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### Advantage 1: Covid Access

#### Only the plan can solve covid access – inequalities heighten the risk of mutations and uneven development – neg objections miss the boat.
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According to Duke Global Health Innovation Center, which monitors COVID-19 vaccine purchases, rich nations representing just 14 per cent of the world population have bought up to 53 per cent of the most promising vaccines so far. As of 4 July 2021, the high-income countries (HICs) purchased more than half (6.16 billion) vaccine doses sold globally. At the same time, the low-income countries (LICs) received only 0.3 per cent of the vaccines produced. The low and middle-income countries (LMICs), which account for 81 per cent of the global adult population, purchased 33 per cent, and COVAX (COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access) has received 13 per cent.10 Many HICs bought enough doses to vaccinate their populations several times over. For instance, Canada procured 10.45 doses per person, while the UK, EU and the US procured 8.18, 6.89, and 4.60 doses per inhabitant, respectively.11

Consequently, there is a significant disparity between HICs and LICs in vaccine administration as well. As of 8 July 2021, 3.32 billion vaccine doses had been administered globally.12 Nonetheless, only one per cent of people in LICs have been given at least one dose. While in HICs almost one in four people have received the vaccine, in LICs, it is one in more than 500. The World Health Organization (WHO) notes that about 90 per cent of African countries will miss the September target to vaccinate at least 10 per cent of their populations as a third wave looms on the continent.13 South Africa, the most affected African country, for instance, has vaccinated less than two per cent of its population of about 59 million. This is in contrast with the US where almost 47.5 per cent of the population of more than 330 million has been fully vaccinated. In Sub-Saharan Africa, vaccine rollout remains the slowest in the world. According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), at current rates, by the end of 2021, a massive global inequity will continue to exist, with Africa still experiencing meagre vaccination rates while other parts of the world move much closer to complete vaccination.14

This vaccine inequity is not only morally indefensible but also clinically counter-productive. If this situation prevails, LICs could be waiting until 2025 for vaccinating half of their people. Allowing most of the world’s population to go unvaccinated will also spawn new virus mutations, more contagious viruses leading to a steep rise in COVID-19 cases. Such a scenario could cause twice as many deaths as against distributing them globally, on a priority basis. Preventing this humanitarian catastrophe requires removing all barriers to the production and distribution of vaccines. TRIPS is one such barrier that prevents vaccine production in LMICs and hence its equitable distribution.

TRIPS: Barrier to Equitable Health Care Access

The opponents of the waiver proposal argue that IPR are not a significant barrier to equitable access to health care, and existing TRIPS flexibilities are sufficient to address the COVID-19 pandemic. However, history suggests the contrary. For instance, when South Africa passed the Medicines and Related Substances Act of 1997 to address the HIV/AIDS public health crisis, nearly 40 of world’s largest and influential pharma companies took the South African government to court over the violation of TRIPS. The Act, which invoked the compulsory licensing provision, allowed South Africa to produce affordable generic drugs.15 The Big Pharma also lobbied developed countries, particularly the US, to put bilateral trade sanctions against South Africa.16

Similarly, when Indian company Cipla decided to provide generic antiretrovirals (ARVs) to the African market at a lower cost, Big Pharma retaliated through patent litigations in Indian and international trade courts and branded Indian drug companies as thieves.17 Another instance was when Swiss company Roche initiated patent infringement proceedings against Cipla’s decision to launch a generic version of cancer drug, “erlotinib”. Though the Delhi High Court initially dismissed Roche's appeal by citing “public interest” and “affordability of medicines,” the continued to pressure the generic pharma companies over IPR. 18 Likewise, Pfizer’s aggressive patenting strategy prevented South Korea in developing pneumonia vaccines for children.19

A recent document by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), or Doctors Without Borders, highlights various instances of how IP hinders manufacturing and supply of diagnostics, medical equipment, treatments and vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, during the peak of the COVID-19 first wave in Europe, Roche rejected a request from the Netherlands to release the recipe of key chemical reagents needed to increase the production of diagnostic kits. Another example was patent holders threatening producers of 3D printing ventilators with patent infringement lawsuits in Italy.20 The MSF also found that patents pose a severe threat to access to affordable versions of newer vaccines.21

The opponents of the TRIPS waiver also argue that IP is the incentive for innovation and if it is undermined, future innovation will suffer. However, most of the COVID-19 medical innovations, particularly vaccines, are developed with public financing assistance. Governments spent billions of dollars for COVID-19 vaccine research. Notably, out of $6.1 billion in investment tracked up to July 2021, 98.12 per cent was public funding.22 The US and Germany are the largest investors in vaccine R&D with $2.2 billion and $1.5 billion funding.

Private companies received 94.6 per cent of this funding; Moderna received the highest $956.3 million and Janssen $910.6 million. Moreover, governments also invested $50.9 billion for advance purchase agreements (APAs) as an incentive for vaccine development. A recent IMF working paper also notes that public research institutions were a key driver of the COVID-19 R&D effort—accounting for 70 per cent of all COVID-19 clinical trials globally.23 The argument is that vaccines are developed with the support of substantial public financing, hence there is a public right to the scientific achievements. Moreover, private companies reaped billions in profits from COVID-19 vaccines.

One could argue that since the US, Germany and other HICs are spending money, their citizens are entitled to get vaccines first, hence vaccine nationalism is morally defensible. Nonetheless, it is not the case. The TRIPS Agreement includes several provisions which mandates promotion of technology transfer from developed countries to LDCs. For instance, Article 7 states that "the protection and enforcement of IP rights should contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users of technical knowledge and in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, and to a balance of rights and obligations."24 Similarly, Article 66.2 also mandates the developed countries to transfer technologies to LDCs to enable them to create a sound and viable technological base. The LMICs opened their markets and amended domestic patent laws favouring developing countries’ products against this promise of technology transfer.

