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### 1

#### Interp: The aff must defend action by the member nations of the WTO

#### WTO member nations are the following countries:

**WTO no date – see the list in the doc** https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/tif\_e/org6\_e.htm#collapseI

\*\*NOTE: This list is taken from the WTO’s website linked above

Members Afghanistan Albania Angola Antigua and Barbuda Argentina Armenia Australia Austria Bahrain, Kingdom of Bangladesh Barbados Belgium Belize Benin Bolivia, Plurinational State of Botswana Brazil Brunei Darussalam Bulgaria Burkina Faso Burundi Cabo Verde Cambodia Cameroon Canada Central African Republic Chad Chile China Colombia Congo Costa Rica Côte d’Ivoire Croatia Cuba Cyprus Czech Republic Democratic Republic of the Congo Denmark Djibouti Dominica Dominican Republic Ecuador Egypt El Salvador Estonia Eswatini European Union (formerly EC) Fiji Finland France Gabon Gambia Georgia Germany Ghana Greece Grenada Guatemala Guinea Guinea-Bissau Guyana Haiti Honduras Hong Kong, China Hungary Iceland India Indonesia Ireland Israel Italy Jamaica Japan Jordan Kazakhstan Kenya Korea, Republic of Kuwait, the State of Kyrgyz Republic Lao People’s Democratic Republic Latvia Lesotho Liberia Liechtenstein Lithuania Luxembourg Macao, China Madagascar Malawi Malaysia Maldives Mali Malta Mauritania Mauritius Mexico Moldova, Republic of Mongolia Montenegro Morocco Mozambique Myanmar Namibia Nepal Netherlands New Zealand Nicaragua Niger Nigeria North Macedonia Norway Oman Pakistan Panama Papua New Guinea Paraguay Peru Philippines Poland Portugal Qatar Romania Russian Federation Rwanda Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Samoa Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of Senegal Seychelles Sierra Leone Singapore Slovak Republic Slovenia Solomon Islands South Africa Spain Sri Lanka Suriname Sweden Switzerland Chinese Taipei Tajikistan Tanzania Thailand Togo Tonga Trinidad and Tobago Tunisia Turkey Uganda Ukraine United Arab Emirates United Kingdom United States Uruguay Vanuatu Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of Viet Nam Yemen Zambia Zimbabwe
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#### Violation: their aff is the United States

#### Vote neg for predictable limits – their aff justifies just eviscerating words in the topic which destroys any predictable basis of neg prep. There’s no non-arbitrary way to choose which words aren’t changeable under their interp which means today they can read X country, tomorrow they can talk about movie copyright law, and next weekend they can reduce military aid or anything else they want. Voter for fairness and education.

#### Topicality should be a voting issue evaluated through competing interpretations—reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention that takes the debate out of the hands of the debaters. Pre-round prep has already been skewed which means the only remedy is to drop the debater.

### 2

#### The topic is haunted by black ghosts. A chorus of voices led by Henrietta Lacks, whose non-consent has formed the basis for medical advancement. The 1AC chooses to begin the conversation at access as opposed to consent which legitimizes the fungibility of blackness.

**Nelson 07** (Alondra Nelson is professor of sociology and gender studies at Columbia University, where she has served as the inaugural Dean of Social Science and Director of the Institute for Research on Women, Gender, and Sexuality. She is President-elect of the Social Science Reseach Council and Chair of the American Sociological Association Section on Science, Knowledge, and Technology. Prior to joining Columbia in 2009, Nelson was on the faculty of Yale University, where she received the Poorvu Award for interdisciplinary teaching excellence. She graduated with a PhD from New York University in 2003. She is the twelfth President of the Social Science Research Council. “Unequal Treatment.” The Washington Post, WP Company, 7 Jan. 2007, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/05/AR2007010500180.html.)

A fresh account of **the Tuskegee study**, including new information about the internal politics of the panel charged by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare with investigating it in 1972, lies at the center of Harriet A. Washington's courageous and poignant book. The balance of Medical Apartheid reveals, with arresting detail, that this scandal **was neither the first chapter nor the last in the exploitation of black subjects in** U.S. **medical research**. Tuskegee was, in the author's words, "the longest and most infamous -- but hardly the worst -- experimental abuse of African Americans. **It has been eclipsed in** both **numbers and egregiousness by other** abusive medical **studies**." Although medical experimentation with human subjects has historically involved vulnerable groups, including children, the poor and the institutionalized, Washington enumerates how black Americans have disproportionately borne the burden of the most invasive, inhumane and perilous medical investigations, from the era of slavery to the present day. (This burden has become global in the last few decades.) In 1855, **John "Fed" Brown, an escaped slave, recalled that the doctor to whom he was indentured produced painful blisters on his body in order to observe "how deep my black skin went."** This study had no therapeutic value. Rather, fascination with the outward appearance of African Americans, whose differences from whites were thought to be more than skin deep, was a significant impulse driving such medical trials.Shielding whites from excruciating experimental procedures also proved a powerful motivation. **J. Marion Sims**, a leading 19th-century physician and **former president of the A**merican **M**edical **A**ssociation, **developed** many of his **gynecological treatments through experiments on slave women who were not granted** the comfort of **anesthesia**. Sims's legacy is Janus-faced; he was pitiless with non-consenting research subjects, yet he was among the first doctors of the modern era to emphasize women's health. Other researchers were more guilty of blind ambition than racist intent. Several African Americans, including such as Eunice Rivers, the nurse-steward of the Tuskegee study, served as liaisons between scientists and research subjects. The infringement of black Americans' rights to their own bodies in the name of medical science continued throughout the 20th century. **In 1945, Ebb Cade,** an African American trucker being treated for injuries received in an accident in Tennessee, **was** surreptitiously **placed without his consent into a radiation experiment sponsored by the U.S. A**tomic **E**nergy **C**ommission**. Black Floridians were** deliberately **exposed to** swarms of mosquitoes carrying **yellow fever** and other diseasesin experiments conducted **by the Army and the CIA in the early** 19**50s.** Throughout the 1950s and '60s, black inmates at Philadelphia's Holmesburg Prison were used as research subjects by a University of Pennsylvania dermatologist testing pharmaceuticals and personal hygiene products; some of these subjects report pain and disfiguration even now. **During the** 19**60s and '70s, black boys were subjected to** sometimes **paralyzing neurosurgery by a U**niversity of **Miss**issippi **researcher** who believed brain pathology to be the root of the children's supposed hyperactive behavior**. In the** 19**90s**, **African American youths in New York were injected with Fenfluramine** -- half of the deadly, discontinued weight loss drug Fen-Phen -- **by Columbia researchers investigating** a hypothesis about **the genetic origins of violence.** Washington's litany of experimental misdeeds done to African Americans is more extensive than can be described here. With such damning evidence, one wonders why she felt it necessary to include examples that, while clearly offensive, do not rise to the threshold of medical experimentation. For instance, supporters of slavery, to justify the peculiar institution, cited data from the 1840 census showing that free African Americans had poorer mental and physical health than enslaved blacks. Nonetheless, taking ideological liberties with questionable statistics is not, in and of itself, an example of medical experimentation, nor was circus impresario P.T. Barnum's display of black Americans as entertainment. While demonstrating the widespread exploitation of blacks, it confuses the thrust of Washington's argument. But Washington also sheds light on how our understanding of what constitutes medical research requires broadening in the face of new developments in genetic science. Federal and state forensic DNA databases contain a disproportionate number of samples from African Americans, for example. Because genetic samples collected for this purpose carry information about a subject's health, blacks are particularly vulnerable to the exposure of sensitive medical information. And although experimentation with human subjects is less invasive than it once was, Washington cautions that it is no less injurious. Researchers still need to be mindful of the rights of their subjects. Given the history presented in Medical Apartheid, it is no surprise that some African Americans continue to regard the medical system with apprehension, despite more stringent safeguards enacted by the federal government in the 1970s. Washington attributes this outlook, which she calls iatrophobia, to the seeds of distrust sown in black communities by the Tuskegee scandal and a history of lesser-known mistreatment.

