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#### Interpretation – topical affs must defend a reduction of intellectual property protections for *medicines*.

#### Violation: they reduce IP protections on *vaccines* which is categorically distinct

#### Vaccines are different from medicines in the context of intellectual property

Garrison 04 [Christopher Garrison, Consultant Legal Advisor to WHO. "Intellectual Property Rights and Vaccines in Developing countries," 04-13-2004, accessed 9-2-2021, https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/events/en/Background\_paper.pdf?ua=1] HWIC

In the last few years, there has been a substantial debate about how intellectual property impacts medicines and in particular how the TRIPS Agreement impacts access to medicines in the developing world. Vaccines are different from medicines in a number of important respects however (at least from the small molecule ‘pill’ medicines if not the newer ‘biotech’ medicines). The issues raised in the access to medicines debate may therefore apply to a greater or lesser extent for vaccines, depending on these differences. This section examines a few of the different forms of intellectual property rights that are relevant in the context of vaccines and outlines the impact of some of the differences between vaccines and medicines.

#### Prefer for limits – allowing non medicines explodes limits to include affs that defend reducing protections for surgeries, therapy, injury prevention, cosmetic procedures, etc. – makes neg prep impossible because the case neg to the Botox and Laser Eye Surgery affs would have no overlap – privileges the aff by stretching pre-tournament neg prep too thin and precluding nuanced rigorous testing of aff

#### Use c/I for norm setting – t is a yes/no question, not a normal theory argument. Being “reasonably topical” doesn’t make sense.

#### No rvis – you have a burden to be topical. Anything else incentivizes chilling debate.
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#### Interpretation—topical affs may not specify medicines

#### Bare plurals imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### Violation: they specified covid vaccines

#### Vote neg:

**1] Precision – any deviation justifies a jettisoning of the resolution which destroys negative predictability and prep**

**2) c/a Limits impact - there are an infinite number of affs are possible under their interp which is unpredictable and makes it impossible to be neg.**

3**] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage – most authors advocate for a change in WTO policy broadly and no reason why aff spec is key**
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#### **Climate innovation is high and solving warming, but continued investment is key -- reducing IP collapses collaboration and investments.**

Brand 5-26, [Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/]

“If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis, can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth?” the discussions around waiving intellectual property (IP) rights set forth in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are currently (and somewhat amorphously) limited to COVID-19 related drug and medical products, it is probably shortsighted to ignore the implications for other technologies critical to sustaining our environment and advancing a more healthful world. In fact, if we want to ensure continued investment in these technologies, we should be very concerned about the message conveyed by the international political tide: if you overcome a challenging scientific problem and your solution has the potential to save lives, be prepared to be subjected to intense political pressure and to potentially hand over your technology without compensation and regardless of the consequences. The biotech industry is making remarkable advances towards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course we dispute this notion), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) Katherine Tai was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. International Pressure May Be Influencing Domestic IP Policy The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensation and no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary international collaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone. If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to invest at the current and required levels. Next on the Chopping Block It is quite reasonable to be worried about the broad implications of a TRIPS IP waiver precedent. International campaigns to weaken IP rights seem to be taking hold in U.S. domestic policy. The TRIPS IP waiver discussions will not conclude in the near term and will not yield more shots in people’s arms. This is not even truly disputed, as our own administration acknowledges that the goal here is technology transfer abroad. Given the signaling that our Administration believes waiving IP rights is an appropriate measure to end global crises, it is proper to worry that facets of the biotech sector addressing climate change may be next on the chopping block.

#### Only a strong private sector can solve climate change

Gulker 19 [Max Gulker, 2-11-2019, "How a Strong Private Sector Will Address Climate Change," AIER, https://www.aier.org/article/how-a-strong-private-sector-will-address-climate-change/]

This is where a society with a free and well-developed private sector ought to shine. The engine of entrepreneurship combined with people responding to facts on the ground with which they alone are intimately aware will yield countless inventions, new construction, and other initiatives great and small. “The private sector” as a whole probably won’t get its due from pundits when the world is adapting to climate change since by its very nature its responses will be decentralized and often hidden in plain sight. We can speculate all we want on entrepreneurial solutions to problems that haven’t yet materialized–but the private sector can shine exactly where our speculation, and that of the public sector, inevitably falls short. Forbes contributor Willy Foote writes, “We need a comprehensive global effort to both mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change. But the latter is not a secondary challenge that can be put on hold until the world solves the former. It’s an immediate need.” The private sector is where much of this action will happen: “Social entrepreneurs, investors, and other private actors—unlike most governments—have inherent flexibility. They can experiment, identify the best solutions, and share that knowledge with others.” The environmental left is becoming less shy about wanting to greatly reduce the size and influence of the private sector. Climate change shows why we need a strong private sector–truly unleashing global knowledge and ingenuity to address changes around the world.

#### Warming causes extinction

Klein 14[(Naomi Klein, award-winning journalist, syndicated columnist, former Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics, member of the board of directors of 350.org), *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*, pp. 12-14]