Another argument against the proposed TRIPS waiver is that a waiver would not increase the manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines. Indeed, one of the significant factors contributing to vaccine inequity is the lack of manufacturing capacity in the global south. Further, a TRIPS waiver will not automatically translate into improved manufacturing capacity. However, a waiver would be the first but essential step to increase manufacturing capacity worldwide. For instance, to export COVID-19 vaccine-related products, countries need to ensure that there are no IP restrictions at both ends – exporting and importing. The market for vaccine materials includes consumables, single-use reactors bags, filters, culture media, and vaccine ingredients. Export blockages on raw materials, equipment and finished products harm the overall output of the vaccine supply chain. If there is no TRIPS restriction, more governments and companies will invest in repurposing their facilities.

Similarly, the arguments such as that no other manufacturers can carry out the complex manufacturing process of COVID-19 vaccines and generic manufacturing as that would jeopardise quality, have also been proven wrong in the past. For instance, in the early 1990s, when Indian company Shantha Biotechnics approached a Western firm for a technology transfer of Hepatitis B vaccine, the firm responded that “India cannot afford such high technology vaccines… And even if you can afford to buy the technology, your scientists cannot understand recombinant technology in the least.”25 Later, Shantha Biotechnics developed its own vaccine at $1 per dose, and the UNICEF (United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund) mass inoculation programme uses this vaccine against Hepatitis B. In 2009, Shantha sold over 120 million doses of vaccines globally.

India also produces high-quality generic drugs for HIV/AIDS and cancer treatment and markets them across the globe. Now, a couple of Indian companies are in the last stage of producing mRNA (Messenger RNA) vaccines.26 Similarly, Bangladesh and Indonesia claimed that they could manufacture millions of COVID-19 vaccine doses a year if pharmaceutical companies share the know-how.27 Recently, Vietnam also said that the country could satisfy COVID-19 vaccine production requirements once it obtains vaccine patents.28 Countries like the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Turkey, Cuba, Brazil, Argentina and South Korea have the capacity to produce high-quality vaccines but lack technologies and know-how. However, Africa, Egypt, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa and Tunisia have limited manufacturing capacities, which could also produce COVID-19 vaccines after repurposing.

Moreover, COVID-19 vaccine IPR runs across the entire value chain – vaccine development, production, use, etc. A mere patent waiver may not be enough to address the issues related to its production and distribution. What is more important here is to share the technical know-how and information such as trade secrets. Therefore, the existing TRIPS flexibilities, such as compulsory and voluntary licensing, are insufficient to address this crisis. Further, compulsory licensing and the domestic legal procedures it requires is cumbersome and not expedient in a public health crisis like the COVID-19 pandemic.

India’s Role in Ensuring Vaccine Equity India's response to COVID-19 at the global level was primarily two-fold. First, its proactive engagements in the regional and international platforms. Second, its policies and programmes to provide therapeutics and vaccines to the world. Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, India has been advocating international cooperation and policy coordination in fighting it. For instance, in April 2020, India co-sponsored a UN resolution that called for fair and equitable access to essential medical supplies and future vaccines to COVID-19. Later, in October 2020, India also put pressure on developed countries with a joint WTO proposal for TRIPS waiver. India’s Vaccine Maitri initiative also aims vaccine equity. As of 29 May 2021, India has supplied 663.698 lakh doses of COVID-19 vaccines to 95 countries. It includes 107.15 lakh doses as a gift to more than 45 countries, 357.92 lakh doses by commercial sales, and 198.628 lakh doses to the COVAX facility.29 The COVAX initiative aims to ensure rapid and equitable access to COVID-19 vaccines for all countries, regardless of their income level. India has decided to supply 10 million doses of the vaccine to Africa and one million to the UN health workers under the COVAX facility. India has also removed the IPR of Covaxin that would help platforms like C-TAP once WHO and developed countries’ regulatory bodies approve the vaccine. If agreed, the waiver would benefit India in many ways. First, more vaccines will help the country to control the pandemic and its recurring waves. Second, it will be a boost to India's pharma industry, particularly the generic medicine industry. According to the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, 834 unique active compounds are involved in the current R&D of COVID-19 therapeutics, vaccines, and diagnostics. It means that thousands of new patents are awaited, and that will hinder India's ability to produce COVID-19 related medical products. Only through a waiver, this challenge can be addressed. Similarly, scientists note that mRNA is the future of vaccine technology. However, manufacturing mRNA vaccines involves complex processes and procedures. Only a very few Indian manufacturers have access to this technology; however, that too is limited. Once Indian companies have access to mRNA technology, it will help country’s generic medicine industry and boost India’s economy. Therefore, even if the WTO agrees on a waiver for a period shorter than proposed, India should accept it. In addition, mRNA vaccines can be produced in lesser time compared to the traditional vaccines. While traditional vaccines’ production takes four to five months, mRNA needs only six to eight weeks. Access to this technology will be vital for India in expediting the fight against COVID-19 and future pandemics. Finally, a waiver may strengthen India's diplomatic soft power. At present, what hinders India's Vaccine Maitri initiative is the scarcity of vaccines at home. On the other hand, China is increasing its standing in Africa, South America and the Pacific through vaccine diplomacy. The WHO approval of the Chinese vaccines and lack of access to vaccines by most developing countries, opens up huge space for China to do its vaccine diplomacy. Here, India should convince its Quad partners, particularly Australia and Japan, who oppose the waiver that vaccine production in developing countries through TRIPS waiver will enable the grouping to deliver its pledged billion doses of COVID-19 vaccine in the Indo-Pacific region. In short, the proposed waiver, if agreed, will help India in addressing the public health crisis by producing more vaccines and distributing them at home; economically, by boosting its generic pharmaceutical industry, and diplomatically, providing vaccines to the developing and least-developed countries. Therefore, India should use all available means and methods, from trade-offs to pressurising, to make the waiver happen.

