# Contention 1: Military Readiness

#### The opioid crisis devastates national security and readiness

Xu 2018 - U.S. Air Force officers  
Ming and Jonathan Sawtelle, "Opioids: A Dark Allure With Deep National Security Implications," Feb 19, https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2018/02/19/opioids\_a\_dark\_allure\_with\_deep\_national\_security\_implications\_113074.html

The American opioid crisis is a slow burning rot with deep national security implications. The dark allure of opium--the strongest, most addictive, and now most accessible depressants ever known—erodes communities and incurs economic losses. The crisis, causing 63,600 deaths in 2016 and 52,000 in 2015, is bestowing quantifiable and devastating harm to children, friends, family and communities into the next generation.[i] Strained morgues and burgeoning orphanages are monuments to families eternally separated and communities at a loss for solutions. Healthcare costs compound losses of workforce productivity and tax flows. Unaddressed, these local tragedies will culminate in a reduction of national military readiness for years to come—even as China, the primary source of the dangerous opioid fentanyl rises to power parity with the United States. Able-bodied volunteers underwrite military readiness. Even before the crisis, qualified or interested candidates are a slim minority. The U.S. Defense Department says, “71% of America’s 34 million 17-24 year-old population could not qualify medically for military service.”[ii] Less than 1% are actually interested, and only .5% of America’s population actually serve.[iii] Opioid-related deaths and related addictions are increasing slightly in the 17-24 year-old population, chipping away at this already narrow recruiting pool. [iv] The future looks bleak. America’s labor force, 25-44 year-olds, the age group most likely to be today’s parents of tomorrow’s recruits, are leading the stats in the most number of opioid-related deaths, most reported addictions, and greatest percentage increase in both categories each year since 2015.[v] Consider this devilish effect of opioid addiction on recruiting: A small business in northeast Rustbelt Ohio actually has a hiring problem—management is unable to find qualified workers who can pass the drug test.[vi] Recruiting stations nationwide may face the same issue in the coming decades as orphans in foster care struggle to achieve parody of stable upbringing, education, health and wellness of children raised in a family. While qualified volunteers guarantee the national security of the United States, it is backed by immense budgetary resources—both at risk. A Center for Disease Control report estimates “the [U.S.] economic burden of prescription opioid overdose, abuse, and dependence…to be $78.5 billion each year.[vii] Nationally, opioid tragedies cost state and local governments more than $7 billion in law enforcement budgets, court cases and incarceration. In 2013, Medicare and Medicaid spent $2.8 billion on substance abuse treatment. Center for Disease Control data from 2001 to 2012 estimates in-patient admission costs increased $50.1 million per year for heroin and opioid addicts, and an increase in hospitalization costs of $700 million annually.[viii] A study by Regional Economic Modeling Inc. estimated opioid abuse reduced workforce productivity by $40 billion[ix], decreasing tax revenues even as the federal budget and national debt reach an all-time high. Any additional decrease in tax revenue is in direct competition with existing defense and mandatory health care spending. The outlook is dark, the prospects grim, but the U.S. can draw from recent history to see the potential national security risks of an entire country recently seduced by opiates. America need only examine the roots of President Xi Jinping’s “China Dream” to garner the historical cautionary tale on a population succumbed to the dark allure. Behind China’s current rapidly rising economy and military modernization lay the Century of Humiliation: one hundred years marked by foreign occupations, civil wars, and the loss of national sovereignty. Opium’s role in the downfall of the last imperial dynasty made its people destitute, subjugated to foreign will, serves as the impetus for the modern drive to make China great again. In the mid-19th Century, opium sales reversed the trade-deficit between the Qing dynasty and the British by an astounding 300%.[x] The downturn of silver in Qing coffers stifled innovation and eroded military readiness. A dulled military-edge resulted in the loss of the first Opium war and a series of foreign occupations.[xi] Drug related corruption in the ruling class eroded governing effectiveness, and civil wars erupted. Opium addiction corrupted every level of Chinese society, and its downfall was a fate the population, once seduced, struggled for one hundred years to overcome.

#### IP is the main reason for the opioid crisis

Hemel & Ouellete 20 - Daniel J Hemel, Lisa Larrimore Ouellete, “ Innovation institutions and the opioid crisis, June 9th 2020, [https://academic.oup.com/jlb/article/7/1/lsaa001/5854401] // Swickle// MAK Recut 8/25/21