In a 2012 report, the World Bank laid out the gamble implied by that target. “As global warming approaches and exceeds 2-degrees Celsius, there is a risk of triggering nonlinear tipping elements. Examples include the disintegration of the West Antarctic ice sheet leading to more rapid sea-level rise, or large-scale Amazon dieback drastically affecting ecosystems, rivers, agriculture, energy production, and livelihoods. This would further add to 21st-century global warming and impact entire continents.” In other words, once we allow temperatures to climb past a certain point, where the mercury stops is not in our control.¶ But the bigger problem—and the reason Copenhagen caused such great despair—is that because governments did not agree to binding targets, they are free to pretty much ignore their commitments. Which is precisely what is happening. Indeed, emissions are rising so rapidly that unless something radical changes within our economic structure, 2 degrees now looks like a utopian dream. And it’s not just environmentalists who are raising the alarm. The World Bank also warned when it released its report that “we’re on track to a 4-C warmer world [by century’s end] marked by extreme heat waves, declining global food stocks, loss of ecosystems and biodiversity, and life-threatening sea level rise.” And the report cautioned that, “there is also no certainty that adaptation to a 4-C world is possible.” Kevin Anderson, former director (now deputy director) of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change, which has quickly established itself as one of the U.K’s premier climate research institutions, is even blunter; he says 4 degrees Celsius warming—7.2 degrees Fahrenheit—is “incompatible with an organized, equitable, and civilized global community.”¶ We don’t know exactly what a 4 degree Celsius world would look like, but even the best-case scenario is likely to be calamitous. Four degrees of warming could raise global sea levels by 1 or possibly even 2 meters by 2100 (and would lock in at least a few additional meters over future centuries). This would drown some island nations such as the Maldives and Tuvalu, and inundate many coastal areas from Ecuador and Brazil to the Netherlands to much of California and the northeastern United States as well as huge swaths of South and Southeast Asia. Major cities likely in jeopardy include Boston, New York, greater Los Angeles, Vancouver, London, Mumbai, Hong Kong, and Shanghai.¶ Meanwhile, brutal heat waves that can kill tens of thousands of people, even in wealthy countries, would become entirely unremarkable summer events on every continent but Antarctica. The heat would also cause staple crops to suffer dramatic yield losses across the globe (it is possible that Indian wheat and U.S. could plummet by as much as 60 percent), this at a time when demand will be surging due to population growth and a growing demand for meat. And since crops will be facing not just heat stress but also extreme events such as wide-ranging droughts, flooding, or pest outbreaks, the losses could easily turn out to be more severe than the models have predicted. When you add ruinous hurricanes, raging wildfires, fisheries collapses, widespread disruptions to water supplies, extinctions, and globe-trotting diseases to the mix, it indeed becomes difficult to imagine that a peaceful, ordered society could be sustained (that is, where such a thing exists in the first place).¶ And keep in mind that these are the optimistic scenarios in which warming is more or less stabilized at 4 degrees Celsius and does not trigger tipping points beyond which runaway warming would occur. Based on the latest modeling, it is becoming safer to assume that 4 degrees could bring about a number of extremely dangerous feedback loops—an Arctic that is regularly ice-free in September, for instance, or, according to one recent study, global vegetation that is too saturated to act as a reliable “sink”, leading to more carbon being emitted rather than stored. Once this happens, any hope of predicting impacts pretty much goes out the window. And this process may be starting sooner than anyone predicted. In May 2014, NASA and the University of California, Irvine scientists revealed that glacier melt in a section of West Antarctica roughly the size of France now “appears unstoppable.” This likely spells down for the entire West Antarctic ice sheet, which according to lead study author Eric Rignot “comes with a sea level rise between three and five metres. Such an event will displace millions of people worldwide.” The disintegration, however, could unfold over centuries and there is still time for emission reductions to slow down the process and prevent the worst. ¶ Much more frightening than any of this is the fact that plenty of mainstream analysts think that on our current emissions trajectory, we are headed for even more than 4 degrees of warming. In 2011, the usually staid International Energy Agency (IEA) issued a report predicting that we are actually on track for 6 degrees Celsius—10.8 degrees Fahrenheit—of warming. And as the IEA’s chief economist put it: “Everybody, even the school children, knows that this will have catastrophic implications for all of us.” (The evidence indicates that 6 degrees of warming is likely to set in motion several major tipping points—not only slower ones such as the aforementioned breakdown of the West Antarctic ice sheet, but possibly more abrupt ones, like massive releases of methane from Arctic permafrost.) The accounting giant PricewaterhouseCoopers as also published a report warning businesses that we are headed for “4-C , or even 6-C” of warming.¶ These various projections are the equivalent of every alarm in your house going off simultaneously. And then every alarm on your street going off as well, one by one by one. They mean, quite simply, that climate change has become an existential crisis for the human species. The only historical precedent for a crisis of this depth and scale was the Cold War fear that we were headed toward nuclear holocaust, which would have made much of the planet uninhabitable. But that was (and remains) a threat; a slim possibility, should geopolitics spiral out of control. The vast majority of nuclear scientists never told us that we were almost certainly going to put our civilization in peril if we kept going about our daily lives as usual, doing exactly what we were already going, which is what climate scientists have been telling us for years. ¶ As the Ohio State University climatologist Lonnie G. Thompson, a world-renowned specialist on glacier melt, explained in 2010, “Climatologists, like other scientists, tend to be a stolid group. We are not given to theatrical rantings about falling skies. Most of us are far more comfortable in our laboratories or gathering data in the field than we are giving interviews to journalists or speaking before Congressional committees. When then are climatologists speaking out about the dangers of global warming? The answer is that virtually all of us are now convinced that global warming poses a clear and present danger to civilization.”

#### None of their innovation preempts apply – this isnt your generic innovation DA but rather climate patents which is distinct
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#### Text: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to appoint an international panel of scientists including National Academies and corresponding organizations to decide if they should reduce intellectual property protections for medicines for COVID-19 by implementing a one and done approach to patent protections and manage similar conflicts of interest between intellectual property. Member states ought to abide by the ruling produced by the panel.

#### International panel of science diplomats can rule over IP---that’s key to science diplomacy.

**Hajjar and Greenbaum 18** [David; Dean Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor, and Professor of Biochemistry and Pathology at Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State, and a recent Senior Fellow in Science Policy at the Brookings Institute; Steven; Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Hunter College of the City University of New York and a Fellow of the American Physical Society. He was a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State; “Leveraging Diplomacy for Managing Scientific Challenges,” American Diplomacy; September 18;<https://americandiplomacy.web.unc.edu/2018/09/leveraging-diplomacy-for-managing-scientific-challenges-an-opportunity-to-navigate-the-future-of-science/>] Justin