#### This lack of consent forms the basis for a cyclical form of antiblack violence. The 1AC furthers the intergenerational legacy that marks freedom on the basis of black non consent.

**Wilderson 20** (Frank B. Wilderson III is a full professor of Drama and African American studies at the University of California, Irvine. He received his BA in government and philosophy from Dartmouth College, his MFA from Columbia University and his PhD in Rhetoric and Film Studies from the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of Incognegro: A Memoir of Exile and Apartheid (South End Press, 2008), which won the American Book Award for 2008, and Red, White, & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms (Duke University Press, forthcoming). He spent ﬁve years in apartheid South Africa, working as an elected ofﬁcial in the African National Congress; a member of the ANC’s armed wing Umkhonto we Sizwe; a lecturer at the University of Witwatersrand, Vista University. “Afropessimism”. Liverright Publishing Corporation. 2020.)

**The** Electoral College is a prime example of a **so- called “democratic” institution** that **owes its condition of possibility to the sexualized violence against**, and captivity of, **Black people.** **Without** the sexualized violence against and mass incarceration of **hundreds of thousands of Black captives, America**ns **would not be able to elect a** U.S. **president.** Thomas Jefferson would never have become president. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, “389,000 [that’s less than a half million] . . . African slaves, bred like horses or sheep, became four- million enslaved African- Americans . . . [T]he forced mating of slaves . . . gave slave states more voting power based on the number of slaves they held captive.” Virginia was the largest slave- breeding state. As a result it gained twenty- five percent of the forty- six Electoral College votes, more than enough to send Jefferson to the White House. Think about that. The kind of captivity needed to breed slaves dwarfs the kind of captivity Muslims are subjected to in Guantánamo or in the “love nest” where the female CIA agent raped the young Afghan. How else can 389,000 people be made to procreate, under pain of torture or death, into 4 million people if they are not incarcerated and forced into sex? Slave- breeding is a kind of forced sex that makes words like rape and incarceration puny and inadequate . The young Afghan man had a prior moment of freedom, and a prior space of consent, before the White woman held him captive and raped him. **For Blacks there is no prior space and time of freedom and consent: the freedom of all others**— in the form of electoral politics— **owes its** condition of **possibility to the** unfreedom (**lack of consent) of** and sexualized violence against **Black people**. People of color experience this madness from time to time; but the forced procreation of Blackness is the bedrock of this madness. The young Afghan’s rights were violated by the White woman; but the concept of rights that can be violated, or respected, rises up out of the breeding of Blacks like cattle. **You can speak of prisoners’ rights, but the term slave rights is an oxymoron.** A historical analysis of the Electoral College illustrates how Black people are political currency, not political subjects. And that is the paradigm of Black people’s existence today. **Black people are political currency** or objects, **not** political actors or **subjects.** Subjects havehomes, or at leastthe capacity forsome sort ofsanctuary. Objects exist as implements, tools, in the psychic life of Human subjects. Hartman’s analysis of the paradox that the idea of rape presents for the woman who is Black, who is a slave, alerted me to the fact that **this universal possession** **of** the oppressed and the oppressor— **consent**— **wasn’t universal at all.** **Consent was not an inherent**, organic capacity, an **element of political ontology that belonged to everyone**, high and low. My mind abstracted in ever- widening concentric circles: if the Black woman cannot be raped because she had no consent to give or withhold, and if this absence of consent is both particular and general— in other words, if it applies broadly to the status of Blackness, and not only to the status of Black women who come before the court as plaintiffs in nineteenth century courts, and if, qua Sexton, the Black man can by raped by the White woman, and if (the culminating and most devastating if) “rape” is too feeble a concept to explain the violation\* of Black flesh— then **all** of us **who are** **marked as Black are of a** different species than all of those who are not. We are a **species of sentient beings that cannot be injured** or murdered, for that matter, because we are dead to the world. No narrative arc of dispossessi**on** can accrue to us. What do I mean by that? Just this: for there to be **a narrative arc** the persona in the narrative must move from possession to dispossession to (the denouement) the prospect of repossession. Another way **of** earmarking the points on the narrative arc would be: Equilibrium to disequilibrium to equilibrium (restored, renewed, and/or reimagined). Rape can be seen on this arc: consent as an ontological and social possession: followed by rape, which would be **dispossession** of consent: followed by consent restored via the trial of the perp, or his/her murder, or the narrative could explain how the victim regained their self- esteem and self- worth even if justice was not done. But even here, when the denouement does not include justice, **there is an assumption that the victim had a “self” to be violated**. In other words, no matter how you slice it, no matter the details of the arc, the narrative arc itself is possible because there exists within the ontology of the subject the Human capacity of consent that could be restored just as it was taken away.

#### The medicines the 1AC claims to provide cannot rectify the disease of antiblackness that they intensify. The alternative is wake work, an analytic that gives rise to new forms of care that arise from our theory of social death that refuses the universalism of consent.

**Hartman 17** (Saidiya Hartman, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Colombia University, PhD from Yale University, February 2, 2017, “In the Wake: A Salon in Honor of Christina Sharpe,” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DGE9oiZr3VM>, uploaded February 7, 2017 by Barnard Center for Research on Women, transcribed from video 6:11-10:18)