How did opioids overwhelm a nation well aware of their addictive properties, claiming victims across the socioeconomic spectrum? To understand that, one must understand not only how opioid manufacturers aggressively marketed their wares and why physicians profligately prescribed these drugs but also why alternative pain management strategies failed to emerge and why opioid antidotes and abuse treatments were so much slower to spread. Purdue Pharma and ‘pill mills’ play a part in this story,18 but so does Medicaid’s ‘best price’ mandate and the National Institutes of Health’s (NIH) allocation of research funding. Comprehending the origins and persistence of the crisis requires a deep dive into the organizations and policies that drove the opioid wave as well as those that failed to produce a robust response. This article takes up that task. We suggest that the opioid epidemic is, in important respects, a disease of design. By this, we do not mean to suggest that the opioid crisis is the outgrowth of any single person’s grand plan. What we mean instead is that the design of institutions created conditions that allowed the crisis to arise and proliferate. We focus in particular on the design of innovation institutions—the legal arrangements that structure the production and allocation of knowledge goods.19 These include not only intellectual property law (patents, trade secrets, trademarks, regulatory exclusivity, etc.), but also the regulatory structures of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) that determine whether knowledge goods can reach the market and the public benefit programs like Medicare and Medicaid that subsidize access to knowledge goods.20 The design of innovation institutions enabled the opioid epidemic in a number of ways. First, US innovation institutions produced powerful incentives for pharmaceutical firms to develop and commercialize highly addictive prescription pain medicines while imposing weaker constraints on the rollout of new and more addictive products. Second, systems for allocating access to medical technologies promoted the use of addictive medicines while creating barriers to access for addiction treatments. Third, innovation institutions allowed—and indeed, encouraged—manufacturers of opioid antidotes to charge sky-high prices for products that, if more widely accessible, likely **could have saved the lives** of thousands of opioid overdose victims. Fourth, even while encouraging the rapid diffusion of addictive opioids, innovation institutions failed to sufficiently reward firms for formulating, refining, or popularizing alternative treatments for addiction or for the underlying problem of chronic pain. Again, no one sat down and designed the system to work this way. But a series of institutional design choices—some conscious, others unconscious—allowed a perfect storm to coalesce. Some of these design flaws are relatively familiar. Intellectual property (IP) is an innovation institution that relies on signals of social value generated by market mechanisms, and market-generated signals can yield inefficient allocations of goods in the presence of externalities. Addictive pain medications generate negative externalities, and overdose and addiction treatments produce positive externalities, so it is perhaps unsurprising that America ended up with too many addictive prescription opioids and too few overdose and addiction treatments. Furthermore, IP distorts investments in research and development toward patentable technologies like pharmaceuticals,21 so it is no surprise that the patent-centric US innovation institutions resulted in a nation awash in pills but wanting for alternative pain treatments. In other respects, our examination of the role of innovation institutions in the opioid epidemic challenges traditional understandings of IP in particular and innovation institutions more broadly. The conventional view posits that IP policy’s fundamental trade-off is between innovation and access, or what economists call dynamic efficiency and allocative efficiency.22 IP incentivizes the development and commercialization of new and better products (the dynamic-efficiency benefit), but it also encourages IP holders to raise prices and restrict access (the allocative-inefficiency cost). The opioid epidemic presents a contrasting image of IP’s potential consumption-expanding effects. Opioid patents induced investments in efforts to create demand for products that consumers did not previously believe they wanted.23 This demand–creation effect was especially powerful because the patented product was habit-forming—Purdue’s lower prices for OxyContin in the short term could thus raise consumption in the long term.24 And this problem was exacerbated by the effective cost often being lowered through prescription drug insurance. Although scholars typically view the increased use of patented technologies as a welfare gain, the example of prescription opioids illustrates that patents’ consumption-expanding effects can be pernicious. Ideally, the government would counteract the biases embedded in the patent system through other innovation institutions, including regulations, taxes, and government-directed financial rewards such as grants and prizes. For example, market-based prizes in the form of insurance reimbursement policies appear to be a particularly promising intervention.25 But in the context of pain treatment, the federal government’s non-patent interventions exacerbated the skew toward prescription opioids and away from other pain management and mitigation strategies. At the same time, government policies created barriers that limited access to addiction treatments. Additionally, and paradoxically, the federal government’s subsidies for opioid antidotes may have reduced access to these lifesaving products, challenging the view that demand-side subsidies are a solution to the patent system’s pitfalls. Recognizing the role of America’s innovation institutions in the opioid epidemic helps inform the search for paths out of the current crisis, but it is essential to emphasize that no magic-bullet policy will bring the opioid epidemic to an end. The proliferation of prescription opioids was both a function of incentives generated by the current innovation ecosystem and a response—misguided as it may have been—to the very real problem of chronic pain afflicting an estimated one in five US adults.26 Any comprehensive effort to curtail opioid abuse will require interventions aimed at addressing chronic pain in ways that do not put patients at risk of addiction. The solution likely will involve regulated use of opioids by the populations for which they are justified as well as both existing and novel nonaddictive analgesics.27 At the same time, wider access to existing non-pharmacological pain treatments such as acupuncture, physical therapy, exercise, meditation, and cognitive behavioral therapy may do as much to mitigate the overuse of prescription opioids as any pharmacological leap.28 Moreover, any comprehensive national strategy to contain the opioid epidemic also will require interventions aimed at individuals already in the throes of addiction (medically known as ‘substance use disorder’ or ‘opioid use disorder’).29 Initiatives at the federal, state, and local levels suggest progress in this regard, though still on a scale far too small relative to the problem that they aim to solve.

#### Readiness is key to effective deterrence – that solves existential great power wars

Dowd, 2015 (Alan W., Senior fellow with the Sagamore Institute for Policy Research and Senior Fellow at the Fraser Institute, “Shield & Sword: The Case for Military Deterrence”, Providence Mag, 12/31/2015, https://providencemag.com/2015/12/shield-sword-the-case-for-military-deterrence/)//JBS