#### Yes scale-up for covid.
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Currently many idle suppliers can’t begin vaccine production until they upgrade and repurpose existing manufacturing capacity for new technology. Opponents often argue that this step is the true barrier to rapid scale-up. One high-profile detractor, BIO President and CEO Michelle McMurry-Heath, argues that “handing [needy countries] the blueprint to construct a kitchen that — in optimal conditions — can take a year to build will not help us stop the emergence of dangerous new Covid variants.”

This argument ignores two core truths: In many cases, manufacturing capacity needs only repurposing which can take mere months. And Covid-19, at the current global response and vaccination rates, will be a threat for years.

Both truths suggest that we pass the blueprint and build the kitchen.

Facilitating structures to transfer technology and capacity are already in place. The WHO launched the mRNA technology transfer hub model last month to provide manufacturers in low- and middle-income countries with the financial, training, and logistical support needed to scale up vaccine manufacturing capacity. Scores of manufacturers in these countries have already expressed interest. This initiative, however, requires recipient manufacturers to acquire the IP necessary for mRNA technologies— which is currently missing.

#### Corona escalates security threats that cause extinction – cooperation thesis is wrong.

Recna 21 [Research Center for Nuclear Weapon Abolition; Nagasaki, Japan; “Pandemic Futures and Nuclear Weapon Risks: The Nagasaki 75th Anniversary pandemic-nuclear nexus scenarios final report,” Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament; 5/28/21; <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2021.1890867>] Justin

The Challenge: Multiple Existential Threats

The relationship between pandemics and war is as long as human history. Past pandemics have set the scene for wars by weakening societies, undermining resilience, and exacerbating civil and inter-state conflict. Other disease outbreaks have erupted during wars, in part due to the appalling public health and battlefield conditions resulting from war, in turn sowing the seeds for new conflicts. In the post-Cold War era, pandemics have spread with unprecedented speed due to increased mobility created by globalization, especially between urbanized areas. Although there are positive signs that scientific advances and rapid innovation can help us manage pandemics, it is likely that deadly infectious viruses will be a challenge for years to come.

The COVID-19 is the most demonic pandemic threat in modern history. It has erupted at a juncture of other existential global threats, most importantly, accelerating climate change and resurgent nuclear threat-making. The most important issue, therefore, is how the coronavirus (and future pandemics) will increase or decrease the risks associated with these twin threats, climate change effects, and the next use of nuclear weapons in war.5

Today, the nine nuclear weapons arsenals not only can annihilate hundreds of cities, but also cause nuclear winter and mass starvation of a billion or more people, if not the entire human species. Concurrently, climate change is enveloping the planet with more frequent and intense storms, accelerating sea level rise, and advancing rapid ecological change, expressed in unprecedented forest fires across the world. Already stretched to a breaking point in many countries, the current pandemic may overcome resilience to the point of near or actual collapse of social, economic, and political order.

In this extraordinary moment, it is timely to reflect on the existence and possible uses of weapons of mass destruction under pandemic conditions – most importantly, nuclear weapons, but also chemical and biological weapons. Moments of extreme crisis and vulnerability can prompt aggressive and counterintuitive actions that in turn may destabilize already precariously balanced threat systems, underpinned by conventional and nuclear weapons, as well as the threat of weaponized chemical and biological technologies. Consequently, the risk of the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), especially nuclear weapons, increases at such times, possibly sharply.

The COVID-19 pandemic is clearly driving massive, rapid, and unpredictable changes that will redefine every aspect of the human condition, including WMD – just as the world wars of the first half of the 20th century led to a revolution in international affairs and entirely new ways of organizing societies, economies, and international relations, in part based on nuclear weapons and their threatened use. In a world reshaped by pandemics, nuclear weapons – as well as correlated non-nuclear WMD, nuclear alliances, “deterrence” doctrines, operational and declaratory policies, nuclear extended deterrence, organizational practices, and the **existential risks** posed by retaining these capabilities – are all up for redefinition.

A pandemic has potential to destabilize a nuclear-prone conflict by incapacitating the supreme nuclear commander or commanders who have to issue nuclear strike orders, creating uncertainty as to who is in charge, how to handle nuclear mistakes (such as errors, accidents, technological failures, and entanglement with conventional operations gone awry), and opening a brief opportunity for a first strike at a time when the COVID-infected state may not be able to retaliate efficiently – or at all – due to leadership confusion. In some nuclear-laden conflicts, a state might use a pandemic as a cover for political or military provocations in the belief that the adversary is distracted and partly disabled by the pandemic, increasing the risk of war in a nuclear-prone conflict. At the same time, a pandemic may lead nuclear armed states to increase the isolation and sanctions against a nuclear adversary, making it even harder to stop the spread of the disease, in turn creating a pandemic reservoir and transmission risk back to the nuclear armed state or its allies.