Wake work is the center of Sharpe’s critical repertoire. **The wake is “the conceptual frame** of and **for** living blackness in the diaspora in the still unfolding aftermaths of Atlantic chattel slavery.” To be in the wake is Sharpe’s way of **describing the afterlife of slavery and the** constitutive and **gratuitous violence that makes Black death the norm** of our modernity. In **the Wake offers** a way of thinking about life lived in the wake of antiblack violence—and in **an intimate relation with death**—**that moves** us **beyond the prevailing debate about Afro-Pessimism and Black vitalism**, social death and love. The **forms of social life and** the **practices of care** that **emerge in, and** that **are conditioned by, social death** are the focus of Sharpe’s extended meditation on slavery and its afterlife. **Wake work**, too, **is a method**. It is “**a turn away from disciplinary solutions to Blackness’s ongoing abjection**” and **toward apprehending the multiple meanings of that abjection** “through inhabitation, that is, through living them as consciousness.” **Wake work is an analytic, an existential ontology, an ethics of engagement, and a poetics of relation that demands we take care**, that we take care of one another. One of the refrains which structures the text is “we are constituted through and by continued vulnerability to this overwhelming force” yet “we are not only known to ourselves and each other by that force.” There is beauty and care and creation. Other key terms that structure the work are “the Door of No Return,” “aspiration,” “annotation” and “redaction,” “anagrammatical blackness,” “trans\*,” “orthography,” “partus sequitur ventrem,” “the intramural,” and “the afterlife of slavery.” Sharpe is a deft and creative reader of literary texts and visual images. Her **archival rearrangements produce new** objects to think with as well as **ways of understanding** and apprehending **the past**. This is, in part, the result of her gaze. **When looking at images of Black suffering**, “I keep looking because that cannot be all there is to see or to say. **I had to take care.” Care is the antidote to violence**. Her method of archival engagement, **annotation and redaction, are ways** to imagine-otherwise a mode of transcription, reconstruction, and creation. In her words, they “are ways **to make Black life visible, if only momentarily**.” The text moves poetically, associatively, and by thinking through juxtaposition. The series of refrains that structure the text produce a collective utterance, rich with the songs and cries of centuries. Sharpe deeply inhabits the words and thoughts of Fanon, Kamau Brathwaite, Dionne Brand, NourbeSe Philip, and others, making obvious the point that we never speak alone, that the chorus is the vehicle for thought, that we are always in relation and need only recognize it. The Wake, the Ship, the Hold, and the Weather are the key constellations of the text. Sharpe’s elaboration of these across the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, across North America, the Caribbean, Europe, and Africa attends to the global dimensions of Black Studies, embracing the captive, the migrant, and the refugee. Reading In the Wake, one has the sense that Sharpe brings all she knows and loves to the object under consideration, to the ship that is a girl, to eyes that reach out to her and to us, and to the lives lost in the wake. Sharpe is a collector and a curator, a poet and a critic, and her strategies of reading, imagining, erasing, and creating have created a beautiful work that is destined to be one of the classics of Black Studies.

### 3

#### Dems win the Senate now, but it’s close---it determines the Biden presidency.

Shane **Goldmacher 7/17**. Reporter, New York Times, “Democrats See Edge in Early Senate Map as Trump Casts Big Shadow,” The New York Times, July 17, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/17/us/politics/midterm-elections.html>, RJP, DebateDrills.

Six months into the Biden administration, Senate Democrats are expressing a cautious optimism that the party can keep control of the chamber in the 2022 midterm elections, enjoying large fund-raising hauls in marquee races as they plot to exploit Republican retirements in key battlegrounds and a divisive series of unsettled G.O.P. primaries.

Swing-state Democratic incumbents, like Senators Raphael Warnock of Georgia and Mark Kelly of Arizona, restocked their war chests with multimillion-dollar sums ($7.2 million and $6 million, respectively), according to new financial filings this week. That gives them an early financial head start in two key states where Republicans’ disagreements over former President Donald J. Trump’s refusal to accept his loss in 2020 are threatening to distract and fracture the party.

But Democratic officials are all too aware of the foreboding political history they confront: that in a president’s first midterms, the party occupying the White House typically loses seats — often in bunches. For now, Democrats hold power by only the narrowest of margins in a 50-50 split Senate, with Vice President Kamala Harris serving as the tiebreaker to push through President Biden’s expansive agenda on the economy, the pandemic and infrastructure.

#### The plan is unpopular---it’s seen as soft on China.

Cynthia Hicks 21. Director of Public Affairs at PhRMA focusing on polling and opinion research that supports advocacy communications and strategy. “New polling shows Americans are sounding the alarm on the TRIPS IP waiver,” PhRMA, May 14, 2021, <https://catalyst.phrma.org/new-polling-shows-americans-are-sounding-the-alarm-on-the-trips-ip-waiver>, RJP, DebateDrills

\*\*\*NOTE – the stuff after “include the following” is a picture that couldn’t be pasted. Go to the URL if you want to see it.

2. Americans are concerned that the TRIPS waiver could risk patient safety, sow public confusion, and cede America’s global innovation leadership to China.

Americans worry that waiving intellectual property introduces unnecessary and dangerous risks to safety and vaccine manufacturing. The top concerns – expressed by more than six in ten voters – include the following:

#### China is the key for the midterms---Senate control hinges on it.

Sarah Mucha 21. Politics reporter at Axios, covering the Biden administration and Congress. “Parties pounce on China as midterm issue,” Axios, June 23, 2021, <https://www.axios.com/democrat-republicans-china-2022-midterms-6c242c54-b51b-444e-b9b2-65ff0afb906a.html>, RJP, DebateDrills

Democrats and Republicans in purple states are already leaning into U.S. competition with China as a key issue in the fight to control the Senate in 2022.

Why it matters: American voters hold [increasingly negative feelings](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/12/americans-views-of-asia-pacific-nations-have-not-changed-since-2018-with-the-exception-of-china/) toward the Chinese government, particularly around bilateral economic relations and following the nation’s handling of the COVID-19 outbreak.

President Biden also has made it clear that confronting China remains a foreign policy priority.

[Possibly vulnerable Democratic senators](https://www.axios.com/senate-seats-2022-midterm-elections-aa166e09-65e9-49be-a1f4-428c36a8dad0.html) are capitalizing on the passage of the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, a sweeping global competition bill focused on China that [recently passed by a rare bipartisan vote](https://www.axios.com/senate-china-competition-bipartisan-e2fa3f88-16d4-4d79-bab0-1b9c6a4f2774.html).

Sen. Raphael Warnock (D-Ga.) visited Kia’s West Point factory in Georgia to address how the bill could address the recent semiconductor shortage and avoid future plant shutdowns, like one the factory experienced.

Sens. Maggie Hassan (D-N.H.) and Mark Kelly (D-Ariz.) wrote op-eds in their local news outlets highlighting the bill's benefits.

The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and state Democratic parties are calling out Republicans like Sens. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) and Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), both of whom voted against the bill.

They’ve also targeted Republicans running in open Senate seats who have expressed opposition to the bill.

Meanwhile, Rubio has been making a play for China hawks in Florida, Axios’ Lachlan Markay [reported last week](https://www.axios.com/rubios-anti-china-voters-senate-race-florida-7f6539ab-86b8-4d08-a423-0a26598863ea.html).

Rubio, who is up for re-election next year, has been sending campaign emails with subject lines such as, "Dems <3 China," and, "Is it time to stand up to Communist China?" to a list maintained by a nonprofit group called Stand Up to China.

In Arizona, Republicans latched onto [Kelly's ties to a Chinese tech firm](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/05/14/senate-elections-2020-mark-kelly-business-ties-chinese-tech-firm-under-fire/5187587002/) last year, and it's likely they'll continue to use that strategy.

The senator's team has argued he isn't beholden to Chinese authorities.

Republicans have long branded Democrats as "weak" on China as a line of attack. Expect that to continue through the campaign cycle, as Democratic candidates tout the passage of the U.S. Innovation Act and reframe the narrative.

They plan to focus on increasing the United States' competitive edge with China as a policy priority.

What they’re saying: David Bergstein, a spokesman for the DSCC, said the campaign committee will be “reminding voters that any Republican who refused to back this critical bill was too weak to stand up to China in order to protect and grow good-paying jobs.”

Chris Hartline, spokesman for the NRSC, said in a statement that "no one believes that Joe Biden and Senate Democrats will do what it takes to confront the geopolitical and economic threat posed by (President) Xi (Jinping) and the Chinese Communist Party.