It’s a paradoxical truth that military readiness can keep the peace. The Romans had a phrase for it: Si vis pacem, para bellum. “If you wish for peace, prepare for war.” President George Washington put it more genteelly: “There is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well prepared to meet an enemy.” Or, in the same way, “We infinitely desire peace,” President Theodore Roosevelt declared. “And the surest way of obtaining it is to show that we are not afraid of war.” After the West gambled civilization’s very existence in the 1920s and 1930s on hopes that war could somehow be outlawed, the men who crafted the blueprint for waging the Cold War returned to peace through strength. Winston Churchill proposed “defense through deterrents.” President Harry Truman called NATO “an integrated international force whose object is to maintain peace through strength…we devoutly pray that our present course of action will succeed and maintain peace without war.”[iii] President Dwight Eisenhower explained, “Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk its own destruction.” President John Kennedy vowed to “strengthen our military power to the point where no aggressor will dare attack.” And President Ronald Reagan steered the Cold War to a peaceful end by noting, “None of the four wars in my lifetime came about because we were too strong.” Reagan also argued, “Our military strength is a prerequisite for peace.”[iv] Even so, arms alone aren’t enough to deter war. After all, the great powers were armed to the teeth in 1914. But since they weren’t clear about their intentions and treaty commitments, a small crisis on the fringes of Europe mushroomed into a global war. Neither is clarity alone enough to deter war. After all, President Woodrow Wilson’s admonitions to the Kaiser were clear, but America lacked the military strength at the onset of war to make those words matter and thus deter German aggression. In other words, America was unable to deter. “The purpose of a deterrence force is to create a set of conditions that would cause an adversary to conclude that the cost of any particular act against the United States of America or her allies is far higher than the potential benefit of that act,” explains Gen. Kevin Chilton, former commander of U.S. Strategic Command. It is a “cost-benefit calculus.”[v] So, given the anemic state of America’s military before 1917, the Kaiser calculated that the benefits of attacking U.S. ships and trying to lure Mexico into an alliance outweighed the costs. That proved to be a grave miscalculation. In order for the adversary not to miscalculate, a few factors must hold. First, consequences must be clear, which was not the case on the eve of World War I. Critics of deterrence often cite World War I to argue that arms races trigger wars. But if it were that simple, then a) there wouldn’t have been a World War II, since the Allies allowed their arsenals to atrophy after 1918, and b) there would have been a World War III, since Washington and Moscow engaged in an unprecedented arms race. The reality is that miscalculation lit the fuse of World War I. The antidote, as alluded to above, is strength plus clarity.A second important factor to avoid miscalculation: The adversary must be rational, which means it can grasp and fear consequences. Fear is an essential ingredient of deterrence. It pays to recall that deterrence comes from the Latin dēterreō: “to frighten off.”[vi] Of course, as Churchill conceded, “The deterrent does not cover the case of lunatics.”[vii] Mass-murderers masquerading as holy men and death-wish dictators may be immune from deterrence. (The secondary benefit of the peace-through-strength model is that it equips those who embrace it with the capacity to defeat these sorts of enemies rapidly and return to the status quo ante.) Third, the consequences of military confrontation must be credible and tangible, which was the case during most of the Cold War. Not only did Washington and Moscow construct vast military arsenals to deter one another; they were clear about their treaty commitments and about the consequences of any threat to those commitments. Recall how Eisenhower answered Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev’s boast about the Red Army’s overwhelming conventional advantage in Germany: “If you attack us in Germany,” the steely American commander-in-chief fired back, “there will be nothing conventional about our response.”[viii] Eisenhower’s words were unambiguously clear, and unlike Wilson, he wielded the military strength to give them credibility.Discussing military deterrence in the context of Christianity may seem incongruent to some readers. But for a pair of reasons it is not. First, deterrence is not just a matter of GDPs and geopolitics. In fact, scripture often uses the language of deterrence and preparedness. For example, in the first chapter of Numbers the Lord directs Moses and Aaron to count “all the men in Israel who are twenty years old or more and able to serve in the army.” This ancient selective-service system is a form of military readiness. Similarly, I Chronicles 27 provides detail about the Israelites’ massive standing army: twelve divisions of 24,000 men each. II Chronicles 17 explains the military preparations made by King Jehoshaphat of Judah, a king highly revered for his piety, who built forts, maintained armories in strategically located cities “with large supplies” and fielded an army of more than a million men “armed for battle.” Not surprisingly, “the fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands surrounding Judah, so that they did not go to war against Jehoshaphat.” In the New Testament, Paul writes in Romans 13 that “Rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong…Rulers do not bear the sword for no reason.” Again, this is the language of deterrence. Those who follow the law within a country and who respect codes of conduct between countries have nothing to fear. Those who don’t have much to fear. Likewise, to explain the importance of calculating the costs of following Him, Jesus asks in Luke 14, “What king would go to war against another king without first sitting down to consider whether his 10,000 soldiers could go up against the 20,000 coming against him? And if he didn’t think he could win, he would send a representative to discuss terms of peace while his enemy was still a long way off.” In a sense, both kings are wise—one because he recognizes that he’s outnumbered; the other because he makes sure that he’s not. Put another way, both kings subscribe to peace through strength. Again, as with the Centurion earlier, Jesus could have rebuked the martial character of these kings, but he did not. This is not just description but commendation. We ignore their example at our peril. Secondly, it is not incongruent if we understand military deterrence as a means to prevent great-power war—the kind that kills by the millions, the kind humanity has not endured for seven decades. We know we will not experience the biblical notion of peace—of shalom, peace with harmony and justice—until Christ returns to make all things new. In the interim, in a broken world, the alternatives to peace through strength leave much to be desired: peace through hope, peace through violence, or peace through submission. But these options are inadequate.The sheer destructiveness and totality of great-power war testify that crossing our fingers and hoping for peace is not a Christian option. Wishful thinking, romanticizing reality, is the surest way to invite what Churchill called “temptations to a trial of strength.” Moreover, the likelihood that the next great-power war would involve multiple nuclear-weapons states means that it could end civilization. Therefore, a posture that leaves peer adversaries doubting the West’s capabilities and resolve—thus inviting miscalculation—is not only unsound, but immoral and inhumane—unchristian. “Deterrence of war is more humanitarian than anything,” Gen. Park Yong Ok, a longtime South Korean military official, argues. “If we fail to deter war, a tremendous number of civilians will be killed.”[ix]

# Contention 2: Biodiversity Loss

#### IPR leads to BioDiversity loss

[1] Pamun 18’ (In partnership with United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and THIMUN, 2018). “PAMUN XVIII RESEARCH REPORT— QUESTION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND BIODIVERSITY” [http://asp-edu.net/pamun/pamun2013/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/OK\_EDITED\_-UNCTAD-biodiversity-and-IP-1.pdf] AHS//MAK Accessed 8/23/21

<http://asp-edu.net/pamun/pamun2013/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/OK_EDITED_-UNCTAD-biodiversity-and-IP-1.pdf>