At the global level, science diplomacy is defined as cooperation among countries in order to solve complex problems through scientific research and education (1). For example, science diplomacy plays an important role in resolving global issues related to the ecosystem (such as clean water, food safety, energy conservation, and preservation of the environment). It also addresses problems related to the healthcare industry. For example, scientists have served at the international level to forge the Middle Eastern Cancer Consortium a decade ago to facilitate better healthcare and improve cancer research in the region. Whether one considers science for diplomacy or diplomacy for science, international science collaborations benefit from allowing science diplomats (broadly defined as science envoys, science attaches, embassy fellows) to help establish positive international relationships between the U.S., Europe, Latin America, Africa or Asia, particularly when proprietary disputes arise (2, 3). These various types of science diplomats already exist; some, like embassy fellows and science envoys, have one-year appointments so their role may be limited, while attaches usually have two or three year appointments that may allow them to be more successful in long, protracted negotiations. In any event, we believe that scientists can play more of a role in advancing international scientific cooperation. A key point addressed here is how to balance security concerns against the need for free exchange of information needed for innovation and growth. Both the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health are already engaged in supporting American science and strengthening collaborations abroad. Such efforts take advantage of international expertise, facilities, and equipment. Here, we provide a rationale for the use of diplomacy to address scientific challenges. This approach allows some scientists working as diplomats to help manage complex and potentially conflicting situations that arise between scientific communities and their governments. Such issues include managing disputes such as licensing agreements for intellectual property (IP) and providing protection of IP. International collaborations can not only support but also accelerate the advancement of science. However, collaborations may carry risk if IP is misappropriated for other purposes. International collaborations should have a basis in strategy and specific goals (for example, drug discovery) in order to justify the use of government and/or corporate funds. About a decade ago, a group of academics from the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom assembled the “Manchester Manifesto,” subtitled “Who Owns Science” (6). This document addressed the lack of alignment between commercial interests, intellectual rights, and credit to the researcher. In our (and commonly held) view, the groups representing these disparate values could benefit from diplomatic mediation. More recently, it has become increasing apparent that managing China as a science and technology superpower represents another challenge for the U.S. Resolution of issues such as ownership of IP, rights to reagents, or use of skilled laboratory personnel from international collaborations may require the efforts of science diplomats. There are few international offices or “guardians” to protect junior and senior scientists in corporate or academic sectors from misuse of reagents or piracy. China’s failure to respect IP rights, and the resulting piracy, has drawn much attention. The media have also focused on the failure of watchdog government agencies to detect and manage these unwanted activities. Industrial espionage compromises U.S. interests. Moreover, Chinese and Russian hackers have cyberattacked U.S. technology companies, financial institutions, media groups, and defense contractors. In 2018, industrial spying was even reported in a major medical school in New York City where scientists were alleged to have illegally shared research findings with Chinese companies. The U.S. has a long history of hiring research personnel from other countries to staff its laboratories and industrial R&D centers. These scientists and engineers have made critical contributions to our nation’s well-being and security. These young Chinese and South Asian graduates of U.S. programs a generation ago now staff our research enterprise. However, recent trends in U.S. graduate school applications in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) reflect a downturn in foreign applicants, particularly from China. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the number of American-born students seeking STEM degrees is not sufficient to satisfy future demands of our high-tech workforce. While our own educational reforms must be augmented, we cannot ignore the need to continue to recruit overseas talent. We believe that foreign scientists can continue to make critical discoveries in the U. S. provided that their talent is nurtured, developed, and harnessed for the common good. At the same time, American companies cannot hire foreign scientists if they take the ideas they generate in U.S. laboratories back to their home countries without proper credit or permission. If the advancement of science is to succeed, greater diplomatic cooperation is needed to solve and manage proprietary issues for the benefit of all (5, 6). So, how does one strike the proper balance between security and growth? Science is a universal social enterprise; international conferences lead to friendships and productive collaborations between nations. Given that the U.S. and Chinese governments recognize the need for international communication and collaboration then surely there should be a mechanism for adjudicating anticipated conflicts. One approach would be for government, industrial, and academic stakeholders to form an international panel of scientists and engineers to manage any conflicts of interest between the need to protect proprietary information crucial to a company’s competitive edge, and the need for students and young faculty members to publish their findings. Smaller scale efforts along these lines have recently given rise to unique global partnerships, such as fellowship support by major pharmaceutical companies, which aim to address these conflicts to the benefit of both parties. An added feature of such arrangements is that they often provide corporate financing for research (9). Can this corporate-academic partnership model be adapted to multinational joint R&D efforts while protecting IP? This question falls squarely within the purview of international science diplomacy, whereby science diplomats can establish rules of conduct governing joint global technology development with proper IP protection. Despite the highly publicized and legitimate piracy allegations against China, at least some data indicates that the Chinese legal system is responding positively to worldwide pressure to honor foreign IP. A 2016 study by Love, Helmers, and Eberhardt, for example, found that between 2006 and 2011, foreign companies brought over 10 percent of patent infringement cases in China, and won over 70 percent of those cases (10). Today, “win rates” average around 80 percent, and “injunction rates,” around 98 percent (10). As Chinese scientists and engineers increasingly enter the top tier of the innovation space, their growing awareness of their own need for IP protection could be a powerful motivating force for the protection of all IP. As stated earlier, science diplomats could catalyze this progress even further by direct negotiations with those parties involved in the conflicts. An obvious flaw in this optimistic outlook is that scientists in the U.S. wield more influence with their government than scientists in China wield with theirs. And to the extent that the Chinese government could be encouraging IP theft, this must be addressed first by those international companies/firms who want to do business with the Chinese. Chinese investments, as well as tech incubators and targeted acquisitions, can enable access to U.S. technologies for commercial development. Although this conveys a level of risk to the developers, it may provide valuable opportunities for U.S. companies as well. In many respects, the extensive engagement and collaboration in innovation between the U.S. and China, often characterized by open exchanges of ideas, talent, and technologies, can be mutually beneficial in enriching and accelerating innovation in both countries. In summary, we believe that science diplomats could help address the increasingly complex issues that arise between accelerating scientific and engineering advances, and the need to protect national security and corporate IP. We also propose that this might be accomplished by asking the National Academies to recommend academic, corporate, and government scientific leaders to serve on an international scientific advisory board, and for the corresponding organizations in other countries to do the same. Access to the free flow of information promotes new knowledge and innovation. A return to a more restrictive intellectual environment is not only harmful to progress, but also nearly impossible to manage in the current internet age. A good place to start would be to engage the newly appointed head of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (the Science Advisor to the President of the United States), and working groups within established organizations. These organizations include the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) or the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, and corresponding international organizations. What incentive is there for a busy and successful scientist to serve in such capacity? It is the same altruism that motivates us to accept assignments as journal editors, manuscript reviewers, or funding agency panelists for the advancement of science toward the greater good.

#### Solves every existential threat.

**Haynes 18**—research associate in the Neurobiology Department at Harvard Medical School (Trevor, “Science Diplomacy: Collaboration in a rapidly changing world,”<http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/science-diplomacy-collaboration-rapidly-changing-world/>, dml) // Re-Cut Justin