#### GOP control of the Senate will be used to usher in a new wave of Trumpism, crushing democracy.

Morton **Kondracke 21**. Retired executive editor of Roll Call, a former "McLaughlin Group" and Fox News commentator and co-author, with Fred Barnes, of Jack Kemp: The Bleeding Heart Conservative Who Changed America. “Why Democrats Must Retain Control of Congress in 2022,” RealClearPolitics, August 4, 2021, <https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2021/08/04/why_democrats_must_retain_control_of_congress_in_2022_146189.html>, RJP, DebateDrills

The 2020 election demonstrated how fragile our democracy is. As Donald Trump tried, [by means both legal and illegal](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Attempts_to_overturn_the_2020_United_States_presidential_election), to overturn the results of a free and fair election, only the [courts and a thin line of courageous Republican election officials](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/its-official-election-was-secure) guaranteed that the peoples’ choice prevailed.

But the safeguards are weaker. Although the Supreme Court [upheld](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/supreme-court/supreme-court-rejects-final-trump-election-challenge-n1260023) the last lower-court dismissal of multiple Trump-inspired lawsuits charging election fraud, in July the court [upheld new voting restrictions](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/voting-rights-breyers-future-spotlight-us-supreme-court-2021-07-01/https:/www.reuters.com/world/us/voting-rights-breyers-future-spotlight-us-supreme-court-2021-07-01/) enacted in Arizona.

And many of the [Republican election officials](https://thehill.com/homenews/state-watch/565657-new-spotlight-on-secretaries-of-state-as-electoral-battlegrounds) who refused to back up Trump’s bogus fraud charges have been [threatened](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/policy-solutions/election-officials-under-attack),  [fired, or are being challenged for reelection by Trump followers](https://www.economist.com/united-states/2021/07/03/state-level-republicans-are-reforming-how-elections-are-administered). Meanwhile, [17 Republican-controlled state legislatures](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-july-2021) have  joined Arizona in making voting more difficult: In several of them,  legislators are trying to [seize control of election management](https://www.politifact.com/article/2021/jul/14/are-state-legislators-really-seeking-power-overrul/), including power to replace county election officials or even decide how a state’s election results should be certified, regardless of the popular vote.

Republicans claim they are acting restore faith in elections, but—with fraud repeatedly shown to be rare and of no effect in in 2020—Trump and his followers are really [undermining faith](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/05/24/2020-election-republican-official-races-490458) in American elections.

The result of this frenzy of activity in furtherance of Trump’s “Big Lie”—that he won the 2020 election (and that he won in a “landslide,” no less) —is that the preservation of American-style self-government depends on Democrats retaining control of Congress in 2022.

Republicans have shown that they simply can’t be trusted to safeguard democracy. Donald Trump now [owns the Republican Party](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/06/11/how-republican-party-became-party-trump/) as GOP politicians up and down the line do his bidding, out of fear or belief.

Even after a mob of Trump supporters invaded the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, Republicans in Congress voted overwhelmingly against [impeaching](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2021/trump-second-impeachment-vote-count-house-results-list/) and [convicting](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2021/trump-second-impeachment-senate-vote/) him for his actions and inaction. Eight GOP senators and 147 representatives [voted not to certify](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/07/us/politics/republicans-against-certification.htmlhttps:/www.nytimes.com/2021/01/07/us/politics/republicans-against-certification.htmlhttps:/www.nytimes.com/2021/01/07/us/politics/republicans-against-certification.html) Electoral College counts submitted by two states (had they prevailed, there would have more). Then only six GOP senators voted in favor of forming a truly bipartisan 9/11-style commission to investigate the insurrection, [killing the proposal by filibuster](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/january-6-commission-senate/2021/05/28/54e9f692-bf27-11eb-b26e-53663e6be6ff_story.htmlhttps:/www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/january-6-commission-senate/2021/05/28/54e9f692-bf27-11eb-b26e-53663e6be6ff_story.html).  After Democratic House Speaker Nancy Pelosi established a select committee to conduct an investigation, Republican leaders attacked her as responsible for the riot,  [falsely claiming](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/27/us/insurrection-pelosi-claims-fact-check.html) she is in charge of security at the Capitol.

Republicans who voted against Trump on any issue relating to Jan. 6 now face [primary opponents](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/02/28/cpac-donald-trump-expected-claim-leadership-republican-party/6843815002/https:/www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/02/28/cpac-donald-trump-expected-claim-leadership-republican-party/6843815002/) backed by him and [censure](https://www.voanews.com/usa/us-politics/republican-groups-censure-party-lawmakers-who-voted-impeach-convict-trump) by their state parties. Rep. Liz Cheney, the most vocal Trump critic in the GOP, lost her House leadership post. Trump has even [attacked Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/02/16/trump-attacks-mcconnell-in-fiery-statement-469150https:/www.politico.com/news/2021/02/16/trump-attacks-mcconnell-in-fiery-statement-469150), who criticized him after Jan. 6 but also blocked creation of the 9/11 commission. It’s classic authoritarian behavior—demanding [total loyalty](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/22/us/politics/trump-disloyalty-turnover.html) from his followers and total control of his faction, and assailing any rivals in power.

Lately, Trump [reportedly](https://www.forbes.com/sites/markjoyella/2021/06/01/maggie-haberman-trump-telling-people-he-expects-to-be-reinstated-as-president-by-august/) has encouraged his followers to believe he can somehow be reinstated as president later this month, and the Department of Homeland Security is [concerned](https://www.cnn.com/2021/06/30/politics/dhs-summer-violence-warnings-conspiracy/index.html) that the violent acts of Jan. 6 may be repeated when he’s not.

The sad, but inevitable conclusion is that if Republicans take control of either chamber in Congress, they will not try to do what’s best for America as a whole. They will do what Trump tells them to do, probably starting with trying to undo everything President Biden and the Democrats in Congress have done during the previous two years.

For starters, if Democrats are to prevail next November, Biden must be seen as a successful moderate-progressive president—one who can defy the historical pattern that presidential parties [almost invariably](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/vitalstats_ch2_tbl4.pdf) lose seats in their first midterm election.

The last two Democratic presidents s who launched major initiatives without GOP support, Bill Clinton (tax increases and health care reform) and Barack Obama (Obamacare and anti-recession stimulus spending), suffered historic shellackings in the ensuing midterms—54 House seats and eight Senate seats in 1994, and 63 House and six Senate seats in 2010. Biden, who has multiple big programs in his policy agenda, has smaller Democratic margins in Congress than Clinton and Obama.  In other words, the Democrats must hang on to almost all of their contested districts and states.

McConnell, who earned the moniker [“grim reaper”](https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/555877-mcconnell-returns-as-senate-grim-reaperhttps:/thehill.com/homenews/senate/555877-mcconnell-returns-as-senate-grim-reaperhttps:/thehill.com/homenews/senate/555877-mcconnell-returns-as-senate-grim-reaper) for blocking Obama, was supposed to be a willing negotiating partner for Biden. Instead, the Senate Republican leader has pronounced himself  [“100% focused”](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/joe-biden/mcconnell-says-he-s-100-percent-focused-stopping-biden-s-n1266443) on defeating Biden’s legislative agenda. So far, Biden has succeeded in passing a $1.9 trillion COVID relief package (with no Republican votes). He is trying to work out a bipartisan $1 trillion [“physical infrastructure”](https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/28/politics/infrastructure-bill-explained/index.html) package. McConnell isn’t the obstruction with this legislation, as Senate negotiators and the White House [sound optimistic](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-senators-move-forward-with-infrastructure-bill-sunday-2021-08-01/). But with Rep. Kevin McCarthy openly angling for Pelosi’s job, nothing is certain in the House.