Biodiversity and its relationship with intellectual property: During the last few years, biodiversity has been lost at an unprecedented rate throughout the world in every ecosystem. According to the FAO, about 75% of the genetic diversity found in agricultural Page 4 of 16 | Research Report crops has been lost over the last century, and this phenomenon continues. It is imperative that we conserve agricultural biodiversity: higher biodiversity of agricultural crops helps increase yield stability and soil fertility and gives species the ability to adapt to changing conditions. High agricultural biodiversity also helps protect our health by ensuring sustainable production in medicinal plant use systems. Agricultural biodiversity loss and the present IPR legislation are inextricably tied. IPRs continue to homogenize agricultural production and medicinal plant use systems and could reduce crop variety development. Our health and our environment is negatively affected, and it is of utmost importance to conserve our agricultural biodiversity. Evolution of IPRs on biological resources As stated before, IPRs are rights to new ideas and information, which allow the creator to prevent the imitation or the commercial exploitation of his/her creations. IPRs have existed for centuries; however, the use of IPRs on living organisms such as GRs is a recent phenomenon. In 1930, the U.S. government passed the U.S. Plant Patent Act, which granted IPRs to new plant varieties with the exception of sexual and tuber-propagated plants. Other countries also extended such forms of IPRs, and in 1957, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) was formed, which was established by the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants that was signed in 1961. The convention was revised in 1972, 1978, and 1991 in Geneva, and each member state is expected to adopt laws that meet the requirements of the convention. With the latest revision in 1991, the convention recognizes new plant varieties as intellectual property and extended international PBRs. Furthermore, in 1972, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the patent claim made by the microbiologist Ananda Chakrabarty for a genetically engineered bacterial strain was permissible, which made it clear that anything man-made, including human genetic material, could be patentable. The legally binding TRIPS agreement in 1995 (explained in detail below) further imposed private IPRs on plant varieties, increasing the control of governments and large corporations over biogenetic resources. International Treaties and Agreements The link between IPRs and biodiversity has been shaped by numerous agreements and institutions. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are the two principal agreements on this issue. Moreover, organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have also become more active in dealing with this issue, and various megadiverse countries (see Major Countries Involved for definition) such as India, Costa Rica, and Mexico are passing laws in order to deal with this issue. Research Report | Page 5 of 16 The most important agreement on the conservation of biodiversity is the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which is often regarded as the founding document of global commitment to sustainable growth. The CBD is a legally binding, multilateral treaty signed on June 5th, 1992. It has been signed by 168 nations, 157 of which have ratified the convention. The convention has three main goals: the “conservation of biological diversity”; the “sustainable use of the components of biological diversity”; and the “fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources”. The treaty recognizes the sovereign right of states over GRs, and it also demands the respect and preservation of associated traditional knowledge at the national level. In fact, article 8(j) of the CBD states: ““Each contracting party shall [...] respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge innovations and practices”, thus recognizing the collective rights of indigenous and local communities, and encouraging member nations to follow the ABS provisions of the agreement, which aim to share GRs equitably with the indigenous communities. Moreover, to improve the implementation of the CBD, two supplementary agreements to the CBD have been signed: the Cartagena Protocol of 2002 and the Nagoya Protocol of 2010. The Nagoya Protocol (Appendix IV), which is explained in the Previous Attempts to Solve the Issue section, deals with the implementation of the third objective: fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. Another important legally binding agreement is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) in 1995. All 162 members of the WTO are signatory states of the agreement. Before the TRIPS agreement was signed, IPRs were restricted within countries; however, with the national treatment article in the TRIPS agreement, every signatory state should ensure that the rights given by IPRs are applied to locals and foreigners alike. In relation to plant varieties, it is important to note that the TRIPS agreement requires that plant varieties, along with microorganisms and microbiological processes, be eligible for IPR protection. In article 27.3(b) of the TRIPS agreement, signatory member states are not permitted to exclude microorganisms and microbiological processes from patentability, and they are expected to provide protection of these new plant varieties through patents, or an “effective” sui generis system. In other words, the agreement requires an exclusive protection for plant varieties, be it in the form of patents or a new sui generis system, which the WTO decides is effective or not. Another form of protection that many developing countries are also adopting as a sui generis system is the model of plant variety protection that is provided by the UPOV Convention (PBRs), whose standards are pretty much equivalent to patent protection. Hence, the TRIPS agreement not only imposes exclusive, private IPRs on biological resources, but it also does not attempt to protect indigenous and local community knowledge. Unlike the CBD, which aims to protect TK and maintain biodiversity, the TRIPS agreement legitimizes the commercial use of biodiversity-related knowledge. However, the TRIPS agreement does require the review of Article 27.3(b)–the article that prohibits the Page 6 of 16 | Research Report exclusion of microorganisms from patentability and provides protection for plant varieties–which has facilitated discussion on the issues with the article (see ‘Previous Attempts’ for detailed information). It is also important to note that both agreements are highly flexible, even though they contradict each other in many aspects. Many articles of the TRIPS agreement can be used by indigenous communities to protect their interests. Article 8 allows members to protect public interest through legal measures and environmental protection could be justified as as being in "public interest". Moreover, article 27(2) allows members to exclude inventions from patentability to safeguard against "serious prejudice" to the environment. The CBD, on the other hand, ensures that it does not conflict with the implementation of any other international agreement. Article 22 of CBD states: “The provisions of this Convention shall not affect the rights and obligations of any Contracting Party deriving from any existing international agreement, except where the exercise of those rights and obligations would cause a serious damage or threat to biological diversity”. This article provides countries with a leeway; although both agreements are legally binding, countries can implement the TRIPS agreement without adhering to obligations of the CBD. Impacts of present IPR legislation Exploitation of traditional knowledge Existing IPR systems, particularly patents, increase the risk of exploitation of traditional knowledge. Existing IPRs are expensive and challenging to acquire, failing to provide local and indigenous communities incentives to protect or capitalize on their traditional knowledge even though traditional knowledge is often shared by all members of the community and passed through the generations. Commercial Exploitation of Plant Varieties and GRs: The TRIPS agreement is intended to provide private IPRs on any products, be they biogenetic resources or not, in order to ensure that trade goes smoothly and corporate interests are protected internationally. In the process, the agreement provides exclusive control of plant varieties to corporations and individuals that they have patented. The privatization of IPRs as a result of the TRIPS agreement has caused commercial and industrial interests to control the resources of developing countries that are rich in biodiversity, leading to biological uniformity and in turn biodiversity loss (explained below). Besides, these private commercial interests are encroaching upon common indigenous and local community knowledge, which is another negative impact of the TRIPS agreement. Biological Uniformity Research Report | Page 7 of 16 The present IPR legislation causes biological uniformity because of growing private commercial interests, which directly causes biodiversity loss. Countries that extend IPRs to plant varieties will be establishing an IPR system where few corporations and individuals prohibit others from making or using the protected variety or any product containing protected genetic information, and push its production for profits. Farmers will be faced with production restrictions, while scientists will be faced with research restrictions. All in all, the present IPR legislation not only discourages the growth of new and different plant varieties, but it also restricts researchers from freely using the genetic information for research into diseases or for making new and more effective plant varieties. Hence, this reduces the availability of biodiversity and leads to the homogenization of agricultural production and plant use systems. For example, Monsanto, an agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology corporation that is facing a surge of lawsuits, is also accused of biological uniformity. It owns such a large portion of the world's cotton seed supply that cotton farmers are not given access to non-GM cotton seeds. These farmers are also not allowed to save, reuse, or even study the seeds due to biotech IPR laws, greatly hindering natural diversity