Today’s world is extremely interconnected. Most of us take this fact for granted, but its implications cannot be overstated. The rate at which information, resources, and people are able to move from one part of the world to another continues to accelerate at an alarming rate. Undoubtedly, this development has done society immense good. In the last century, global life expectancy has doubled, the percentage of people living in extreme poverty has dropped by about 60%, and world literacy rates have increased by a similar margin. But while these statistics paint a promising picture of human civilization, human progress rests on a fragile foundation of international cooperation; the challenges presented by an interconnected world are immense. War, natural disasters, and economic collapse now exert their effects globally, creating economic and ecological disasters and mass human migrations on an unprecedented scale. And with the US pulling out of major multilateral agreements on trade, climate change mitigation, and denuclearization, you might wonder if our ability to collaborate across borders productively is really up to the task. Global challenges require global solutions, and global solutions require collaboration between countries both big and small, rich and poor, authoritative and democratic. There are few human enterprises capable of providing continuity across these differences, and as technological solutions are becoming available to some of our most pressing issues, two in particular will be necessary to getting the job done: science and diplomacy. While science has long been utilized as a means to reach political ends—think of British explorer James Cook’s mapping of unexplored continents or the United States’ Manhattan Project—a more formal integration of scientists into the diplomatic process is being undertaken. This effort, which has led to scientists and academics playing a direct role in foreign policy development and international relations, has given birth of a new branch of diplomacy: science diplomacy. What is science diplomacy? As both the term and concept of science diplomacy have only recently gained traction in scientific and diplomatic circles, it’s been given a variety of definitions. But common to them all is the focus on applying scientific expertise to an international effort. The focus of these efforts is to solve international problems collaboratively while balancing economic prosperity, environmental protection, and societal wellbeing. The challenge of reaching this balance in the face of a booming global population cannot be understated, but this new branch of diplomacy is already at work and is producing results. International agreements such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Iran Nuclear Deal are two famous examples, and science diplomacy is also establishing international collaboration in many other important arenas. While these lesser known efforts may not dominate the headlines, they are quietly tackling the global issues of today and preparing us for those of tomorrow. Natural disasters don’t respect national boundaries (and neither does the aftermath) In 2013, the number of refugees displaced by natural disasters—hurricanes, droughts, earthquakes—outnumbered those displaced by war. Current projections estimate as many as 1 billion people may be displaced by natural disasters by the year 2050. That would mean 1 in 9 people on the planet displaced and looking for a home. Compare this to the estimated 12 million refugees displaced by the war in Syria, and a frightening picture begins to form. As natural disasters continue to increase in both their frequency and intensity, solutions for mitigating the risk of total catastrophe will be underpinned by science, technology, and the ability of the international community to collaborate. Many organizations are starting to tackle these problems through the use of science diplomacy. The center for Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) is composed of ten national committees—a network of government sponsored research institutions across the world in countries ranging the political and economic scale. These working groups have committed to improving disaster-risk-reduction science and technology while providing guidance to policy makers charged with implementing disaster prevention and mitigation strategies. IRDR is governed by a committee comprising experienced scientists and natural disaster experts. Its members come from all over the world—the US, China, Uganda, Norway, Mexico, Venezuela, and more. The diversity of this organization starts at the top and is crucial to developing comprehensive risk-reduction strategies. Data and insights from countries with varying areas of expertise are being shared and built upon, facilitating more accurate natural disaster forecasting and better strategies for mitigating their destructive power. And by including representatives from countries of varying political and economic power in its leadership, IRDR ensures that its work will consider the needs of the global community at large, rather than just nations with considerable wealth and political standing. The results of this type of international collaboration speak for themselves. Although humanity is grappling with more natural disasters than ever before, deaths related to these incidents continue to trend downward. Operating outside of the typical political framework that dominates foreign relations, IRDR provides a model for effective collaboration across the geopolitical spectrum in the face of a major global issue. Explore or Exploit? Managing international spaces Over the last few decades the polar ice cap that covers much of the Arctic Ocean has been shrinking. So much so, that during the warm season vast areas of previously solid ice have become open waters, creating opportunities for new trade routes and exposing the Arctic’s enormous reserves of oil and natural gas. Depending on your values, this will sound either like an opportunity for huge economic development of the region or the inevitable exploitation of one of the last untouched natural territories on the planet. And if you live there, like the half a million indigenous people who currently do, how this territory is managed will determine where you can live, how (and if) you can make a living, and what the health of the ecosystems that have supported Arctic life for millennia will look like. Luckily, such a scenario was predicted decades ago. In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, then leader of the then Soviet Union, delivered a speech outlining his aspirations for the arctic to be explored rather than exploited—to radically reduce military presence, create a collaborative multinational research effort, cooperate on matters of environmental security, and open up the Northern Sea Route for trade. This speech laid the foundation for the Arctic Council (Figure 1), which is one of the most successful examples of science diplomacy at work. Composed of the eight Arctic nations, including geopolitical rivals US and Russia, and numerous groups of indigenous peoples, the Arctic Council was established to maintain Gorbachev’s vision for the region while giving the indigenous peoples a seat at the negotiating table. The council’s activities are conducted by six scientific and technology-based working groups who conduct research in the area and provide knowledge and recommendations to the council members. As a result of this research, and allowing scientists to take part in the negotiations, the Arctic council has enacted several legally binding agreements regarding the sustainable development and environmental protection of the Arctic Ocean. These agreements have facilitated cooperation on a number of important issues including search and rescue operations, prevention and containment of maritime oil pollution, and, most recently, enhanced data sharing and scientific research collaborations. Against a backdrop of rapidly deteriorating diplomatic relations, the US and Russia have co-chaired task forces that laid the foundation for these agreements, proving to the world that meaningful results can be achieved through the avenue of science diplomacy, regardless of geopolitics. Science diplomacy going forward The technical expertise that characterizes science diplomacy will continue to be in demand across many realms of foreign policy. For example, synthetic biology and gene-editing technology continue to factor into matters regarding agriculture and trade. Also, digital currencies, such as bitcoin, have changed the way economists and businesses are approaching markets. Finally, machine learning and artificial intelligence are being used by governments as a means for population control, giving rise to a new type of governance—digital authoritarianism. While this expertise will be necessary for managing such issues, building international coalitions can’t be done through a purely scientific and technical lens. Convincing others to cooperate means providing them with a convincing argument to do so, and in terms they understand and find compelling. To achieve this, scientists must be trained to communicate their expertise in a way that moves stakeholders in policy discussions to act. This means appealing to motivations they have been largely taught to put to the side—whether they be political, economic, or emotional in nature—without obscuring the data and insights they have to offer. For our leaders, policy makers, and diplomats to effectively understand issues underpinned by science and technology, experts in these fields must continue to be integrated into the mechanisms of governance. With scientists in the US running for elections in numbers like never before, we can expect this trend to continue. And in the face of a rising wave of nationalism across the world, it is crucial that we do everything we can to foster collaboration. The future of human civilization depends on it.

## 5

### 1nc – da

#### Infrastructure and reconciliation are the priority now. they’ll pass by new deadline

Alemany 10/12 [Jacqueline Alemany and Theodoric Meyer, "The new deadline to pass Biden's agenda is coming up fast", 10/12/21, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/10/13/new-deadline-pass-biden-agenda-is-coming-up-fast/]

New deadline, old problems: Less than two weeks after House Democrats missed a deadline to hold a vote on the infrastructure bill, the party is staring down another one.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer say they’re aiming to pass the $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill and a larger package stuffed full of Democrats’ child care, health care and climate change priorities by Oct. 31, when a short-term extension of highway funding is set to run out.

Coincidentally, Oct. 31 is the day before the much-anticipated United Nations climate summit kicks off in Glasgow, where administration officials are eager to show off legislation that would establish credibility in negotiations with foreign governments. White House press secretary Jen Psaki told reporters last month that Biden expected the reconciliation bill — much of which is focused on fighting climate change — would “move forward in advance of that.”

(Asked about it on Tuesday, Psaki said Biden would tout the administration's commitment to combating climate change in Glasgow “regardless of where the package stands.”)

And two days later, Virginians will head to the polls to elect a new governor in a contest lawmakers and the White House are watching closely. Former Democratic Gov. Terry McAuliffe has implored Democrats in Washington to pass the infrastructure bill by Election Day.

The 18-day sprint

Can Democrats really pass two massive bills in the next 18 days?

“Yes,” Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-Va.) told The Early yesterday evening. “Will it is a different matter. But can it? Yeah. We’re experts at coming right up against the edge and pulling a miracle.”

#### Pushing a WTO takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

**Bhadrakumar 5/9** M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the **awesome clout** of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already **gone on the offensiv**e blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather **spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry** to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO **dragging on for months, if not years**, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be **huge opposition** to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ **European allies as well**. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### The Bill quickly secures the vulnerable grid.

Carney 21 [Chris, August 6; Senior Policy Advisor at Nossaman LLC, former US Representative, Former Professor of Political Science at Penn State University; JD Supra, “The US Senate Infrastructure Bill: Securing Our Electrical Grid Through P3s and Grants,” https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-us-senate-infrastructure-bill-4989100/]

As we begin to better understand the main components of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that the US Senate is working to pass this week, it is clear that public-private partnerships ("P3s") are a favored funding mechanism of lawmakers to help offset high costs associated with major infrastructure projects in communities. And while past infrastructure bills have used P3s for more conventional projects, the current bill also calls for P3s to help pay for protecting the US electric grid from cyberattacks. Responding to the increasing number of cyberattacks on our nation’s infrastructure, and given the fragile physical condition of our electrical grid, the Senate included provisions to help state, local and tribal entities harden electrical grids for which they are responsible.

Section 40121, Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnerships, calls for not only physical protections of electrical grids, but also for enhancing cyber-resilience. This section seeks to encourage the various federal, state and local regulatory authorities, as well as industry participants to engage in a program that audits and assesses the physical security and cybersecurity of utilities, conducts threat assessments to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities, and provides cybersecurity training to utilities. Further, the section calls for strengthening supply chain security, protecting “defense critical” electrical infrastructure and buttressing against a constant barrage of cyberattacks on the grid. In determining the nature of the partnership arrangement, the size of the utility and the area served will be considered, with priority going to utilities with fewer available resources.

Section 40122 compliments the previous section as it seeks to incentivize testing of cybersecurity products meant to be used in the energy sector, including SCADA systems, and to find ways to mitigate any vulnerabilities identified by the testing. Intended as a voluntary program, utilities would be offered technical assistance and databases of vulnerabilities and best practices would be created. Section 40123 incentivizes investment in advanced cybersecurity technology to strengthen the security and resiliency of grid systems through rate adjustments that would be studied and approved by the Secretary of Energy and other relevant Commissions, Councils and Associations.