In principle, the common threat of the pandemic might induce nuclear-armed states to reduce the tension in a nuclear-prone conflict and thereby the risk of nuclear war. It may cause nuclear adversaries or their umbrella states to seek to resolve conflicts in a cooperative and collaborative manner by creating habits of communication, engagement, and mutual learning that come into play in the nuclear-military sphere. For example, militaries may cooperate to control pandemic transmission, including by working together against criminal-terrorist non-state actors that are trafficking people or by joining forces to ensure that a new pathogen is not developed as a bioweapon.

To date, however, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the isolation of some nuclear-armed states and provided a textbook case of the failure of states to cooperate to overcome the pandemic. Borders have slammed shut, trade shut down, and budgets blown out, creating enormous pressure to focus on immediate domestic priorities. Foreign policies have become markedly more nationalistic. Dependence on nuclear weapons may increase as states seek to buttress a global re-spatialization6 of all dimensions of human interaction at all levels to manage pandemics. The effect of nuclear threats on leaders may make it less likely – or even impossible – to achieve the kind of concert at a global level needed to respond to and administer an effective vaccine, making it harder and even impossible to revert to pre-pandemic international relations. The result is that some states may proliferate their own nuclear weapons, further reinforcing the spiral of conflicts contained by nuclear threat, with cascading effects on the risk of nuclear war.

### Advocacy

#### Plan Text – Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose

#### 2] Use epistemic modesty for evaluating the framework debate:

#### A] Substantively true since it maximizes the probability of achieving net most moral value—beating a framework acts as mitigation to their impacts but the strength of that mitigation is contingent.

#### B] Clash—disincentives debaters from going all in for framework which means we get the ideal balance between topic ed and phil ed—it’s important to talk about contention-level offense

#### 3] Reject calc indicts and util triggers permissibility arguments:

#### A] Empirically denied—both individuals and policymakers carry out effective cost-benefit analysis which means even if decisions aren’t always perfect it’s still better than not acting at all

### Underview

#### [1] Nonideal theory is epistemically bankrupt:

#### a) triggers skep – we’d constantly be fixing injustices as a precondition to ethical action so we never get to the bottom of what is actually ethical b) every ethical theory can be misused – but that isn’t a problem with ethical principles, that is a problem with us – also means we should reclaim the true function of these ethical concepts in places like debate to challenge the way they are misunderstood

#### [2] Aff gets 1AR theory – otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive and there’s no way to check against this. Aff theory is drop the debater, competing interps, and the highest layer of the round – the 1ARs too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance – you must be punished,

**[3] Pessimism reifies the idea that disability is something that should be “cured” or abandoned and relies on a vision of psychoanalysis that** **abstracts from disabled people’s lived experiences and resistance**
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**My critique of anti-cure politics arises from my personal experiences** described in other parts of this essay. Those experiences **include chronic pain, depression, and abuse** and participation in feminism, anti-racism, queer theory, disability studies, and other critical-political projects. Drawing on my experiences assists me in engaging analytic concepts, and vice versa. The personal and theoretical are thus inseparable from, if not reducible to, each other. Yet **academia**, with its love of the View from Nowhere, typically **treats personal experience with suspicion**. It purportedly cannot meet academic criteria for adequate evidence because it is imagined as too particular, too embodied, and too subjective. Even critical-political fields often view personal experience with skepticism and wariness, a defensive reflex against attempts to discredit them by conflating them with the personal alone. Indeed, appeals to personal experience sometimes shut down critique, especially within a confessional and therapeutic culture that demands performances of authenticity to justify the exercise of power (Mollow and McRuer 8). Although personal experience never speaks for itself and must always be theorized, this discomfort risks cordoning the two off from one another, rather than teasing out their entanglements.

Although this suspicion of personal experience is endemic to most academic fields, **I turn** here **to a particular preference for the abstract and the theoretical at the expense of the material and experiential: the anti-relational strand of queer theory influenced by psychoanalysis** and represented by work like Lee Edelman's No Future and Leo Bersani's "Is the Rectum a Grave?" Unlike the work of Halberstam, Warner, Ahmed, and Muñoz, this strand gives up on the tension between positivity and negativity altogether in favor of the strictly negative (as one might gather from the titles of Edelman's and Bersani's pieces). I read Bersani's piece in graduate school and Edelman's book when it was originally published, but I became reacquainted with them through Anna Mollow's essay "Is Sex Disability? Queer Theory and the Disability Drive" in the anthology Sex and Disability. Reading them now, with experiences like those chronicled in this essay under my belt, their complicity with the View from Nowhere comes sharply into view. Just as the disabled normate haunts Brilliant Imperfection, a desire for the "purity of sexuality as a singular trope of difference," not contaminated by "race, gender, and other particularities," haunts anti-relational work (Muñoz 11).

**Edelman's book critiques reproductive futurism**, a pro-natalist ideology that conflates futurity with procreation, upholds heteronormativity, and abjects queerness in the name of the Child (2). **Following Edelman, Mollow critiques rehabilitative futurism, a pro-cure ideology that conflates futurity with the eradication of disability** and upholds compulsory able-bodied/mindedness in the name of the Child (288). **Mollow draws on** Bersani's and **Edelman's** articulations of the **death drive to theorize** what she calls **the disability drive**. She contends, "to foreground associations between disability and the death drive means theorizing disability in terms of identity disintegration, lack, and suffering… I critique politics of disability that emphasize identity formation and pride, exploring instead the benefits of highlighting those aspects of sex and disability that undercut and perhaps even preclude assertions of humanity" (287). In some ways, then, **Mollow**, Edelman, and Bersani argue for an embrace of negativity not entirely different from what I call for in the above section. However, their work **relies on the ahistorical language of psychoanalysis, a closed symbol system that feigns universality and casts material and personal experience as irrelevant to abstract theorizing.**