[2] Chaudhuri 2 - Sabuj Kumar Chaudhuri is a researcher at the University of Calcutta - Department of Library & Information Science, Associate Professor in DLIS University of Calcutta India ; Shastri Indo-Canadian Visiting Faculty in York University Canada ; CEU/HESP Research Excellence Fellow;Budapest Hungary; PhD, MSc(Marine Sc)(Gold Medalist),AIS(NISCAIR) June 2003, “The Impact of IPR on Biodiversity”

In addition, the privatization of genetic resources that have been engineered and patented accelerates the trend toward monocultural cropping. Furthermore an engineered organism may produce unanticipated harmful impacts on other species in its new environment that may cause further erosion and ecological degradation. Improved seeds require more fertilizer and pesticide consumption, which has tremendous contribution towards biodiversity loss, and have direct impact on floral, faunal and microbial population. Moreover substantial royalties payment to the developed countries and multinational seed companies will greatly increase the debt burden that could further intensify the environmental and social disruption if we consider the debt repayment such as the export of natural products. The successful development of biological diversity will depend upon creative relationship that can be nurtured between two opposite poles –formal innovative and community systems. For this to work, policymakers must implement technology transfer with a strong inclination towards active participatory approaches to research and extension. Active participation means exercising practical power and command over genetic resources by farmers and rural people that would be reciprocated by the formal system with their analysis, experimentation, professional, institutional and policy changes from time to time in order to discharge our international obligations and at the same time keeping in view of sustainability of biodiversity. Ultimately, the reason to conserve our genetic diversity and to encourage innovation out of these biogenetic resources is to improve the quality of human life and this should be kept in mind always before any invention or policy changes, otherwise our very existence will be at stake

#### Biodiversity loss leads to extinction, two scenarios

[a] Ecosystems are already unstable now, we are on the brink

NOAA, May 11, 2021, “Extinction and Biodiversity Loss are Inextricably Linked” [https://defenders.org/blog/2021/05/extinction-and-biodiversity-loss-are-inextricably-linked] AHS//MAK Accessed 8/23/21

When you hear the word extinction, you might immediately think of dinosaurs, woolly mammoths and saber-toothed tigers. Or you might think of a more recent species gone from Earth, like passenger pigeons, Tasmanian tigers, Carolina parakeets and Pyrenean ibex. But do you think of extinction as happening daily to our planet’s species? Up to a million species could be facing extinction within decades, according to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) report that made headlines in 2019. IPBES extinction risk graphic 2019 IPBES. But extinction doesn’t have to be decades ago or part of the not-so-distant future. In 2020 alone, scientists declared 65 North American plant species, 22 frog species, the Lord Howe long-eared bat and many more species extinct. The next species we lose could blink out tomorrow. We hope it won’t, and Defenders is fighting to protect all our vulnerable species, like the vaquita, red wolf, southern resident orca, black-footed ferret and North Atlantic right whale. But biodiversity loss continues – and “biodiversity” is not some vague blanket term that you may have heard in science class. Biodiversity loss means individual species, like the newly described Gulf of Mexico whale or the marbled murrelet or the Joshua tree, are in danger of going extinct. We are losing plants and animals all over the world and we’re losing them because of our own actions Biodiversity loss and climate change together present the greatest threat to our planet’s health in the history of humankind, threatening to unravel the rich and intricate tapestry of life on Earth. We are on the verge of a sixth mass extinction caused by destruction of habitat from development, overexploitation of wildlife, climate change, pollution and invasive species. Humans have significantly altered over 75% of terrestrial environments and 66% of marine environments. Nearly 75% of freshwater resources are now devoted to crop or livestock production and 85% of wetlands present in 1700 had been lost by 2000. Almost 33% of reef-forming corals, sharks and shark relatives, over 33% of marine mammals, and over 40% of amphibians are threatened with extinction. And the very laws and regulations enacted to keep our imperiled species from disappearing are under attack themselves in the United States. Today, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is endangered, eviscerated by the previous administration that saw wildlife as an obstacle to pillaging our natural resources for private profits. Our planet is now losing living species at rates up to 1,000 times higher than background extinction rates. Many species are critically endangered, down to only a few hundred individuals in the wild or worse. The relationships among species and the influence they have on each other are what create and maintain thriving and balanced ecosystems. And as more and more species die out, the web of life unravels, accelerating the pace of biodiversity loss and threatening food security, ecosystem services and human health in the process.

#### [b] Biodiversity loss leads to disease – it’s the single strongest driver

Matt and Gebser ’10 – Florian Matt and Ronny Gebser, “Biodiversity decline can increase the spread of infectious diseases like Hantavirus”, TEEBcase, February 2011, [https://www.cbd.int/financial/values/g-valuehealth.pdf] Accessed 09/27/21 AHS // AP

Intuitively one might expect that higher overall biodiversity leads to greater diversity and abundance of pathogens and thus more incidences of the transmission of diseases. Therefore, species-rich environments might be seen to exhibit a higher infection risk than anthropogenic disturbed environments with a low biodiversity. However, research results show the opposite. Several studies suggest that with the loss of biodiversity the transmission of diseases increases (Keesing et al. 2010). Thus biodiversity loss causes the loss of an important ecosystem service: buffering the spreading of infectious diseases to humans, animals and plants (Pongsiri et al. 2009). The decline of biodiversity might lead to a faster rate of emergence and re-emergence of infectious diseases, such as the Hantavirus, and therefore the infection of a greater proportion of the human population (Keesing et al. 2010, Pongsiri et al. 2009, Suzan et al. 2008, Peixoto and Abramson 2006). Regionally different genotypes of Hantaviruses cause hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome (HFRS) in Asia and Europe and the Hantavirus pulmonary syndrom (HPS) in the Americas (Pongsiri et al. 2009).