Lastly, Section 40124, a long sought-after package of cybersecurity grants for state, local and tribal entities is included in the bill. This section adds language that would enable state, local and tribal bodies to apply for funds to upgrade aging computer equipment and software, particularly related to utilities, as they face growing threats of ransomware, denial of service and other cyberattacks. However, under Section 40126, cybersecurity grants may be tied to meeting various security standards established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and/or submission of a cybersecurity plan by a grant applicant that shows “maturity” in understanding the cyber threat they face and a sophisticated approach to utilizing the grant.

While the final outcome of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act may still be weeks or months away, inclusion of these provisions not only demonstrates a positive step forward for the application of federal P3s and grants generally, they also show that Congress recognizes the seriousness of the cyber threats our electrical grids face. Hopefully, through judicious application of both public-private partnerships and grants, the nation can quickly secure its infrastructure from cyberattacks.

#### Grid vulnerabilities spark nuclear war – extinction.

Klare 19 [Michael; November; Professor Emeritus of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College; Arms Control Association, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation,” https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation]

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13

The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14

## Case

### Solvency

#### Temporary waiver not T – explodes limits and they cant solve since not permaentn

#### Squo solves – plan increases price of scarce materials and results in costly, ineffective facilities

Mcmurry-Heath 8/18 (Michelle Mcmurry-Heath, [physician-scientist and president and CEO of the Biotechnology Innovation Organization.], 8-18-2021, “Waiving intellectual property rights would harm global vaccination“, STAT, accessed: 8-19-2021, https://www.statnews.com/2021/08/18/waiving-intellectual-property-rights-compromise-global-vaccination-efforts/) ajs

Covid-19 vaccines are already remarkably cheap, and companies are offering them at low or no cost to low-income countries. Poor access to clinics and transportation are barriers in some countries, but the expense of the shot itself is not. In fact, if the World Trade Organization grants the IP waiver, it could make these vaccines more expensive.

Here’s why. Before Covid-19 emerged, the world produced at most [5.5 billion doses](https://www.barrons.com/articles/a-plan-to-break-the-vaccine-manufacturing-bottleneck-51621952245) of various vaccines every year. Now the world needs an additional [11 billion doses](https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-g7-summit---12-june-2021) — including billions of doses of mRNA vaccines that no one had ever mass-manufactured before — to fully vaccinate every eligible person on the planet against the new disease.

Even as Covid-19 vaccines were still being developed, pharmaceutical companies began retrofitting and upgrading existing facilities to produce Covid-19 vaccines, at a cost of $40 to $100 million each. Vaccine developers also licensed their technologies to well-established manufacturers, like the Serum Institute of India, to further increase production. As a result, almost every facility in the world that can quickly and safely make Covid-19 vaccines is already doing so, or will be in the next few months.

#### The aff is only a symbolic move

Damian **Garde 21,** National Biotech Reporter, “Waiver of patent rights on Covid vaccines may be mostly symbolic, for now,” STAT, 5-6-2021, https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/06/waiver-of-patent-rights-on-covid-19-vaccines-in-near-term-may-be-more-symbolic-than-substantive/

The U.S.’s stunning endorsement of a proposal to waive Covid-19 vaccine patents has won plaudits for President Biden and roiled the global pharmaceutical industry. **But, at least in the short term, it’s likely to be more of a symbolic milestone than a turning point in the pandemic.** For months, proponents of the proposal have argued that the need to waive intellectual property protections was urgent given the growth of Covid cases in low- and middle-income countries, which have been largely left without the huge shipments of vaccine already purchased by wealthy countries. But patents alone don’t magically produce vaccines. Experts suggested the earliest the world could expect to see additional capacity flowing from the waiver — if it’s approved at the World Trade Organization — would be in 2022. Prashant Yadav, a supply chain expert and senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, said the biggest barrier to increasing the global vaccine supply **is a lack of raw materials and facilities that manufacture the billions of doses the world needs.** Temporarily suspending some intellectual property, as the U.S. proposes to do, **would have little effect on those problems**, he said.

#### I’ll impact turn the rest of the aff – they have to answer each one and can’t kick out of anything since im not reading solvency defense to each specific scenario or they simply just have no offense and vote neg on presumption

### Adv 1

#### Pandemics doesn’t cause extinction.

Halstead 19 John Halstead, doctorate in political philosophy. [Cause Area Report: Existential Risk, Founders Pledge, https://founderspledge.com/research/Cause%20Area%20Report%20-%20Existential%20Risk.pdf]//BPS

However, there are some reasons to think that naturally occurring pathogens are unlikely to cause human extinction. Firstly, Homo sapiens have been around for 200,000 years and the Homo genus for around six million years without being exterminated by an infectious disease, which is evidence that the base rate of extinction-risk natural pathogens is low.82 Indeed, past disease outbreaks have not come close to rendering humans extinct. Although bodies were piled high in the streets across Europe during the Black Death,83 human extinction was never a serious possibility, and some economists even argue that it was a boon for the European economy.84 Secondly, infectious disease has only contributed to the extinction of a small minority of animal species.85 The only confirmed case of a mammalian species extinction being caused by an infectious disease is a type of rat native only to Christmas Island. Having said that, the context may be importantly different for modern day humans, so it is unclear whether the risk is increasing or decreasing. On the one hand, due to globalisation, the world is more interconnected making it easier for pathogens to spread. On the other hand, interconnectedness could also increase immunity by increasing exposure to lower virulence strains between subpopulations.87 Moreover, advancements in medicine and sanitation limit the potential damage an outbreak might do.

#### COVID slows climate change in the long-term – their evidence is about a short-term, volatile effect which is not practical – answers Mcpherson.

David Hosansky, MA, 21 [MA Journalism, Director of UCAR Media Relations, internally citing study + NCAR scientist Andrew Gettelman (PhD in Atmospheric Science)], "COVID-19 lockdowns temporarily raised global temperatures," University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, February 2, 2021, <https://news.ucar.edu/132775/covid-19-lockdowns-temporarily-raised-global-temperatures> C.VC

Despite the short-term warming effects, Gettelman emphasized that the long-term impact of the pandemic may be to slightly slow climate change because of reduced emissions of carbon dioxide, which lingers in the atmosphere for decades and has a more gradual influence on climate. In contrast, aerosols – the focus of the new study – have a more immediate impact that fades away within a few years.

The study was published in Geophysical Research Letters. It was funded in part by the National Science Foundation, NCAR’s sponsor. In addition to NCAR scientists, the study was co-authored by scientists at Oxford University, Imperial College, and the University of Leeds.

TEASING OUT THE IMPACTS

Although scientists have long been able to quantify the warming impacts of carbon dioxide, the climatic influence of various types of aerosols – including sulfates, nitrates, black carbon, and dust – has been more difficult to pin down. One of the major challenges for projecting the extent of future climate change is estimating the extent to which society will continue to emit aerosols in the future and the influence of the different types of aerosols on clouds and temperature.

To conduct the research, Gettelman and his co-authors used two of the world’s leading climate models: the NCAR-based Community Earth System Model and a model known as ECHAM-HAMMOZ, which was developed by a consortium of European nations. They ran simulations on both models, adjusting emissions of aerosols and incorporating actual meteorological conditions in 2020, such as winds.

This approach enabled them to identify the impact of reduced emissions on temperature changes that were too small to tease out in actual observations, where they could be obscured by the variability in atmospheric conditions.

