but it is **not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it**, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus **capitalist structures** (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) **are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected**. We **stop participating in activities that support** (finance, condone) **the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations.** In this way **our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist** relations **and force them out of existence**. This is how it has to be done. **This is a plausible, realistic strategy**. **To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight**, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism**, is foolhardy**. **Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations**. Such a **revolution will never happen automatically,** blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. **It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs.** But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t imply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). **Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life**, by millions of people. **It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so.** Nevertheless, **there are** many **concrete ways that** individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can **gut capitalism**, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always **keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves**. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. **By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets**, and so forth, we were **forced onto the labor market in order to survive**, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how **we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves** (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), **and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor** and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. **This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally**, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because **capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system**. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but **we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system**. Thus **our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else.** Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: **in order for capitalism to be destroyed** millions and millions of **people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want**. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather **it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire**, an overriding need. **What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way**, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. **Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.** The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. **The long term goa**l of communists, anarchists, and socialists **has always been to restore community**. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the **free development of each is a condition for the free development of all**. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. **The long term goals have always been clear**: to abolish wage-slavery, **to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world**.

## Case

### Adv

#### We control the root cause of war, which will cause nuclear war – their evidence says nuclear war is bad but there are no specific warrants why the scenario for war will occur in the first place

#### Opioid terrorism should’ve already been triggered it’s been over 4 years and the US is still just addicted to Opioids as it was during that time – additionally – marijuana hasn’t been legalized in many countries and even in most of the US, which means even reducing patents doesn’t reduce the amount of opioids being used or produced by nations

#### No solvency – Illicit market means that terrorists can get medicines from there where people are already buy drugs off the black market – they just have to purchase and then develop the weapon – stopping patents doesn’t solve that or it means that the aff doesn’t solve once the delay is over – their morell evidence says It is also produced by drug cartels – which decks solvency since they can continue regardless of legal changes

#### No attacks now – their quetteville evidence says its happening now but its from 2018 – at worst there were conflicts with non state actors in the middle east but nowhere have we gotten close to using chemical wepaons or WMD – even with the afghanistan pull out, there were no new developments that werent seen before

#### Too many steps to impact – which countries are still developing chemical weapons are unknown and how likely terrorists – the geneva convention also outlawed chemical weapons which means its even less likely to be stockpiled and used in different countries for terrorists to take

#### Legalization in Thailand doesn’t indicate it is happening globally – just means one country is okay with it

#### Bathtubs kill more people than terrorism

Mueller and Stewart 10/29/18 [John Mueller is Woody Hayes Senior Research Scientist, Mershon Center for International Security Studies, and adjunct professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University. He is also a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington. Mark G. Stewart is Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at The University of Newcastle in Australia. Terrorism and Bathtubs: Comparing and Assessing the Risks. October 29, 2018. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09546553.2018.1530662?journalCode=ftpv20]

The likelihood that anyone outside a war zone will be killed by an Islamist extremist terrorist is extremely small. In the United States, for example, some six people have perished each year since 9/11 at the hands of such terrorists—vastly smaller than the number of people who die in bathtub drownings. Some argue, however, that the incidence of terrorist destruction is low because counterterrorism measures are so effective. They also contend that terrorism may well become more frequent and destructive in the future as terrorists plot and plan and learn from experience, and that terrorism, unlike bathtubs, provides no benefit and exacts costs far beyond those in the event itself by damagingly sowing fear and anxiety and by requiring policy makers to adopt countermeasures that are costly and excessive. This article finds these arguments to be wanting. In the process, it concludes that terrorism is rare outside war zones because, to a substantial degree, terrorists don’t exist there. In general, as with rare diseases that kill few, it makes more policy sense to expend limited funds on hazards that inflict far more damage. It also discusses the issue of risk communication for this hazard

#### No impact to bioterror

Filippa Lentzos 14, PhD from London School of Economics and Social Science, Senior Research Fellow in the Department of Social Science, Health and Medicine at King’s College London, Catherine Jefferson, researcher in the Department of Social Science, Health, and Medicine at King’s College London, DPhil from the University of Sussex, former senior policy advisor for international security at the Royal Society, and Dr. Claire Marris, Senior Research Fellow in the Department of Social Science, Health and Medicine at King's College London, “The myths (and realities) of synthetic bioweapons,” 9/18/2014, http://thebulletin.org/myths-and-realities-synthetic-bioweapons7626

The bioterror WMD myth. Those who have overemphasized the bioterrorism threat typically portray it as an imminent concern, with emphasis placed on high-consequence, mass-casualty attacks, performed with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). This is a myth with two dimensions.¶ The first involves the identities of terrorists and what their intentions are. The assumption is that terrorists would seek to produce mass-casualty weapons and pursue capabilities on the scale of 20th century, state-level bioweapons programs. Most leading biological disarmament and non-proliferation experts believe that the risk of a small-scale bioterrorism attack is very real and present. But they consider the risk of sophisticated large-scale bioterrorism attacks to be quite small. This judgment is backed up by historical evidence. The three confirmed attempts to use biological agents against humans in terrorist attacks in the past were small-scale, low-casualty events aimed at causing panic and disruption rather than excessive death tolls. ¶ The second dimension involves capabilities and the level of skills and resources available to terrorists. The implicit assumption is that producing a pathogenic organism equates to producing a weapon of mass destruction. It does not. Considerable knowledge and resources are necessary for the processes of scaling up, storage, and dissemination. These processes present significant technical and logistical barriers.¶ Even if a biological weapon were disseminated successfully, the outcome of an attack would be affected by factors like the health of the people who are exposed and the speed and manner with which public health authorities and medical professionals detect and respond to the resulting outbreak. A prompt response with effective medical countermeasures, such as antibodies and vaccination, can significantly blunt the impact of an attack.