#### That causes extinction

Quick 18 [(Jonathan, Corresponding Member of the Faculty of Medicine at Harvard University and the Chair of the Global Health Council) “Are we prepared for the looming epidemic threat?,” The Guardian, 03/18/2018] DD

A new epidemic could turn into a pandemic without warning. It could be born in a factory farm in Minnesota, a poultry farm in China or the bat-inhabited elephant caves of Kenya – anywhere infected animals are in contact with humans. It could be a variation of the 1918 Spanish flu, one of hundreds of other known microbial threats or something entirely new, such as the 2003 Sarsvirus that spread globally from China. Once transmitted to a human, an airborne virus could pass from that one infected individual to 25,000 others within a week, and to more than 700,000 within the first month. Within three months, it could spread to every major urban centre in the world. And by six months, it could infect more than 300 million people and kill more than 30 million.This is not alarmist science fiction. It is one of several highly plausible scenarios – and far from the worst – developed by infectious disease specialists working with disease-modelling experts. Bill Gates, who funds a group that uses computer simulations to predict the spread of diseases, said: “The Ebola epidemic showed me that we are not ready for a serious epidemic, an epidemic that would be more infectious and would spread faster than Ebola did.” He put the likelihood of a catastrophic epidemic at “well over 50%” in his lifetime.Gates’s model estimates that a perilous virus, carried via cars, planes, ships and trains, and spreading quickly in packed cities, could kill up to 33 million people in just over 200 days. In the last century alone, smallpox killed 300 to 500 million people. The 1918-19 Spanish flu killed 50 to 100 million and Aids has taken 40 million lives since it was first recognised in 1981. The annual influenza outbreak still claims half a million people a year worldwide. The west African Ebola crisis took more than 11,000 lives – seven times the total of the 22 Ebola epidemics that preceded it. But widespread death isn’t the only threat. For those who survive the initial infection, an epidemic leaves its own particular trail of disfigurement and disability. People who contracted smallpox suffered characteristic, sometimes horrific, scars, along with blindness, limb deformities and other disabilities. As a lifelong condition, Aids and the side-effects of treatment can affect nearly every body system, from brain to bone. In the early stages of a new epidemic – before it has been recognised or how it spreads has been determined, and before appropriate protection measures are in place – health workers die in high numbers. As with war, where common illness can take more lives than war injuries, epidemics sometimes take more lives from disruption of primary health care than from the epidemic itself. Because health workers are diverted to emergency response centres, and health facilities are sometimes closed, epidemics can also disrupt routine public healthcare needs such as immunisation, treatment of acute illness and facility-based births.Finally, there is the stunning financial and economic cost to households, communities, businesses and entire countries. Such a pandemic could cause a global stock market crash that obliterates the livelihoods and savings of millions of survivors. “A severe and prolonged global pandemic could … hit global GDP by as much as 5-10% in the first year,” noted the authors of the Bank of America/Merrill Lynch 2015 Global Pandemics Primer report. Oxford Economics has suggested that the cost of a global pandemic, including spillover across industry sectors, could be as great as $3.5tn – an impact far greater than the magnitude of the great financial crisis of 2008. Graphic Every year, the world spends more than $50bn controlling epidemics such as avian influenza, HIV/Aids, malaria and polio, and responding to new threats such as Ebola. In addition to the direct cost of preparedness, immunisation and emergency response, there’s the indirect cost of disruption in travel, transport of goods, tourism, financial markets and other areas of economic activity. Wherever it has been measured, this indirect economic impact is at least equal to and usually greater than the direct cost, bringing the total cost of infectious disease epidemics close to $100bn a year. In short, even in the absence of Gates’s imagined pandemic, we can expect to spend $1tn on epidemics over the next decade unless we fundamentally change course. Scientists don’t know which microbe it will be, where it will come from or whether it will be transmitted through the air, by touch, through bodily fluids or through a combination of routes, but they do know that epidemics behave a bit like earthquakes. Scientists know that a “big one” is coming because scores of new, smaller earthquakes pop up around the globe every year.I write this not just because I’m scared. I’m also furious. Many leaders, economists and scientists believe that the risk of potentially devastating epidemics could be prevented for a fraction of the cost of battling an out of control global pandemic. The obvious question is this: why aren’t we deploying absolutely everything we have to make sure that the next disease outbreak doesn’t turn into a global catastrophe? There are three broad answers. First, there’s fear. We are all afraid of death. We respond to the fear of epidemic disease by wanting to blame someone else. Any time a threat arises, we want to blame the “other”, those not like “us”. At the outbreak of the 1918 Spanish flu, Americans blamed “the Hun”. Aids was blamed on gay men. We want to punish those with the disease, pretending that whatever makes them other has cursed them. The most contagious behavioural reaction that affects political leaders, businesspeople and the public is panic that disproportionately exceeds the actual event. Scared people overpersonalise the news, and their worries increase. Fear is a warning system intended to alert us to impending danger, just as it is in animals. When we let it override our rationality, we make things much worse. Second is denial and complacency, which often starts at the top, with political leaders or public health officials who reject the reality before them. Denial undermines the very trust needed to combat an epidemic. And complacency sets in when the last epidemic passes. We feel that we’ll have the silver bullet vaccine in time; that technology will save us, so we don’t need to spend time and money on basic prevention. Finally, financial self-interest: how many vaccines never get developed because poor people can’t pay for the drugs that pharmaceutical companies could develop? How many times do governments and leaders plead that there is no budget for preparedness? How many disease-fostering agribusiness companies line the pockets of politicians who conveniently overlook the threats bubbling up from factory farm sewage? Not recognising these failings – and not doing everything we can in spite of them to prevent a potentially staggering loss of life and livelihood – would be not just irresponsible, but criminal. All kinds of complex and interconnected social, economic and environmental risk factors contribute to the emergence and spread of disease. Consider how just one, population growth, leads to a whole set of others. The world’s population is now more than 7.5 billion and it is projected to increase by more than 2 billion people by mid-century. More than half that number will be born in Africa, and most of them will be packed into dense urban areas where an epidemic can spread like wildfire. The more people there are, the greater the demand for shelter, food and water. Imagine that you are a poor person living in a remote part of Guinea or the Amazon jungle, and you want to do the thing that is most instinctive for all of us: to stay alive. If you are lucky enough to procure cows, goats or chickens, you need room for a pasture. And if you need wood for fires or to build a house, you chop down the trees. But your own personal needs are nothing in comparison to the demands of agribusiness and industry, which obliterates millions of acres of forestland each year. Between 2000 and 2010, these industries annually consumed some 13 million hectares (50,000 square miles). Clear-cutting – cutting down every tree in an area – brings people in closer contact with primates, rodents and bats that carry dangerous pathogens. Some researchers believe that ravaged tropical forests and increased human activity in countries such as Liberia and Guinea presented an ideal opportunity for the Ebola virus to jump from its natural reservoir to humans. Deforestation also leads to flooding, which attracts mosquitoes. The hotter the jungle (and the planet) becomes as a result of all this deforestation, the happier mosquitoes are. If you’re living near a forest in Africa and have the leisure to be focused on more than your survival, you may have begun to notice that some amphibians and birds that hunted mosquitoes have disappeared (because they are extinct). Those that are not extinct may have migrated to more northerly realms that are rapidly becoming more hospitable, thanks to global climate change. Viruses such as Ebola, Aids and Zika aren’t like fastidious plants that stay rooted in only one place. On any given day, millions of people around the world are moving around on planes, trains, boats, trucks and automobiles, some from places where undiscovered viruses are festering in the bloodstreams of wild beasts and fowls. An average of 10 million people a day take to the skies; 3.5 billion passenger flights a year.All this creates huge opportunities for the transcontinental spread of pathogens such as [Sars](javascript:textise('https://www.theguardian.com/world/sars')), Ebola or Zika. A person who has been infected in a hot zone won’t feel ill for days or weeks, not until they land in Dallas, Singapore, London or New York. And the duration of the longest intercontinental flights is now greater than the incubation period of several common pathogens. A person may be asymptomatic when they get on a jumbo jet in Hong Kong, but by the time they land in New York they will have spread the virus to the crew and passengers.In the case of Aids, the virus spread slowly at first. Then, as Africa became more urbanised and roads connected remote regions to cities, men went to the cities to look for work. Those men hooked up with infected prostitutes who spread the virus to clients. Disease travels especially fast in west Africa, where the population is highly mobile. People move around a lot to look for work or food or to visit extended family members across borders. Also, sick people will travel to countries that have the resources to treat them when their own countries do not. One sick individual crossing a border to seek a cure could start a wave of new infections across a country that has all but succeeded in controlling an outbreak. The problem is compounded by the illegal trade of goods, animals and people; there is often no record of who or what may have entered a country, or when or where that person or animal carrying a deadly virus might have done so, making the prevention and treatment of the disease very difficult. And like the proverbial butterfly whose beating wings can set off a hurricane somewhere far away, any single human being can do something that sets off catastrophic consequences. People need to have sex; before Aids broke out, thousands spread the disease through unprotected sex, and a few irresponsible ones continued this behaviour even after discovering they had contracted HIV. Humans hug and kiss: during the Ebola crisis, containing the disease was made far more difficult not just because of an ancient tradition of kissing dead bodies but because people insist on touching one another. And human beings need to eat: given a choice between starvation and risking disease, most people would prefer to roast a monkey or a bat. Ebola, Aids and Zika each arose in the first half of the 20th century and spent their first several decades in the African bush, largely unnoticed by the rest of the world. But they are three very different examples of emerging infectious diseases. And they are just three of nearly 400 new infectious diseases that have been identified in the last 75 years. Since 1971, scientists have discovered at least 25 new pathogens for which we have no vaccine and no treatment.