I call queer theory's anti-relational strand **"a closed system" because of its explicit rejection of both politics and history.** **Edelman contends that queer theory represents "the 'side' outside all political sides"** (7). **Mollow** nuances such sentiments, but ultimately **agrees** with Edelman that reproductive and rehabilitative futurism structure the "only politics we're permitted to know" (134). **This sweeping claim ignores** feminist, queer, antiracist, and crip **critical-political projects, dismissing them as mere identity politics**, too wrapped up in dominant notions of the human and therefore **not ideologically pure enough** to provide a real alternative to futurism. **What is that "real" alternative** that only queer theory and psychoanalysis can offer**? The implosion**/explosion **of the self** into nothingness. **This** type of self-annihilation **also requires a detachment from history.** Edelman, for instance, distinguishes the rhetorical figure of the Child from "the lived experiences of any historical children" (11). He makes a comparable move with the death drive, arguing that it does not denote literal death, but rather a metaphoric or symbolic death of the sovereign subject via the self-shattering nature of sex.

Similarly, Bersani's famous piece "Is the Rectum a Grave?" redeems penetrative (anal) sex as the space for the destruction of the sovereign subject, revels in its "anti-communal, anti-egalitarian, anti-nurturing, and anti-loving" qualities, and praises the metaphoric "suicidal ecstasy of being a woman" (22; 18). It's important to note that this recuperation only applies to penetrative sex, leaving other forms of sexual intimacy unaccounted for and bereft of any radical potential. Although I understand Bersani's piece as an intervention in homophobic discourses around gay men and the AIDS epidemic, he comes perilously close to reinforcing the vision of sex at the heart of U.S. rape culture. He argues for the appeal of "powerlessness" and "loss of control" during sex, a white masculinist fantasy given that Western culture always already positions femininity and black/brownness in these very terms (23-24).

My own experiences illustrate how a sexual breach of subjecthood can play out differently for members of marginalized groups than they might for those with more privilege. On one level, I get the appeal of the sort of surrender discussed by Bersani. In fact, I once asked my partner to tie me up on my stomach and blindfold me. In the process, she violated me via unwanted anal penetration, an "anti-loving" breach of trust and interdependence on both physical and emotional levels. On Bersani's view, this breach is the whole point of sex, the moment when the self loses autonomy, integrity, and control (as if I ever enjoyed such subjecthood in the first place). If we take this line of thinking to its logical conclusion, we come dangerously close to the familiar heteropatriarchal apology for rape, buttressed by a theoretical apparatus that claims universality: regardless of my explicitly stated wishes, I subconsciously wanted to be violated. Situating the self-annihilating queer as the site of revolution obscures these kinds of problematic echoes, dismissing them from the start as too personal, particular, and material.

**The turn to the self-annihilating queer animates Mollow**'s essay, as well. She postulates queerness and disability as structuring positions that raise important questions about "self-disintegration" (305). Far more attentive to history and lived experiences, her piece grapples directly with challenges to the anti-relational strand, much like Clare reckons with challenges to anti-cure politics in Brilliant Imperfection. Yet, also like Clare's book, her essay is haunted by the disabled normate and the naturally impaired body-mind; instead of celebrating it, she wants to destroy it, but still remains within its terms. **She notes that "disability is fantasized in terms of a loss of self**, of mastery, integrity, and control, a loss that … is indissociable from sexuality" (297; emphasis in original). **She wants us to lean into this fantasy**, which requires that we accept the conflation of the self with mastery, integrity, and control in the first place.

Through the grammatical slippage of the dependent clause, **any other visions of the self** (e.g., based on interdependence, care, or empathy) **vanish**. If we accept the sovereign self, then, yes, the death and disability drives might be resources for exploding or imploding it and the systems of oppression it enables. But such explosions and implosions need not lead to **self-annihilation**, which **seems to me just another instantiation of the disembodied View from Nowhere wherein death represents transformation** into pure soul **and** thus ultimate **freedom from the** located-ness of the **body**. If we're going to explode or implode sovereign subjectivity, then **let's clear space for other notions of the self, rather than glorifying nothingness.**

Moreover, what happens if we take literal death (biological and/or social) seriously? What happens if we take material violence, which can and does end lives, seriously? In that case, it should become clear that reproductive futurism is the domain of only some children. This ideology values children only insofar as they themselves can further reproduce whiteness, heterosexuality, the gender binary, able-bodied/mindedness, and so forth. In Muñoz's words, in a world where queer youths of color too often do not get a chance to grow up, "racialized kids, queer kids, are not the sovereign princes of futurity" (95-96). The fact that the anti-relational strand pretends such questions can or should be set aside speaks to the normative positions it upholds.

**I** therefore **read these** anti-relational **pieces** with interest, but also **with growing anger.** **I am in the process of healing from over a decade's worth of chronic pain, depression, and abuse**. I am not over these things. **I learn to survive with them**, maybe even learn from them and integrate them into my self-perception, even as I refuse to romanticize or celebrate them as keys to enlightenment and transcendence. **I haven't overcome my disabilities in some** Herculean **display of** willpower and **sovereign subjecthood**. I haven't overcome them at all, but I do embrace the value of my own survival as part of my critical-political orientation toward the world.