Trump is actively trying to scuttle infrastructure spending. He’s telling Republicans to oppose it, saying passage means letting “the Radical Left play you for weak fools and losers,” and he has [threatened primary challenges](https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewsolender/2021/07/28/trump-threatens-lots-of-primaries-for-gop-senators-over-infrastructure-deal/?sh=4be66d98276b) against GOP legislators who support it. This, despite his promising to pass a [$2 trillion bill](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/07/28/infrastructure-deal-trump-501287) while president (then never delivering). Republicans who support it obviously want money for roads, bridges and broadband for their constituents.

But they don’t like the contents of Biden’s follow-up proposal—a $3.5 trillion “human infrastructure” program, which would expand Medicare, caregiving for the disabled and elderly, and child care, while funding universal pre-kindergarten, free community college, national paid family leave, and extended child tax credits. And they don’t like the corporate and capital gains tax increases Democrats propose to pay for it all. So the Democratic plan is to pass it as a “budget reconciliation” measure requiring only Democratic votes.

If, next November, the GOP captures one chamber—most likely, the [House](https://centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/forecasting-the-2022-midterm-election-with-the-generic-ballot/)—whatever Biden can get done in his first two years can’t be easily undone, but he will get nothing more passed. If the GOP gets control of both chambers, Republicans will try to reverse anything he has accomplished. He’ll have only his veto pen as protection.  Stalemate from 2023 through 2024—and an unsuccessful-seeming Biden presidency—could reelect Trump (or someone backed by him), in which case constitutional norms and respect for election results and the rule of law would again be in peril.

**Extinction**

**Kasparov 17**

Garry Kasparov, Chairman of the Human Rights Foundation, former World Chess Champion, “Democracy and Human Rights: The Case for U.S. Leadership,” Testimony Before The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, February 16th, <https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/021617_Kasparov_%20Testimony.pdf>

As one of the countless millions of people who were freed or protected from totalitarianism by the United States of America, it is easy for me to talk about the past. To talk about the belief of the American people and their leaders that this country was exceptional, and had special responsibilities to match its tremendous power. That a nation founded on freedom was bound to defend freedom everywhere. I could talk about the bipartisan legacy of this most American principle, from the Founding Fathers, to Democrats like Harry Truman, to Republicans like Ronald Reagan. I could talk about how the American people used to care deeply about human rights and dissidents in far-off places, and how this is what made America a beacon of hope, a shining city on a hill. America led by example and set a high standard, a standard that exposed the hypocrisy and cruelty of dictatorships around the world. But there is no time for nostalgia. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War, Americans, and America, have retreated from those principles, and **the world has become much worse off as a result**. American skepticism about America’s role in the world deepened in the long, painful wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and their aftermaths. Instead of applying the lessons learned about how to do better, lessons about faulty intelligence and working with native populations, the main outcome was to stop trying. This result has been a tragedy for the billions of people still living under authoritarian regimes around the world, and it is based on faulty analysis. You can never guarantee a positive outcome— not in chess, not in war, and certainly not in politics. The best you can do is to do what you know is right and to try your best. I speak from experience when I say that the citizens of unfree states do not expect guarantees. They want a reason to hope and a fighting chance. People living under dictatorships want the opportunity for freedom, the opportunity to live in peace and to follow their dreams. From the Iraq War to the Arab Spring to the current battles for liberty from Venezuela to Eastern Ukraine, people are fighting for that opportunity, giving up their lives for freedom. The United States must not abandon them. The United States and the rest of the free world has an unprecedented advantage in economic and military strength today. What is lacking is the will. The will to make the case to the American people, the will to take risks and invest in the long-term security of the country, and the world. This will require investments in aid, in education, in security that allow countries to attain the stability their people so badly need. Such investment is far more moral and far cheaper than the cycle of **terror, war**, refugees, and **military intervention** that results when America leaves a vacuum of power. The best way to help refugees is to prevent them from becoming refugees in the first place. The Soviet Union was an existential threat, and this focused the attention of the world, and the American people. There **existential threat** today is not found on a map, but it **is very real**. The forces of the past are making steady progress against the modern world order. **Terrorist** movements in the Middle East, extremist parties across Europe, a paranoid tyrant in **North Korea threatening nuclear blackmail,** and, at the center of the web, an **aggressive KGB dictator in Russia**. They all want to turn the world back to a dark past because their survival is threatened by the values of the free world, epitomized by the United States. And **they are thriving as the U.S. has retreated**. The global freedom index has declined for ten consecutive years. No one like to talk about the United States as a global policeman, but **this is what happens when there is no cop on the beat. American leadership begins at home**, right here. America cannot lead the world on democracy and human rights if there is no unity on the meaning and importance of these things. **Leadership is required to make that case clearly and powerfully**. Right now, Americans are engaged in politics at a level not seen in decades. It is an opportunity for them to rediscover that making America great begins with believing America can be great. The Cold War was won on American values that were shared by both parties and nearly every American. Institutions that were created by a Democrat, Truman, were triumphant forty years later thanks to the courage of a Republican, Reagan. This bipartisan consistency created the decades of strategic stability that is the great strength of democracies. Strong institutions that outlast politicians allow for long-range planning. In contrast, dictators can operate only tactically, not strategically, because they are not constrained by the balance of powers, but cannot afford to think beyond their own survival. This is why a dictator like Putin has an advantage in chaos, the ability to move quickly. This can only be met by strategy, by long-term goals that are based on shared values, not on polls and cable news. The fear of making things worse has paralyzed the United States from trying to make things better. There will always be setbacks, but the United States cannot quit. The spread of **democracy is the only** proven **remedy for** nearly **every crisis that plagues the world today. War, famine, poverty, terrorism**–all are generated and exacerbated by authoritarian regimes. A policy of America First inevitably puts American security last. American leadership is required because there is no one else, and because it is good for America. There is no weapon or wall that is more powerful for security than America being envied, imitated, and admired around the world. Admired not for being perfect, but for having the exceptional courage to always try to be better. Thank you.

## Case

### AT: Solvency

#### All their ev is in the context of global WTO waivers, not just a U.S. one which means masks, tech, ppe, etc. don’t solve for their underlying impacts

#### No evidence for why a patent is key for increased vaccines– most factories can already make it

**Iancu, 21**, 4/13/21, Stat News, “No evidence that patents slow access to vaccines”, Andrei Iancu is a partner at Irell & Manella, a law firm based in Los Angeles, and a senior adviser to the Renewing American Innovation Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. He served as the undersecretary of commerce for intellectual property and director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, a position to which he was confirmed unanimously by the Senate, URL: <https://www.statnews.com/2021/04/13/no-evidence-patents-slow-vaccine-access/>, KR

Gutting patent rights is a dangerous prospect. Drug invention is highly risky: Fewer than 12% of new molecular entities that make it to the clinical trial stage get to the marketplace. The endeavor depends on $100 billion in annual private-sector investment, on top of billions in taxpayer money. Kill the patents taken out on these advances and you kill the incentive to invest. That would mean even worse trouble when the next pandemic comes around, in five, 10, or 20 years.