# Contention 3: WTO Collapse

#### W.T.O. credibility is on the brink now, but Biden and people-centric action is the crucial revival that it needs.

Farah Stockman, 12-17-2020, "The W.T.O Is Having a Midlife Crisis," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/17/opinion/wto-trade-biden.html

If the World Trade Organization were a person, it would be that dude at the bar drinking the afternoon away in his business suit and wondering where it all went wrong. He used to be a big shot. When the W.T.O. was created in 1995 to write the rule book for international trade and to referee disputes between countries, it was popular and powerful. Unlike most international bodies, it has a dispute-resolution mechanism that was widely used. Its decisions had teeth. If W.T.O. judges decided that a country wasn’t playing by the rules, judges could authorize retaliatory tariffs so that victims could recoup their losses. Even a superpower like the United States generally obeyed the rulings of its seven-member Appellate Body. If a member nation had a law that ran afoul of the W.T.O. treaty, then that law had to go. But now the W.T.O. is all washed up. Like Rodney Dangerfield, it gets no respect. Its two biggest economies — China and the United States — are in a trade war, issuing tit-for-tat tariffs that violate its rules. No one fears the wrath of its Appellate Body anymore because that body has ceased to function. No new judges have been appointed to replace the old ones whose terms expired. Member states are actively floating alternatives. Its director general resigned in frustration a year before his term was up. It’s tempting to believe that Mr. W.T.O. ended up drunk at this bar because he got punched in the nose by President Trump. There’s some truth to that. Mr. Trump did cripple the W.T.O. when he refused to appoint new judges so he could get out of having to abide by decisions he didn’t like. But the W.T.O. was on a downward spiral long before it got beaten up by Mr. Trump. If President-elect Joe Biden is going to help fix the W.T.O., he can’t just roll back what Mr. Trump has done. Real recovery requires soul-searching about what went wrong. When the W.T.O. was born in the 1990s, faith in free markets was at a record high. The Soviet Union had just collapsed. The United States, the world’s sole superpower, embraced an almost messianic belief in the ability of unfettered capitalism to improve lives around the world. Americans pushed more than 100 nations to join together to create a strong international body to remove barriers to international trade and protect investors. Weaker countries agreed because, in theory, it meant they would no longer be at the mercy of the strong. They could get W.T.O. judges on their side. But the power of the W.T.O. became a problem pretty quickly. Domestic laws and programs that got in the way of “free trade” were swatted aside like cobwebs. The W.T.O. has ordered countries to gut programs that encouraged renewable energy and laws that protected workers from unfair foreign competition, as if international commerce were more important than climate change and workers’ rights. The W.T.O. wasn’t just powerful. It was ambitious. Unlike the previous trade regulator, known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which dealt primarily with tariffs, the W.T.O. aimed to tackle a whole host of things that had little to do with traditional trade. That’s partly because of corporations, which lobbied their governments behind closed doors to rewrite the rules of trade to their advantage. Investment banks pushed for financial deregulation around the world, rolling back laws like Glass-Steagall, which kept Wall Street from recklessly gambling away pension funds. Pharmaceutical companies pushed to extend their patents, complicating the efforts in developing countries to get access to generic, affordable drugs. Big agriculture companies pushed to lift bans on genetically modified food. People began to grumble that the W.T.O. had fallen in with a bad crowd of bullies or that it had gotten too big for its britches. The W.T.O.’s decision-making looked even more questionable after the body turned a blind eye to China’s bad behavior. Its judges ruled against government subsidies for locally produced solar panels in the United States and India, on the grounds that they were unfair to foreign producers. But a smorgasbord of subsidies in China were deemed no problem at all. People began to complain that the W.T.O. just wasn’t up to the task of regulating the world economy. It didn’t help that it took years to render decisions, an eternity in the world of business. The W.T.O. looked tardy and incompetent. Now, as the world economy is in tatters from a pandemic and as a future crisis of climate change looms, the W.T.O. is drunk at a bar, waiting to see whether Joe Biden will come to its rescue. There are some quick fixes that the Biden administration should support, such as the appointment of a new director general. Everyone but Mr. Trump seems to like Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala of Nigeria, who would become the first woman and first African to serve in that post. Removing American opposition to her candidacy might go a long way to building back trust and good will after the Trump era. But Mr. Biden shouldn’t rush to fill the seats of the Appellate Body just yet. The world has a historic opportunity to change the direction of international trade rules and carve out more space for countries to experiment with solutions to climate change and income inequality. Countries around the world could use economic stimulus funding to make strategic investments in green energy with subsidies. That’s what Mr. Biden’s Build Back Better plan is all about. But so much of the plan — from subsidies for green energy infrastructure to strong “Buy American” provisions — risks running afoul of W.T.O. rules. That’s why the incoming administration should use this moment to try to get agreement on some of the deep-seated issues that brought us here in the first place. One reason the world has avoided those tough conversations for so long is that litigation is easier than negotiation. Now that that’s no longer an option, maybe W.T.O. member states will be able to forge an agreement to meet the moment. There are hopeful signs that Mr. Biden intends to do just that. One of his veteran economic advisers, Jared Bernstein, has long argued that the rules of global trade should be revamped to meet the needs of ordinary people, not just corporations. The appointment of Katherine Tai as U.S. trade representative is an inspired choice. In her many years of experience working on U.S. trade policy, she stands out for her commitment to figuring how to balance the interests of corporations with the needs of American society, including workers' rights, environmental protection and racial justice. She strikes me as the perfect person to stage an intervention.

