**Resolved:**

**Public health services should expand access to gene editing technologies**

**Contention 1: Increase discrimination & inequality**

Gene editing would likely lead to its ignorance of the regulatory limits, to the emergence of a market-based eugenics that would exacerbate already existing discrimination, inequality, and conflict, as Arun Kumar wrote in 2017.

That is because, according to Dr Michael Antoniou, “Permitting germline intervention for any intended purpose would open the door to an era of high-tech consumer eugenics in which affluent parents seek to choose socially preferred qualities for their children,”

Marcy Darnovsky agrees that, "You could find wealthy parents buying the latest offspring upgrades for their children. We could see the emergence of genetic haves and have nots, leading to even greater inequality than we already live with." And such technology “would set in motion a bunch of competitive and commercial dynamics … and even if these genetically modified children weren’t really stronger, better or more intelligent, [we] could be inserting new types of discrimination and new inequality into the world,” Darnovsky goes on to conclude.

And what discrimination and inequality lead to is even more severe health problems. As Lewis saied in 2015, “overwhelming body of research on discrimination and health indicates that self-reported experiences of discrimination are an important risk factor for poor mental and physical health.” And Olshansky furthers that “People who are discriminated against also often times have higher levels of stress, which can cause hypertension, heart disease, and chronic illness.” This kind of negative impacts of discrimination largely outweighs the technology of gene editing.