So before governments take the risk of waiving patents, they should evaluate whether intellectual property rights are really standing in the way of vaccine manufacturing and distribution. To do that, they need to answer two questions:

Is there evidence that a broad range of Covid-19 vaccine developers have been asked for, and unreasonably refused, licenses to their IP?

Are there more facilities that could manufacture a vaccine in short order if they just had the intellectual property?

The answers are no and no.

The issues about making more vaccines and distributing them to every country are far more complex than those proposing to waive intellectual property rights on these vaccines would have us believe. Manufacturing and distributing these vaccines is extremely complicated, posing issues well beyond patents.

Almost every factory on the planet that can make these vaccines is already doing so. One of the biggest, the Serum Institute in India, has contracts with AstraZeneca and others to make millions of doses. Under deals like these, manufacturing plants in India will produce 3.6 billion doses of vaccine this year, second only to the United States.

Other companies have licensed their manufacturing process to subcontractors, and even to competitors. Johnson & Johnson and Merck are teaming up to expand manufacturing capacity of the J&J vaccine. Novartis and Sanofi are using their facilities to help increase the production of the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine.

In short, there’s robust collaboration and cooperation within the industry to ensure that vaccines are made quickly and safely. And patents actually facilitate such cooperation, because each entity can rest assured that its proprietary technology is protected in the long run.

So before rushing to disrupt the world’s intellectual property systems, governments need to identify specific evidence that intellectual property protection is actually a problem. Adar Poonawalla, CEO of the Serum Institute of India, told The Guardian that insufficient license-granting by patent holders is not an impediment to speedy vaccine rollout and that “it just takes time to scale up,” pointing to the complexity of the manufacturing process.

And Bill Gates, the mega-philanthropist whose foundation spearheads many global vaccination efforts, recently told the “Sway” podcast, “Believe me, IP did not limit anything.”

On the contrary, intellectual property rights made it possible for research scientists to make the decades of investments required to develop and deliver safe and effective Covid-19 vaccines in record time. Companies would not share such critical technology with competitors if the law didn’t protect their investments.

Some of those advocating for patent waivers have their hearts in the right place: They want to end the pandemic.

But the evidence that setting aside patent protection will do anything to boost access or expand supply just isn’t there. Removing intellectual property protections on medicines will only ensure that we have fewer of them in the future. This is not a risk worth taking, especially when the evidence suggests we don’t need to.

### AT: Disease

#### Turn – Reductions in IP protections decks innovation

Pipes 3/5 Sally Pipes [Sally C. Pipes is President, CEO, and Thomas W. Smith Fellow in Health Care Policy at the Pacific Research Institute, a California-based think tank founded in 1979.], 3-5-2021, "Intellectual Property Rights Are Key To Fighting Covid-19 And Protecting Public Health," Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/sallypipes/2021/03/05/intellectual-property-rights-are-key-to-fighting-covid-19-and-protecting-public-health/> DD AG

The record-setting development of multiple Covid-19 vaccines will go down in history as some of medical science's greatest achievements. In less than a year, the competing vaccines went from the drawing board to saving lives around the world. Unfortunately, many liberal policymakers are attacking the system of strong intellectual property rights that underpinned the work of these heroic scientists. If their attacks are successful, then there could be many fewer medical miracles in our future. Later this month, the World Trade Organization is expected to rule on a petition championed by the governments of India and South Africa to suspend patents related to Covid-19 vaccines and treatments. Supporters of this scheme claim it would boost the availability of vaccines in poorer countries. They also argue that governments have helped fund the research that led to the Covid-19 vaccines—so the public has a claim on the fruits of that work. There's no evidence that suspending intellectual property rights will speed up the manufacturing or distribution of Covid vaccines. The process of making these vaccines is hard. The machines that make the particles that go into the shots are highly complex, and their supply is limited. As pharmaceutical researcher Derek Lowe has explained, "There are definitely not dozens of companies who can make enough RNA," the genetic material in the Moderna and Pfizer/BioNTech vaccines that instructs our cells in how to fight the coronavirus. Lowe continues: "And you can count on one hand the number of facilities who can make the critical lipid nanoparticles" that carry the mRNA to our cells. There's a wealth of evidence, on the other hand, that revoking patents will cause drugmakers to put their research and development efforts on hold. Pharmaceutical companies spend an average of 15 years and nearly $3 billion to bring a new medicine to market. Just one-tenth of one percent of potential pharmaceutical compounds ever enter clinical trials in humans. And just 0.02% of those compounds ends up garnering approval and being dispensed to patients. Clearly, developing life-saving medicines is a risky, expensive, and time-consuming endeavor. Few investors would ever consider funding drug research if there were a threat that governments could seize the fruits of that research and prevent them from having a chance to recoup their money. India and South Africa aren't the only countries looking to launch a broadside on the global intellectual property system. The idea has a following here in the United States, too. Last year, attorneys general from 31 states, as well as American Samoa, Guam, and the District of Columbia, called on the federal government to revoke the patent for remdesivir, the antiviral developed by Gilead Sciences that shortened stays in the hospital for patients with Covid-19. The attorneys general argued that the government had a claim on the intellectual property behind the drug, since it had funded early-stage research. Nevermind that the federal government's own experts determined that it didn't "qualify. . . as a joint inventor of the compound." The public's investment in research broadly related to remdesivir totaled about $70 million; Gilead, with no guarantee of any success, risked more than $1 billion developing the drug. Drugmakers have come up with the vaccines that will ultimately save millions of lives and allow the world to return to life as usual. They've also developed ways to get those vaccines to as many people quickly and cheaply—often to the detriment of their bottom line. AstraZeneca, for example, has volunteered not to take any profits during the pandemic and pledged to direct more than 64% of its vaccine doses to developing nations. Johnson & Johnson has promised to allocate up to half a billion vaccines to lower-income countries. All four major vaccine developers—Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, and Johnson & Johnson—are allowing manufacturers to license their patents for free in order to make more vaccines available as quickly as possible. Suspending patents won't increase the number of vaccines available. It will only prevent the development of new innovative and life-saving drugs—and leave us less prepared for future pandemics. It's an idea that tomorrow's patients will pay for.

#### Companies will keep complex production steps secret if forced to forgo patents – that shuts down cooperation.

Silverman 3/21 Rachel Silverman -- a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development, “Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations”, 15 March 2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/> | MU

According to some activists, the solution to this inequity is relatively simple: By suspending protections on covid-19 vaccine patents, the international community “could help break Big Pharma monopolies and increase supplies so there are enough doses for everyone, everywhere,” [claims](https://peoplesvaccine.org/take-action/)the People’s Vaccine Alliance. Indeed, 58 low- and middle-income countries have mobilized in support of a proposed World Trade Organization [waiver](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669.pdf&Open=True) that would temporarily exempt [coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_4)-related intellectual property from normal international rules and protections. And while the effort to waive IP protections has been a global health hot topic for months, it gained a high-profile endorsement in the United States recently from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). In a March 10 video statement, Sanders [called upon President Biden](https://twitter.com/GlobalJusticeUK/status/1369734275818549252?s=20) to support the IP suspension while slamming “huge, multibillion-dollar pharmaceutical companies [that] continue to prioritize profits by protecting their monopolies.”