The results showed that the warming effect was strongest in the mid and upper latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere. The effect was mixed in the tropics and comparatively minor in much of the Southern Hemisphere, where aerosol emissions are not as pervasive.

Gettelman said the study will help scientists better understand the influence of various types of aerosols in different atmospheric conditions, helping to inform efforts to minimize climate change. Although the research illustrates how aerosols counter the warming influence of greenhouse gases, he emphasized that emitting more of them into the lower atmosphere is not a viable strategy for slowing climate change.

“Aerosol emissions have major health ramifications,” he said. “Saying we should pollute is not practical.”

#### McPherson is written BEFORE a broad analysis of the pandemic – literally one month in. Our evidence is an analysis of the pandemic writ large and even indicates that “despite short term effects” climate change has reduced empirically

#### BUT Pandemics solve nuclear war that spills up to ext---it’s likely now.

Barry. R. Posen 20. Ford International Professor of Political Science at MIT and Director Emeritus of the MIT Security Studies Program. 4/23/2020. “Do Pandemics Promote Peace?” <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-04-23/do-pandemics-promote-peace>. DOA: 9/2/2020. SIR.

What these analysts miss is that COVID-19, the disease caused by the coronavirus, is weakening all of the great and middle powers more or less equally. None is likely to gain a meaningful advantage over the others. All will have ample reason to be pessimistic about their military capabilities and their overall readiness for war. For the duration of the pandemic, at least, and probably for years afterward, the odds of a war between major powers will go down, not up. PAX EPIDEMICA? A cursory survey of the scholarly literature on war and disease appears to confirm Blainey’s observation that pessimism is conducive to peace. Scholars have documented again and again how war creates permissive conditions for disease—in armies as well as civilians in the fought-over territories. But one seldom finds any discussion of epidemics causing wars or of wars deliberately started in the middle of widespread outbreaks of infectious disease. (The diseases that European colonists carried to the New World did weaken indigenous populations to the point that they were more vulnerable to conquest; in addition, some localized conflicts were fought during the influenza pandemic of 1919–21, but these were occasioned by major shifts in regional balances of power following the destruction of four empires in World War I.) That sickness slows the march to war is partly due to the fact that war depends on people. When people fall ill, they can’t be counted on to perform well in combat. Military medicine made enormous strides in the years leading up to World War I, prior to which armies suffered higher numbers of casualties from disease than from combat. But pandemics still threaten military units, as those onboard U.S. and French aircraft carriers, hundreds of whom tested positive for COVID-19, know well. Sailors and soldiers in the field are among the most vulnerable because they are packed together. But even airmen are at risk, since they must take refuge from air attacks in bunkers, where the virus could also spread rapidly. Ground campaigns in urban areas pose still greater dangers in pandemic times. Much recent ground combat has been in cities in poor countries with few or no public health resources, environments highly favorable to illness. Ground combat also usually produces prisoners, any of whom can be infected. A vaccine may eventually solve these problems, but an abundance of caution is likely to persist for some time after it comes into use. Major outbreaks damage national economies, which are the source of military power. The most important reason disease inhibits war is economic. Major outbreaks damage national economies, which are the source of military power. COVID-19 is a pandemic—by definition a worldwide phenomenon. All great and middle powers appear to be adversely affected, and all have reason to be pessimistic about their military prospects. Their economies are shrinking fast, and there is great uncertainty about when and how quickly they will start growing again. Even China, which has slowed the spread of the disease and begun to reopen its economy, will be hurting for years to come. It took an enormous hit to GDP in the first quarter of 2020, ending 40 years of steady growth. And its trading partners, burned by their dependence on China for much of the equipment needed to fight COVID-19, will surely scale back their imports. An export-dependent China will have to rely more on its domestic market, something it has been attempting for years with only limited success. It is little wonder, then, that the International Monetary Fund [forecasts](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oz56lV17s9o) slower growth in China this year than at any time since the 1970s. Even after a vaccine is developed and made widely available, economic troubles may linger for years. States will emerge from this crisis with enormous debts. They will spend years paying for the bailout and stimulus packages they used to protect citizens and businesses from the economic consequences of social distancing. Drained treasuries will give them one more reason to be pessimistic about their military might. LESS TRADE, LESS FRICTION How long is the pacifying effect of pessimism likely to last? If a vaccine is developed quickly, enabling a relatively swift economic recovery, the mood may prove short-lived. But it is equally likely that the coronavirus crisis will last long enough to change the world in important ways, some of which will likely dampen the appetite for conflict for some time—perhaps up to five or ten years. After all, the world is experiencing both the biggest pandemic and the biggest economic downturn in a century. Most governments have not covered themselves with glory managing the pandemic, and even the most autocratic worry about popular support. Over the next few years, people will want evidence that their governments are working to protect them from disease and economic dislocation. Citizens will see themselves as dependent on the state, and they will be less inclined to support adventures abroad. At the same time, governments and businesses will likely try to reduce their reliance on imports of critical materials, having watched global supply chains break down during the pandemic. The result will probably be diminished trade, something liberal internationalists see as a bad thing. But for the last five years or so, trade has not helped improve relations between states but rather fueled resentment. Less trade could mean less friction between major powers, thereby reducing the intensity of their rivalries. In the Chinese context, less international trade could have positive knock-on effects. Focused on growing the domestic economy, and burdened by hefty bills from fighting the virus, Beijing could be forced to table the Belt and Road Initiative, an ambitious trade and investment project that has unnerved the foreign policy establishments of great and middle powers. The suspension of the BRI would soothe the fears of those who see it as an instrument of Chinese world domination. Interstate wars have become relatively rare since the end of World War II. The United States and the Soviet Union engaged in a four-decade Cold War, which included an intense nuclear and conventional arms race, but they never fought each other directly, even with conventional weapons. Theorists debate the reasons behind the continued rarity of great-power conflict. I am inclined to believe that the risk of escalation to a nuclear confrontation is simply too great. COVID-19 does nothing to mitigate such risks for world leaders—and a great deal to feed their reasonable pessimism about the likely outcome of even a conventional war.

### Adv 2

#### No heg impact

* empirics and political psychology prove US posture is unrelated to great power peace
* other factors aren’t accounted for in their analysis

Fettweis 17 [Christopher Fettweis, associate professor of political science at Tulane University. Unipolarity, Hegemony, and the New Peace. May 8, 2017. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636412.2017.1306394?needAccess=true]

After three years in the White House, Ronald Reagan had learned something surprising: “Many people at the top of the Soviet hierarchy were genuinely afraid of America and Americans,” he wrote in his autobiography. He continued: “Perhaps this shouldn’t have surprised me, but it did … I’d always felt that from our deeds it must be clear to anyone that Americans were a moral people who starting at the birth of our nation had always used our power only as a force for good in the world…. During my first years in Washington, I think many of us took it for granted that the Russians, like ourselves, considered it unthinkable that the United States would launch a first strike against them.” 100 Reagan is certainly not alone in believing in the essential benevolent image of his nation. While it is common for actors to attribute negative motivations to the behavior of others, it is exceedingly difficult for them to accept that anyone could interpret their actions in negative ways. Leaders are well aware of their own motives and tend to assume that their peaceful intentions are obvious and transparent.