I respect attempts to identify the excessive, the very thing that cannot be resolved, captured, or made to signify in any coherent way, and to think beyond the human. Yet **the anti-relational strain** reads very differently now that I have emerged from a kind of living death. It **angers me given how hard I fight to believe in my right to survive and exist**, not as a lone self with mastery and control, but as an interdependent self fumbling towards compassion, justice, and care. **I'm not interested in being a figurehead for** the revolution if that revolution depends on my **erasure, absence, and self-sacrifice**. I've come too close to actual suicide to see anything ecstatic about it; **I've existed too long in chronic pain to see anything liberatory about that**, either.

I know that psychoanalysis often takes bodily pain and pleasure as one of its starting points, typically imagined as the acute, extraordinary experience of orgasm. It is not the daily slog of chronic pain that inhibits not only mastery and control, but also care, compassion, and survival. Queer versions of **psychoanalysis** claim to pay attention to sexual pain and pleasure, but then **do their best to** escape and **transcend material embodiment. They focus so narrowly on the symbolic destruction of the sovereign self that they end up treat**ing **it** as if it's detached from the body, **as if it's "just" metaphor**. But **metaphors live in actual suicidal women; they are more than abstracted playthings** for academic bad boys, their closed symbolic systems, and their "white gay male crypto-identity politics" that reproduce the mind/body dualism (Muñoz 95).

**Total negativity is disempowering and devolves into the power relations they criticize – instead, you should embrace a middle ground that accepts ongoing processes of change**

**Bailey 19** – Associate Professor of Communication Arts at Allegheny College. She specializes in rhetorical studies, media studies, and feminist/queer theory.

Courtney W. Bailey, “On the Impossible: Disability Studies, Queer Theory, and the Surviving Crip,” *Disability Studies Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 4, 2019, https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/6580/5463

Although there are similarities between the diversity training and the town hall, dismissing them both as merely confessional spaces for airing personal grievances misses the point entirely. Stories from the town hall circulated in the halls of power and informed major institutional decisions, and the diversity training prompted the college to restructure its first-year orientation entirely. **None of these solutions was perfect**, of course, **but the desire for perfection itself troubles me**. In Ahmed's analysis of diversity work within U.K. higher education, she concludes that "**when we have to think strategically, we** have to accept our complicity; we **forgo any illusions of purity**; we give up on the safety of exteriority" (94). As my own analysis suggests, **such illusions haunt** both **the anti-cure and anti-relational strands** insofar as they wish to escape into the exteriority and purity of the View from Nowhere.

But **strategic alternatives do exist**. Concepts like the feminist killjoy, dignity in shame, the queer art of failure, and cruising utopia **hold onto the paradox between positivity and negativity**, refusing to abandon either one and getting their juice from this very tension. **These** concepts **illustrate** what Judith Butler calls "working the weakness in the norm" and "**repetition with a difference," creative riffs on the dominant, rather than complete breaks with it** (Bodies 237; "Imitation" 317). In this spirit, **I suggest reworking the** reviled/celebrated figure of the **super-crip into the figure of the surviving crip**. This conclusion takes the first tentative but hopeful steps towards fleshing out this concept more fully.

I invoke the term "crip" to signal both a reclamation of a slur and a critical-political orientation toward compulsory able-bodied/mindedness. I invoke the term "surviving" in place of "super" to foreground the paradox between positivity and negativity discussed above. If super-crip stories emphasize overcoming disability through either Western medicine and/or religion, then surviving crip stories emphasize persistence, tenacity, and obstinance in the face of structural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal violence and trauma. **Whereas the former fixates on cure** as the path to overcoming disability, **the latter highlights** the process of pursuit rather than the product of cure. Indeed, the term "surviving" indicates **ongoing, elliptical processes that loop back** on (**but do not simply repeat) themselves**, in contrast to the linear, once-and-for-all triumph implied by the term "survivor." 6 The surviving crip does not characterize death as a failure of cure or as proof of the futility of cure, but as part of the process of surviving. **This shift entails neither a rejection nor head-long embrace of death, but a reckoning with our mortality, weakness, and fragility** and our strength, resilience, and adaptability.

#### [4] Evolution proves our theory true

**Johnson and Thayer 16** – Dominic D. P. Johnson, D.Phil., Ph.D.\* and Bradley A. Thayer, Ph.D., “The evolution of offensive realism Survival under anarchy from the Pleistocene to the present,” https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/56B778004187F70B8E59609BE7FEE7A4/S073093841600006Xa.pdf/div-class-title-the-evolution-of-offensive-realism-div.pdf