The logic of the argument seems clear and intuitive — at first. Without patents, which serve narrow commercial interests, companies all over the world could freely produce the vaccine. Sure, Big Pharma would lose money — but this is a pandemic, and human life comes before private profit, especially when vaccines receive substantial public financing to support research and development. As with HIV drugs in years past, widespread generic production would dramatically increase supply and drive down prices to levels affordable even in the developing world.

Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have little effect. It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts. There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents.

The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna [announced in October](https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/statement-moderna-intellectual-property-matters-during-covid-19) that it would not enforce IP rights on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has taken no steps to share information about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the company’s direct control within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine [not yet participating in Covax](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/coronavirus-vaccine-access-poor-countries-moderna/2021/02/12/0586e532-6712-11eb-bf81-c618c88ed605_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_9), a global-aid-funded effort (including a [pledged $4 billion from the United States](https://www.npr.org/2021/02/18/969145224/biden-to-announce-4-billion-for-global-covid-19-vaccine-effort)) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries.

It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own.

[We focused on covid. Now our other patients are suffering.](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/08/covid-hospital-addiction-cancer/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_11)

One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, [lowering prices dramatically](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-drug-evaluation-and-research-cder/generic-competition-and-drug-prices).

Vaccines, in contrast, are complex [biological](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-biologics-evaluation-and-research-cber/what-are-biologics-questions-and-answers#:~:text=What%20is%20a%20biological%20product,tissues%2C%20and%20recombinant%20therapeutic%20proteins.) products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.

#### In the age of globalization multilateral cooperation is necessary to prevent outbreaks.

Laxminarayan et al. 12 Ramanan Laxminarayan Ph.D., M.P.H is an economist and an epidemiologist. He is founder and director of the Center for Disease Dynamics, Economics & Policy in Washington, D.C. and senior research scholar at Princeton University, an affiliate professor at the University of Washington. “Cooperation is crucial to eliminate infectious disease”, June 2012, <https://www.scidev.net/global/opinions/cooperation-is-crucial-to-eliminate-infectious-disease/> | MU

Even non-neighbouring countries can experience huge gains from every country’s efforts. India’s smallpox eradication programme, which was supported by a global effort including the United States, failed initially because of an ineffective strategy, despite the long-term economic incentive. But the United States benefited by not having to carry out in-country vaccinations once smallpox was eradicated worldwide. [3]

When non-infected countries invest in vaccination efforts for infected countries, enhanced herd immunity in the long term benefits the global population. The Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative, which covered eastern Swaziland, southern Mozambique and the northeastern KwaZulu-Natal province in South Africa, is one example in which a richer country (South Africa) financed the elimination of malaria in poorer countries (Swaziland and Mozambique).

The first step in achieving global benefit is to achieve regional benefits. And since the world is increasingly connected, the benefits of regional control usually extend to non-neighbouring countries — for example, by avoiding introductions of malaria from endemic to disease-free regions.

To effectively target diseases that extend across borders, cooperation — among countries, external funders and international organisations — is essential. In practical terms, this begins with understanding the origins of the disease and is facilitated through coordinated logistical and administrative efforts, long-term funding and targeting disease in infected populations.

The importance of transboundary incentives suggests that malaria elimination, for instance, has as much to do with a neighbouring country’s stance against malaria — and its effect on the number of incoming cases — as the endemic country’s control efforts. International programmes should pay attention to these incentives and explicitly consider them in financing measures to control infectious diseases that span countries.

### AT: Heg

#### US hegemony is dead – there’s no coming back

* COVID, economic downturns, nationalistic politics, security internationally
* Rise in other great powers to rival
* Weaker states can seek alternatives to US support
* Rise in right-wing networks vs liberal policies

Cooley and Nexon 20 (Alexander Cooley is the Claire Tow Professor of Political Science at Barnard College and Director of Columbia University’s Harriman Institute, Daniel H. Nexon is an Associate Professor in the Department of Government and at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, 6/9/2020, Foreign Affairs, “How Hegemony Ends”, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-06-09/how-hegemony-ends>) //EG

Multiple signs point to a crisis in global order. The uncoordinated international response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the resulting economic downturns, the resurgence of nationalist politics, and the hardening of state borders all seem to herald the emergence of a less cooperative and more fragile international system. According to many observers, these developments underscore the dangers of U.S. President Donald Trump’s “America first” policies and his retreat from global leadership.

Even before the pandemic, Trump routinely criticized the value of alliances and institutions such as NATO, supported the breakup of the European Union, withdrew from a host of international agreements and organizations, and pandered to autocrats such as Russian President Vladimir Putin and the North Korean leader Kim Jong Un. He has questioned the merits of placing liberal values such as democracy and human rights at the heart of foreign policy. Trump’s clear preference for zero-sum, transactional politics further supports the notion that the United States is abandoning its commitment to promoting a liberal international order.

Some analysts believe that the United States can still turn this around, by restoring the strategies by which it, from the end of World War II to the aftermath of the Cold War, built and sustained a successful international order. If a post-Trump United States could reclaim the responsibilities of global power, then this era—including the pandemic that will define it—could stand as a temporary aberration rather than a step on the way to permanent disarray.

After all, predictions of American decline and a shift in international order are far from new—and they have been consistently wrong. In the middle of the 1980s, many analysts believed that U.S. leadership was on the way out. The Bretton Woods system had collapsed in the 1970s; the United States faced increasing competition from European and East Asian economies, notably West Germany and Japan; and the Soviet Union looked like an enduring feature of world politics. By the end of 1991, however, the Soviet Union had formally dissolved, Japan was entering its “lost decade” of economic stagnation, and the expensive task of integration consumed a reunified Germany. The United States experienced a decade of booming technological innovation and unexpectedly high economic growth. The result was what many hailed as a “unipolar moment” of American hegemony.

But this time really is different. The very forces that made U.S. hegemony so durable before are today driving its dissolution. Three developments enabled the post–Cold War U.S.-led order. First, with the defeat of communism, the United States faced no major global ideological project that could rival its own. Second, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and its accompanying infrastructure of institutions and partnerships, weaker states lacked significant alternatives to the United States and its Western allies when it came to securing military, economic, and political support. And third, transnational activists and movements were spreading liberal values and norms that bolstered the liberal order.

Today, those same dynamics have turned against the United States: a vicious cycle that erodes U.S. power has replaced the virtuous cycles that once reinforced it. With the rise of great powers such as China and Russia, autocratic and illiberal projects rival the U.S.-led liberal international system. Developing countries—and even many developed ones—can seek alternative patrons rather than remain dependent on Western largess and support. And illiberal, often right-wing transnational networks are pressing against the norms and pieties of the liberal international order that once seemed so implacable. In short, U.S. global leadership is not simply in retreat; it is unraveling. And the decline is not cyclical but permanent.