#### Zero risk of nuclear terrorism

Leonard Weiss 15, visiting scholar at the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University and member of the National Advisory Board of the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, March/April 2015, “On fear and nuclear terrorism,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. 71, No. 2, p. 75-87

Manufacturing a nuclear weapon. To accomplish this, a terrorist group would have to obtain an appropriate amount of one of the two most popular materials for nuclear weapons, highly enriched uranium (HEU) or plutonium separated from fuel used in a production reactor or a power reactor. Weapon-grade plutonium is found in weapon manufacturing facilities in nuclear weapon states and is very highly protected until it is inserted in a weapon. Reactor-grade plutonium, although still capable of being weaponized, is less protected, and in that sense is a more attractive target for a terrorist, especially since it has been produced and stored in prodigious quantities in a number of nuclear weapon states and non-weapon states, particularly Japan.

But terrorist use of plutonium for a nuclear explosive device would require the construction of an implosion weapon, requiring the fashioning of an appropriate explosive lens of TNT, a notoriously difficult technical problem. And if a high nuclear yield (much greater than 1 kiloton) is desired, the use of reactor-grade plutonium would require a still more sophisticated design. Moreover, if the plutonium is only available through chemical separation from some (presumably stolen) spent fuel rods, additional technical complications present themselves. There is at least one study showing that a small team of people with the appropriate technical skills and equipment could, in principle, build a plutonium-based nuclear explosive device (Mark et al., 1986). But even if one discounts the high probability that the plan would be discovered at some stage (missing plutonium or spent fuel rods would put the authorities and intelligence operations under high alert), translating this into a real-world situation suggests an extremely low probability of technical success. More likely, according to one well-known weapon designer,4 would be the death of the person or persons in the attempt to build the device.

There is the possibility of an insider threat; in one example, a team of people working at a reactor or reprocessing site could conspire to steal some material and try to hide the diversion as MUF (materials unaccounted for) within the nuclear safeguards system. But this scenario would require intimate knowledge of the materials accounting system on which safeguards in that state are based and adds another layer of complexity to an operation with low probability of success.

### 2

#### Interp: Debaters may not run delay plans

#### Violation: they do

#### Reasons to prefer:

#### Predictability: Can’t predict how long delays last or if the delays will be implemented then un implemented then implemented again making neg prep impossible on the implementation of the affirmative.

#### Ground: Affs can spike out of any negative arguments linking to the aff based on implementation because lit is based on permanent policies

#### Destroys limits: Lets affirmative add delay planks to all affs and spec infinite amount of times on duration of them. Makes debate impossible

#### Voter for fairness and education

#### Prefer counter interps. Reasonability is arbritary and invites judge intervention

### 3

#### Reduce means a net decrease

Public Law 87-253 (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982, 97th US Congress, Sept 8, 1982, Lexis)

E) Prior to approving any application for a refund, the Secretary shall require evidence that such reduction in market- ings has taken place and that such reduction is a net decrease in marketings of milk and has not been offset by expansion of production in other production facilities in which the person has an interest or by transfer of partial interest in the produc- tion facility or by the taking of any other action. which is a scheme or device to qualify for payment.

#### Reduce means to make smaller.

Concise Oxford English Dictionary, 2008, Twelfth Edition, Oxford Reference Online

Reduce v.

1. make or become smaller or less in amount, degree, or size. • boil (a sauce or other liquid) so that it becomes thicker and more concentrated. • (chiefly N. Amer.) (of a person) lose weight. • (Photography) make (a negative or print) less dense.

2. (reduce someone/thing to) bring someone or something by force or necessity to (an undesirable state or action). • (reduce someone to) make someone helpless with (shock, anguish, or amusement).

3. (reduce something to) change something to (a simpler or more basic form). • convert a fraction to (the form with the lowest terms).

4. (Chemistry) cause to combine chemically with hydrogen. • undergo or cause to undergo a reaction in which electrons are gained from another substance or molecule. The opposite of oxidize.

5. restore (a dislocated body part) to its proper position.

6. (archaic) besiege and capture (a town or fortress).

#### Violation: The plan text says “delay” enforcement for cannabis patents which does not result in a net decrease of those patents – blatantly untopical

#### Standards

#### Ground – topic disads like the innovation DA assume that there is a long-term result from the aff because a reduction results in a decrease of patents for the long term future. Their aff would skirt those discussion

#### Research -

#### The impact is fairness and education