Few principles unite the discipline of international relations, but one exception is anarchy—the absence of government in international politics. Anarchy is, ironically, the ‘‘ordering’’ principle of the global state system and the starting point for most major theories of international politics, such as neoliberalism and neorealism.42,43,44,45 Other theoretical approaches, such as constructivism, also acknowledge the impact of anarchy, even if only to consider why anarchy occurs and how it can be circumvented.46,47 Indeed, the anarchy concept is so profound that it defines and divides the discipline of political science into international politics (politics under conditions of anarchy) and domestic politics (politics under conditions of hierarchy, or government). Given the prominence of the concept in present-day international relations theory, it is striking that anarchy only took hold as a central feature of scholarship in recent decades, since the publication of Kenneth Waltz’s Theory of International Politics in 1979. In fact, however, **anarchy has been a constant feature of the entire multimillion year history of the human lineage (and indeed the 3.5 billion–year history of the evolution of all life on Earth before that). It is not just that we lack a global Leviathan today; humans never had such a luxury. The fact that human evolution occurred under conditions of anarchy, that we evolved as hunter-gatherers in an ecological setting of predation, resource competition, and intergroup conflict, and that humans have been subject to natural selection** for millions of years **has profound consequences for understanding human behavior**, not least how humans perceive and act toward others. Scholars often argue over whether historically humans experienced a Hobbesian ‘‘state of nature,’’ but—whatever the outcome of that debate—it is certainly a much closer approximation to the prehistoric environment in which human brains and behavior evolved. **This legacy heavily influences our decision-making and behavior today, even—perhaps especially—in the anarchy of international politics**. We argue that **evolution under conditions of anarchy has predisposed human nature toward the behaviors predicted by offensive realism: Humans**, particularly men, **are strongly self-interested, often fear other groups, and seek more resources, more power, and more influence** (as we explain in full later). **These strategies** are not unique to humans and, in fact, **characterize a much broader trend in behavior among mammals as a whole—especially primates**—as well as many other major vertebrate groups, including birds, fish, and reptiles. **This recurrence of behavioral patterns** across different taxonomic groups **suggests that the behaviors characterized by offensive realism have broad and deep evolutionary roots**. This perspective does not deny the importance of institutions, norms, and governance in international politics. On the contrary, it provides or adds to the reasons why we demand and need them, and indeed why they are so hard to establish and maintain. Until recently, **international relations theorists rarely used insights from the life sciences to inform their understanding of human behavior**. However, **rapid advances in the life sciences offer increasing theoretical and empirical challenges to scholars in** the social sciences in general and **international relations** in particular, who are therefore under increasing pressure to address and integrate this knowledge rather than to suppress or ignore it. Whatever one’s personal views on evolution, **the time has come to explore the implications of evolutionary theory for mainstream theories of international relations**. **The most obvious challenge that evolutionary theory presents to international relations concerns our understanding of human nature**. Theories purporting to explain human behavior make explicit or implicit assumptions about preferences and motivations, and mainstream theories in international politics are no exception. Many **criticisms of international relations theories focus on these unsubstantiated or contested assumptions about underlying human nature. The parsimony of general theories depends on how well they explain phenomena across space and time**; in other words, the more closely they coincide with empirical observations across cultures and throughout history. The most enduring theories of international relations, therefore, will be ones that are able to incorporate (or at least do not run against the grain of) evolutionary theory. Although Thomas Hobbes claimed to have deduced Leviathan scientifically from ‘‘motion’’ and the physical senses, he was writing two hundred years before Darwin and so had no understanding of evolution. International relations scholars have tended to claim to deduce their own theories from Hobbes, or subsequent philosophers who followed him, and we suggest it is time to revisit the idea of foundational scientific principles. **Starting with biology, or with human evolutionary history, has never been typical in international relations scholarship**, but this approach is now less exotic than it once seemed as innovators in a range of social sciences, including economics, psychology, sociology, and political science, pursue this line of inquiry. **International relations stands to gain from** similar **interdisciplinary insights**. At the dawn of the 21st century, an era that will be dominated by science at least as much as philosophy, **we have the opportunity to move away from untested assumptions about human nature. Instead, we can make more concrete predictions about how humans tend to think and act in different conditions, based on new scientific knowledge about human cognition** and behavior, **and in particular a greater understanding of the social and ecological context in which human brains and behaviors evolved**. But what was that context?

#### [5] Methodological pluralism is necessary to any sustainable critique, which justifies permutations to any K – we impact turn your notion of “severance” or “exclusivity”.

**Bleiker 14** – (6/17, Roland, Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland, “International Theory Between Reification and Self-Reflective Critique,” International Studies Review, Volume 16, Issue 2, pages 325–327)

Methodological pluralism lies at the heart of Levine's sustainable critique. He borrows from what Adorno calls a “constellation”: an attempt to juxtapose, rather than integrate, different perspectives. It is in this spirit that Levine advocates multiple methods to understand the same event or phenomena. He writes of the need to validate “multiple and mutually incompatible ways of seeing” (p. 63, see also pp. 101–102). In this model, a scholar oscillates back and forth between different methods and paradigms, trying to understand the event in question from multiple perspectives. No single method can ever adequately represent the event or should gain the upper hand. But each should, in a way, recognize and capture details or perspectives that the others cannot (p. 102). In practical terms, this means combining a range of methods even when—or, rather, precisely when—they are deemed incompatible. They can range from poststructual deconstruction to the tools pioneered and championed by positivist social sciences. The benefit of such a methodological polyphony is not just the opportunity to bring out nuances and new perspectives. Once the false hope of a smooth synthesis has been abandoned, the very incompatibility of the respective perspectives can then be used to identify the reifying tendencies in each of them. For Levine, this is how reification may be “checked at the source” and this is how a “critically reflexive moment might thus be rendered sustainable” (p. 103). It is in this sense that Levine's approach is not really post-foundational but, rather, an attempt to “balance foundationalisms against one another” (p. 14). There are strong parallels here with arguments advanced by assemblage thinking and complexity theory—links that could have been explored in more detail.

### Advantage 2: Credibility

#### The plan is critical to boosting WTO legitimacy.

Navnit 21 [Brajendra; Ambassador and Permanent Representative of India to WTO; “Science has delivered, will the WTO deliver?” Helsinki Times; 1/18/21; <https://www.helsinkitimes.fi/columns/columns/viewpoint/18561-science-has-delivered-will-the-wto-deliver.html>] Justin

TRIPS waiver proposal from India, South Africa and other members

A proposal by India, South Africa and eight other countries calls on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) to exempt member countries from enforcing some patents, and other Intellectual Property (IP) rights under the organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, known as TRIPS, for a limited period of time.

It is to ensure that IPRs do not restrict the rapid scaling- up of manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines and treatments. While a few members have raised concerns about the proposal, a large proportion of the WTO membership supports the proposal. It has also received the backing of various international organizations, multilateral agencies and global civil society.