#### We win US hegemony low since both we are saying it and they’re own evidence, they get no offense --- declining states must retrench or they risk overextension and a catastrophic loss in credibility that makes their impacts inevitable

MacDonald and Parent 18 Paul K. MacDonald and Joseph M. Parent. MacDonald is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Wellesley University. Parent is associate professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame. “Twilight of the Titans: Great Power Decline and Retrenchment.” Cornell University Press. 2018.

Third, preventive war theories obsess over the appearance of credibility, not where it comes from or how much it is worth. For Gilpin, the “fundamental problem with a policy of appeasement or accommodation” is that it leads to “continuing deterioration in a state’s prestige and international position.” But commitments are checks: they only cash when there is something behind them. In world politics, power is the closest equivalent to money, and as a declining state’s power draws down, it has to be more frugal. Great powers cannot be fooled for long; commitments must be backed. Yet declining powers have less capability and must decide whether to keep a stronger, shorter defensive perimeter, or a longer, weaker one. Preventive war theories assert the sanctity of credibility in theory as they recommend overdrawing it in practice. And, while the debate remains lively, credibility in the abstract appears to be worth less than policymakers believe. Great powers are not obligated to defend their interests with equal vigor, and accommodation in one area does not necessarily invite exploitation in others. A reputation for bluffing can be worse than a reputation for weakness.

Most important, credibility is more multifaceted and contextual than preventive war theories assume. Great powers certainly worry about their power and prestige, but their commitments are not of equal weight, and concessions in one area need not be seen as weakening commitments elsewhere. The fact that commitments are complex allows declining powers to shift burdens and concentrate capabilities at key points of challenge. Tactical retreats and strongpoint defenses make deterrence more robust and threats more credible, and may help signal benign intentions. The multifaceted nature of commitments also provides crafty rising challengers with opportunities to challenge the status quo in places that dominant powers are unlikely to vigorously defend. Rising powers that undertake modest challenges to the status quo in less sensitive areas send the most important signal that they do not intend to forcibly overturn the existing order. In this way, rising powers can take advantage of their newfound strength without generating incentives for declining powers to clip their wings.

Altogether, these points suggest that shifts in power are concerning but rarely generate strong incentives for war. Declining powers will be drawn to preventive war when uncommon stars align: if war is likely to succeed, if the consequences of war can be managed, if victory will reverse flagging fortunes, and if there are no better options. A declining power must also be confident that rising challengers will continue to ascend rapidly up the ranks, that they will fight to assure their ascendance, and that they are bent on future domination. In the absence of these conditions, pugnacious policies make little sense. Defeat in a preventive war opens the floodgates for exploitation on multiple fronts, and even a successful war can compromise a great power to the point of vulnerability. Typically, states will manage the very real, but often ambiguous, dangers that accompany decline with more caution than aggression.

#### Multipolarity is locked in --- trying to go back to unipolarity eviscerates cooperation that solves a litany of existential risks
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American foreign policy is at a crossroads. The United States has been an expanding power since its start in 1789. It battled its way across North America in the 19th century and gained global dominance in the second half of the 20th.

But now, facing China’s rise, India’s dynamism, Africa’s soaring populations and economic stirrings, Russia’s refusal to bend to its will, its own inability to control events in the Middle East and Latin America’s determination to be free of its de facto hegemony, US power has reached its limits.

One path for the US is global cooperation. The other is a burst of militarism in response to frustrated ambitions. The future of the US, and of the world, hangs on this choice.

Global cooperation is doubly vital.

Only cooperation can deliver peace and the escape from a useless, dangerous and ultimately bankrupting new arms race, this time including cyber weapons, space weapons and next-generation nuclear weapons.

And only cooperation can enable humanity to face up to urgent planetary challenges, including the destruction of biodiversity, the poisoning of the oceans, and the threat posed by global warming to the world’s food supply, vast drylands and heavily populated coastal regions.

Yet, global cooperation means the willingness to reach agreements with other countries, not simply to make unilateral demands of them.

And the US is in the habit of making demands, not making compromises.

When a state feels destined to rule — as with ancient Rome, the Chinese “Middle Kingdom” centuries ago, the British Empire from 1750 to 1950, and the US since World War II — compromise is hardly a part of its political vocabulary.

As former US president George W. Bush succinctly put it, “you’re either with us or against us”.

Not surprisingly, then, the US is finding it hard to accept the clear global limits that it is confronting.

In the wake of the Cold War, Russia was supposed to fall in line; but President Vladimir Putin did not oblige.

Likewise, rather than bringing stability on US terms, America’s covert and overt wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, South Sudan and elsewhere created a firestorm stretching across the greater Middle East.

China was supposed to show gratitude and deference to the US for the right to catch up from 150 years of abuse by Western imperial powers and Japan.

Instead, China has the audacity to think that it is an Asian power with responsibilities of its own.

There is a fundamental reason, of course, for these limits.

At the end of World War II, the US was the only major power not destroyed by the war. It led the world in science, technology and infrastructure.

It constituted perhaps 30 per cent of the world economy and formed the cutting edge of every high-tech sector.

It organised the post-war international order: the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions, the Marshall Plan, the reconstruction of Japan and more.

Under that order, the rest of the world has closed much of the vast technological, educational and infrastructural gap with the US.

As economists say, global growth has been “convergent”, meaning that poorer countries have been catching up.

The share of the world economy represented by the US has declined by roughly half (to around 16 per cent currently).

China now has a larger economy in absolute terms than the US, though still only around one-fourth the size in per capita terms.

None of this catching up was a perfidious trick against the US or at its expense.

It was a matter of basic economics: given peace, trade, and a global flow of ideas, poorer countries can get ahead. This tendency is to be welcomed, not shunned.

But if the global leader’s mindset is one of domination, the results of catch-up growth will look threatening, which how many US “security strategists” view them.

Suddenly, open trade, long championed by the US, looks like a dire threat to its continued dominance.

Fear-mongers are calling for the US to close itself off to Chinese goods and Chinese companies, claiming that global trade itself undermines American supremacy.

My former Harvard colleague and leading US diplomat Robert Blackwill and former State Department adviser Ashley Tellis expressed their unease in a report published last year.

The US has consistently pursued a grand strategy “focused on acquiring and maintaining preeminent power over various rivals”, they wrote, and “primacy ought to remain the central objective of US grand strategy in the twenty-first century”.

But “China’s rise thus far has already bred geopolitical, military, economic, and ideological challenges to US power, US allies, and the US-dominated international order”, Blackwill and Tellis noted.

“Its continued, even if uneven, success in the future would further undermine US national interests.”

US President-elect Donald’s Trump’s newly named trade adviser Peter Navarro agrees.

“Whenever we buy products made in China,” he wrote last year of the US and its allies, “we as consumers are helping to finance a Chinese military build-up that may well mean to do us and our countries harm”.

With just 4.4 per cent of the world’s population and a falling share of world output, the US might try to hang on to its delusion of global dominance through a new arms race and protectionist trade policies.

Doing so would unite the world against US arrogance and the new US military threat.

The US would sooner rather than later bankrupt itself in a classic case of “imperial overreach”.

The only sane way forward for the US is vigorous and open global cooperation to realise the potential of 21st century science and technology to slash poverty, disease, and environmental threats.

A multipolar world can be stable, prosperous, and secure. The rise of many regional powers is not a threat to the US, but an opportunity for a new era of prosperity and constructive problem solving.