Both strains of the hegemonic-stability explanation assume not only that US power is benevolent, but that others perceive it that way. Hegemonic stability depends on the perceptions of other states to be successful; it has no hope to succeed if it encounters resistance from the less powerful members of the system, or even if they simply refuse to follow the rules. Relatively small police forces require the general cooperation of large communities to have any chance of establishing order. They must perceive the sheriff as just, rational, and essentially nonthreatening. The lack of balancing behavior in the system, which has been puzzling to many realists, seems to support the notion of widespread perceptions of benevolent hegemony.101 Were they threatened by the order constructed by the United States, the argument goes, smaller states would react in ways that reflected their fears. Since internal and external balancing accompanied previous attempts to achieve hegemony, the absence of such behavior today suggests that something is different about the US version.

Hegemonic-stability theorists purport to understand the perceptions of others, at times better than those others understand themselves. Complain as they may at times, other countries know that the United States is acting in the common interest. Objections to unipolarity, though widespread, are not “very seriously intended,” wrote Kagan, since “the truth about America’s dominant role in the world is known to most observers. And the truth is that the benevolent hegemony exercised by the United States is good for a vast portion of the world’s population.” 102 In the 1990s, Russian protests regarding NATO expansion—though nearly universal—were not taken seriously, since US planners believed the alliance’s benevolent intentions were apparent to all. Sagacious Russians understood that expansion would actually be beneficial, since it would bring stability to their western border.103 President Clinton and Secretary of State Warren Christopher were caught off guard by the hostility of their counterparts regarding the issue at a summit in Budapest in December 1994.104 Despite warnings from the vast majority of academic and policy experts about the likely Russian reaction and overall wisdom of expansion itself, the administration failed to anticipate Moscow’s position.105 The Russians did not seem to believe American assurances that expansion would actually be good for them. The United States overestimated the degree to which others saw it as benevolent.

Once again, the culture of the United States might make its leaders more vulnerable to this misperception. The need for positive self-regard appears to be particularly strong in North American societies compared to elsewhere.106 Western egos tend to be gratified through self-promotion rather than humility, and independence rather than interdependence. Americans are more likely to feel good if they are unique rather than a good cog in society’s wheel, and uniquely good. The need to be perceived as benevolent, though universal, may well exert stronger encouragement for US observers to project their perceptions onto others.

The United States almost certainly frightens others more than its leaders perceive. A quarter of the 68,000 respondents to a 2013 Gallup poll in sixty-five countries identified the United States as the “greatest threat to world peace,” which was more than three times the total for the second-place country (Pakistan).107 The international community always has to worry about the potential for police brutality, even if it occurs rarely. Such ungratefulness tends to come as a surprise to US leaders. In 2003, Condoleezza Rice was dismayed to discover resistance to US initiatives in Iraq: “There were times,” she said later, “that it appeared that American power was seen to be more dangerous than, perhaps, Saddam Hussein.” 108 Both liberals and neoconservatives probably exaggerate the extent to which US hegemony is everywhere secretly welcomed; it is not just petulant resentment, but understandable disagreement with US policies, that motivates counterhegemonic beliefs and behavior.

To review, assuming for a moment that US leaders are subject to the same forces that affect every human being, they overestimate the amount of control they have over other actors, and are not as important to decisions made elsewhere as they believe themselves to be. And they probably perceive their own benevolence to be much greater than do others. These common phenomena all influence US beliefs in the same direction, and may well increase the apparent explanatory power of hegemony beyond what the facts would otherwise support. The United States is probably not as central to the New Peace as either liberals or neoconservatives believe.

#### A large hegemonic power gap causes global backlash against U.S. power that makes effective exercise of leadership impossible

Maher 11 – Richard Maher, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, Winter 2011, “The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World,” Orbis, Vol. 55, No. 1, p. 53-68

Since the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, **world politics has been unipolar, defined by** American preponderance in each of the core components of state power—military, economic, and technological. Such an imbalanced distribution of power in favor of a single country is unprecedented in the modern state system. This **material advantage** does not automatically **translate into America’s** preferred political and diplomatic outcomes, however. **Other states**, if now only at the margins, **are challenging U.S. power and authority**. Additionally, on a range of issues, **the U**nited **S**tates **is finding it increasingly difficult to realize its goals and ambitions**. The even bigger challenge for policymakers in Washington is how to respond to signs that America’s unquestioned preeminence in international politics is waning. This **decline in the U**nited **S**tate**s’ relative position is** in part **a consequence of the** **burdens and susceptibilities produced by unipolarity**. Contrary to the conventional wisdom, **the U.S. position both internationally and domestically** may actually be strengthened **once** this period of **unipolarity has passed**.

On pure material terms, the gap between the United States and the rest of the world is indeed vast. **The U.S. economy, with a GDP of over $14 trillion, is nearly three times the size of China’s, now the world’s second-largest national economy. The U**nited **S**tates today **accounts for** approximately 25 percent of global economic output, a figure that has held relatively stable despite steadily increasing economic growth in China, India, Brazil, and other countries. **Among the group of six or seven great powers, this figure approaches 50 percent**. When one takes discretionary spending into account, the United States today spends more on its military than the rest of the world combined. This imbalance is even further magnified by the fact that five of the next seven biggest spenders are close U.S. allies. China, the country often seen as America’s next great geopolitical rival, has a defense budget that is one-seventh of what the United States spends on its military. There is also a vast gap in terms of the reach and sophistication of advanced weapons systems. By some measures, the United States spends more on research and development for its military than the rest of the world combined. What is remarkable is that the United States can do all of this without completely breaking the bank. The United States today devotes approximately 4 percent of GDP to defense. As a percentage of GDP, the United States today spends far less on its military than it did during the Cold War, when defense spending hovered around 10 percent of gross economic output. As one would expect, the United States today enjoys unquestioned preeminence in the military realm. No other state comes close to having the capability to project military power like the United States.1

And yet, despite this material preeminence**, the U**nited **S**tates **sees its** political and strategic influence **diminishing around the world**. It is involved in two costly and destructive wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, where success has been elusive and the end remains out of sight. China has adopted a new assertiveness recently, on everything from U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, currency convertibility, and America’s growing debt (which China largely finances). Pakistan, **one of America’s closest strategic allies, is facing the threat of social and political collapse**. Russia **is using its vast energy resources to** reassert its dominance in what it views as its historical sphere of influence. **Negotiations with** North Korea and Iran have **gone nowhere in dismantling their nuclear programs**. Brazil’s **growing economic and political influence offer another option for partnership and investment for countries in the Western Hemisphere**. And **relations with** Japan, following the election that brought the opposition Democratic Party into power, **are at their frostiest in decades**. To many observers, it seems that **America’s vast power is not translating into America’s preferred outcomes.**

#### China rise is peaceful

* China seeks limited predation not outright competition
* Strategy and policy moves show coop over conflict
* Care most about stability
* No evidence they are focused on heg – leaders understand risks of competition

Shifrinson 19 [Joshua Shifrinson is an Assistant Professor of International Relations with the Pardee School of Global Affairs at Boston University. Should the United States Fear China’s Rise? Winter 2019. www.bu.edu/pardeeschool/files/2019/01/Winter-2019\_Shifrinson\_0.pdf]

In short, limited predation—not an overt and outright push to overtake and challenge the United States—is the name of China’s current and highly rational game. As significantly, it appears Chinese leaders are aware of the structural logic of the situation. Despite ongoing debate over the extent to which China has departed from its long-standing “hide strength, bide time” strategy first formulated by Deng Xiaoping in favor a more assertive course seeking to increase Chinese influence in world affairs, Chinese leaders and China watchers have been at pains to point out that Chinese strategy still seeks to avoid provoking conflict with the United States.49 As one analyst notes, China’s decision to carve out a more prominent role for itself in world politics has been coupled with an effort to reassure and engage the United States so as to avoid unneeded competition while facilitating stability.50 Chinese leaders echo these themes, with one senior official noting in 2014 that Chinese policy focused on “properly addressing] conflicts and differences through dialogue and cooperation instead of confrontational approaches.”51 Xi Jinping himself has underlined these currents, arguing even before taking office that U.S.-Chinese relations should be premised on “preventing conflict and confrontation,” and more recently vowing that “China will promote coordination and cooperation with other major countries.”52 Ultimately, as one scholar observes, there is “hardly evidence that [... China has] begun to focus on hegemonic competition.”53 Put another way, China’s leaders appear aware of the risks of taking an overly confrontational stance toward a still-potent United States and have scoped Chinese ambitions accordingly.