Unprecedented times call for unorthodox measures. We saw this in the efficacy of strict lockdowns for a limited period, as a policy intervention, in curtailing the spread of the pandemic.International Monetary Fund (IMF) in its October 2020 edition of World Economic Outlook states “…However, the risk of worse growth outcomes than projected remains sizable. If the virus resurges, progress on treatments and vaccines is slower than anticipated, or countries’ access to them remains unequal, economic activity could be lower than expected, with renewed social distancing and tighter lockdowns”. The situation appears to be grimmer than predicted, we have already lost 7% of economic output from the baseline scenario projected in 2019. It translates to a loss of more than USD 6 trillion of global GDP. Even a 1% improvement in global GDP from the baseline scenario will add more than USD 800 billion in global output, offsetting the loss certainly of a much lower order to a sector of economy on account of the Waiver.

"While making the vaccines available was a test of science, making them accessible and affordable is going to be a test of humanity"

Merely a signal to ensure timely and affordable access to vaccines and treatments will work as a big confidence booster for demand revival in the economy. With the emergence of successful vaccines, there appears to be some hope on the horizon. But how will these be made accessible and affordable to global population? The fundamental question is whether there will be enough of Covid-19 vaccines to go around. As things stand, even the most optimistic scenarios today cannot assure access to Covid-19 vaccines and therapeutics for the majority of the population, in rich as well as poor countries, by the end of 2021. All the members of the WTO have agreed on one account that there is an urgent need to scale-up the manufacturing capacity for vaccines and therapeutics to meet the massive global needs. The TRIPS Waiver Proposal seeks to fulfil this need by ensuring that IP barriers do not come in the way of such scaling up of manufacturing capacity.

Why existing flexibilities under the TRIPS Agreement are not enough

The existing flexibilities under the TRIPS Agreement are not adequate as these were not designed keeping pandemics in mind. Compulsory licenses are issued on a country by country, case by case and product by product basis, where every jurisdiction with an IP regime would have to issue separate compulsory licenses, practically making collaboration among countries extremely onerous. While we encourage the use of TRIPS flexibilities, the same are time-consuming and cumbersome to implement. Hence, only their use cannot ensure the timely access of affordable vaccines and treatments. Similarly, we have not seen a very encouraging progress on WHO’s Covid19-Technology Access Pool or the C-TAP initiative, which encourages voluntary contribution of IP, technology and data to support the global sharing and scale-up of the manufacturing of COVID- 19 medical products. Voluntary Licenses, even where they exist, are shrouded in secrecy. Their terms and conditions are not transparent. Their scope is limited to specific amounts or for a limited subset of countries, thereby encouraging nationalism rather than true international collaboration.

Why is there a need to go beyond existing global cooperation initiatives?

Global cooperation initiatives such as the COVAX Mechanism and the ACT-Accelerator are inadequate to meet the massive global needs of 7.8 billion people. The ACT-A initiative aims to procure 2 billion doses of vaccines by the end of next year and distribute them fairly around the world. With a two-dose regime, however, this will only cover 1 billion people. That means that even if ACT-A is fully financed and successful, which is not the case presently, there would not be enough vaccines for the majority of the global population.

Past experience

During the initial few months of the current pandemic, we have seen that shelves were emptied by those who had access to masks, PPEs, sanitizers, gloves and other essential Covid-19 items even without their immediate need. The same should not happen to vaccines. Eventually, the world was able to ramp up manufacturing of Covid-19 essentials as there were no IP barriers hindering that. At present, we need the same pooling of IP rights and know-how for scaling up the manufacturing of vaccines and treatments, which unfortunately has not been forthcoming, necessitating the need for the Waiver.

It is the pandemic – an extraordinary, once in a lifetime event – that has mobilized the collaboration of multiple stakeholders. It is knowledge and skills held by scientists, researchers, public health experts and universities that have enabled the cross-country collaborations and enormous public funding that has facilitated the development of vaccines in record time – and not alone IP!

Way forward

The TRIPS waiver proposal is a targeted and proportionate response to the exceptional public health emergency that the world faces today. Such a Waiver is well-within the provisions of Article IX of the Marrakesh Agreement which established the WTO. It can help in ensuring that human lives are not lost for want of a timely and affordable access to vaccines. The adoption of the Waiver will also re-establish WTO’s credibility and show that multilateral trading system continues to be relevant and can deliver in times of a crisis. Now is the time for WTO members to act and adopt the Waiver to save lives and help in getting the economy back on the revival path quickly.

While making the vaccines available was a test of science, making them accessible and affordable is going to be a test of humanity. History should remember us for the “AAA rating” i.e. for Availability, Accessibility and Affordability of Covid19 vaccines and treatments and not for a single “A rating” for Availability only. Our future generations deserve nothing less.

#### WTO cred solves wars that go nuclear.

Hamann 09 [Georgia; 2009; J.D. Candidate, Vanderbilt University Law School; “Replacing Slingshots with Swords: Implications of the Antigua-Gambling 22.6 Panel Report for Developing Countries and the World Trading System,” VANDERBILT JOURNAL OF TRANSNATIONAL LAW, http://www.jogoremoto.pt/docs/extra/duqJ53.pdf] Justin

Both Antigua and the U.S. claimed the resolution of the arbitration as a victory.99 In reality, the decision reached a midpoint between the respective countries’ positions, establishing a victory for the evolution of the international trading system itself. 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 Unites States 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, and issuing judgments are keenly aware of the responsibility they have to uphold the organization’s credibility.108