#### Specifically, a successful agreement on TRIPS concerning COVID would revitalize the organization.

David Meyer, 6-18-2021, "The WTO's survival hinges on the COVID-19 vaccine patent debate, waiver advocates warn," Fortune, <https://fortune.com/2021/06/18/wto-covid-vaccines-patents-waiver-south-africa-trips/> [LDI 21 – CWK]

The World Trade Organization knows all about crises. Former U.S. President Donald Trump threw a wrench into its core function of resolving trade disputes—a blocker that President Joe Biden has not yet removed—and there is widespread dissatisfaction over the fairness of the global trade rulebook. The 164-country organization, under the fresh leadership of Nigeria's Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, has a lot to fix. However, one crisis is more pressing than the others: the battle over COVID-19 vaccines, and whether the protection of their patents and other intellectual property should be temporarily lifted to boost production and end the pandemic sooner rather than later. According to some of those pushing for the waiver—which was originally proposed last year by India and South Africa—the WTO's future rests on what happens next. "The credibility of the WTO will depend on its ability to find a meaningful outcome on this issue that truly ramps-up and diversifies production," says Xolelwa Mlumbi-Peter, South Africa's ambassador to the WTO. "Final nail in the coffin" The Geneva-based WTO isn't an organization with power, as such—it's a framework within which countries make big decisions about trade, generally by consensus. It's supposed to be the forum where disputes get settled, because all its members have signed up to the same rules. And one of its most important rulebooks is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS, which sprang to life alongside the WTO in 1995. The WTO's founding agreement allows for rules to be waived in exceptional circumstances, and indeed this has happened before: its members agreed in 2003 to waive TRIPS obligations that were blocking the importation of cheap, generic drugs into developing countries that lack manufacturing capacity. (That waiver was effectively made permanent in 2017.) Consensus is the key here. Although the failure to reach consensus on a waiver could be overcome with a 75% supermajority vote by the WTO's membership, this would be an unprecedented and seismic event. In the case of the COVID-19 vaccine IP waiver, it would mean standing up to the European Union, and Germany in particular, as well as countries such as Canada and the U.K.—the U.S. recently flipped from opposing the idea of a waiver to supporting it, as did France. It's a dispute between countries, but the result will be on the WTO as a whole, say waiver advocates. "If, in the face of one of humanity's greatest challenges in a century, the WTO functionally becomes an obstacle as in contrast to part of the solution, I think it could be the final nail in the coffin" for the organization, says Lori Wallach, the founder of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, a U.S. campaigning group that focuses on the WTO and trade agreements. "If the TRIPS waiver is successful, and people see the WTO as being part of the solution—saving lives and livelihoods—it could create goodwill and momentum to address what are still daunting structural problems." Those problems are legion.

#### WTO collapse goes nuclear

Hamann 9 **–** Hamann, J.D. Vanderbilt University Law School, 2009 “Replacing Slingshots with Swords: Implications of the Antigua-Gambling 22.6 Panel Report for Developing Countries and the World Trading System” http://www.vanderbilt.edu/jotl/manage/wp-content/uploads/hamann-cr\_final\_final.pdf

Voluntary compliance with WTO rules and procedures is of the **utmost importance to the international trading system**.100 Given the increasingly globalized market, **the coming years will see an increase in the importance of the WTO as a cohesive force and arbiter of disputes that likely will become more frequent and injurious**.101 The work of the WTO cannot be overstated in a **nuclear-armed world**, as the body continues to promote respect and even amity among nations with opposing philosophical goals or modes of governance.102 Demagogues in the **U**nites **S**tates may decry the rise of China as a geopolitical threat,103 and extremists in Russia may play dangerous games of brinksmanship with other great powers, **but trade keeps politicians’ fingers off “the button.”**104 The WTO offers an astounding rate of compliance for an organization with no standing army and no real power to enforce its decisions, suggesting that governments recognize the value of maintaining the international construct of the WTO.105 In order to promote voluntary compliance, the WTO must maintain **a high level of credibility**.106 Nations must perceive the WTO as the most reasonable option for dispute resolution or fear that the WTO wields enough influence to enforce sanctions.107 The arbitrators charged with performing the substantive work of the WTO by negotiating, compromising