#### Extended containment causes backlash from rising powers – they read uniqueness for us

Hal Brands 18, the Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins-SAIS, senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 10/24/18, “Danger: Falling Powers,” https://www.the-american-interest.com/2018/10/24/danger-falling-powers/

There is, then, no disputing that rising powers can have profoundly disruptive effects. Yet such powers might not actually be the most aggressive or risk-prone type of revisionist state. After all, if a country’s position is steadily improving over time, why risk messing it all up through reckless policies that precipitate a premature showdown? Why not lay low until the geopolitical balance has become still more favorable? Why not wait until one has surpassed the reigning hegemon altogether and other countries defer to one’s wishes without a shot being fired? So while a rising revisionist power may be tempted to assert itself, it should also have good reason to avoid going for broke.

Now imagine an alternative scenario. A revisionist power—perhaps an authoritarian power—has been gaining influence and ratcheting its ambitions upward. Its leaders have cultivated intense nationalism as a pillar of their domestic legitimacy; they have promised the populace that past insults will be avenged and sacrifices will be rewarded with geopolitical greatness and global prestige. Yet then the country’s potential peaks, either because it has reached its natural limit or because of some unforeseen development, and the balance of power starts to shift in unfavorable ways. It becomes clear to the country’s leadership that it may not be able to accomplish the goals it has set and fulfill the promises it has made, and that the situation will only further worsen with time. A roll of the iron dice now seems more attractive: It may be the only chance the nation has to claim geopolitical spoils before it is too late.

In this scenario, it is not rising power that makes the revisionist state so dangerous, but the temptation to act before decline sets in. In this sense, the dynamic bears a resemblance to the famous Davies J-Curve theory of revolution, wherein a populace is held to be more inclined to revolt not when it is maximally oppressed but rather when raised expectations are shown to be in vain.

Obviously, rational analysis does not always prevail in world politics. Rising states can become intoxicated with their own strength; they may simply get tired of waiting to attain the status they desire; or some domestic pressure may impel leaders to act dangerously. But revisionists whose power has begun to decline, or who have hit a rogue bump in the road, may not feel that they even have the option of waiting.

**Deterring Russia causes spiraling insecurity and nuclear war**

**Beebe 10/7**/19 [George Beebe is vice president and director of studies at the Center for the National Interest, a nonpartisan think tank in Washington. He is also the former head of Russia analysis at the CIA, and the author of The Russia Trap: How Our Shadow War with Russia Could Spiral into Nuclear Catastrophe. We’re More at Risk of Nuclear War With Russia Than We Think. October 7, 2019. https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2019/10/07/were-more-at-risk-of-nuclear-war-with-russia-than-we-think-229436]

A related, second assumption American policymakers make is seeing the Russian threat as primarily a **deterrence problem**. The logic goes something like this: Wars often happen because the states that start them believe they can win, but the United States can disabuse a would-be aggressor of this belief through a show of force, thus deterring conflict. Indeed, Washington seems convinced that showing the Kremlin it will punish Russian transgressions—through toughened economic sanctions, an enhanced military posture in Europe and more aggressive cyber operations—is the best path to preserving peace.

But, when dealing with states that **believe** they are **under** some form of **assault**, focusing on **deterrence** can be **counterproductive**. Rather than averting aggression by demonstrating the will to fight back, America might be **unintentionally increasing** the **odds of** a **war**. To a great degree, this is the situation the United States already faces. Years of **enlargement of NATO** and **perceived** U.S. **involvement** in Russia’s **internal businesses** have **convinced the Kremlin** that America poses an existential threat. In turn, Russia’s meddling in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, coupled with a string of aggressions against its neighbors, have convinced Washington that Moscow is going for the West’s jugular.

### Adv 3

#### The poverty/trade stuff is irrelevant – concede the util framing which means extinction must ow/

#### c/a all of the US-China advantage cards in adv 2– the impact turns definitively still apply since their argument is that the WTO can solve war btw the us and china, which is irrel if we’ve won that china rise is fine – also means coop stuff is irrelevant

#### WTO can’t solve anything – nations won’t come collaborate and regulate

Aaronson, George Washington University, 2014, Susan, June, “Can Trade Policy Set Information Free” http://www.gwu.edu/~iiep/assets/docs/papers/2014WP/AaronsonIIEPWP20149.pdf

In theory, the WTO should be an appropriate venue for such discussions. WTO members agreed not to place tariffs on data flows. However, the member states have not found common ground on how to reduce new trade barriers to information flows. In 2011, several nations nixed a US and EU proposal that members agree not to block Internet service providers or impede the free flow of information online. Moreover, the members of the WTO have made little progress on adding new regulatory issues such as privacy and cyber security that challenge Internet policymakers. However, many new online activities will require cooperative global regulation on issues that transcend market access -- the traditional turf of the WTO. These issues will require policymakers to think less about ensuring that their model of regulation is adopted globally but more about achieving interoperability among different governance approaches. Alas, policymakers are not consistently collaborating to achieve interoperability The US, the EU, and Canada use trade policies to govern the Internet at home and across borders. The three trade giants use bilateral and regional trade agreements to encourage e-commerce, reduce online barriers to trade, and to develop shared policies in a world where technology is rapidly changing and where governments compete to disseminate their regulatory approaches. Policymakers also use export controls, trade bans or targeted sanctions to protect Internet users in other countries or to prevent officials of other countries from using Internet related technologies in ways that undermine the rights of individuals abroad. Finally, policymakers may use trade agreements to challenge other governments’ online rules and policies as trade barriers.

#### WTO and interdependence doesn’t solve war – prefer studies at the multilateral not just dyadic level – competitive dynamics outweigh conflict dampening incentives.

Chatagnier and Kavakli 17 – (2017, J. Tyson, PhD in Political Science, Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Houston, and Kerim Can, PhD in Political Science, assistant professor at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Sabanci University in Turkey, “From Economic Competition to Military Combat: Export Similarity and International Conflict,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol 61, Issue 7, 2017)

International trade has long been thought to facilitate peace among nations (Kant [1795] 1970). A voluntary exchange of goods that leaves both parties better off inherently raises the value of each side to the other, increasing the cost of conflict. The belief that economic interaction can ignite a positive dynamic of cooperation and reduce conflictual behavior is so intuitive and widespread that some political pundits have even heralded free trade as the path to world peace (see, e.g., Griswold 1998; Boudreaux 2006).The conventional wisdom within the international relations literature (e.g., Oneal and Russett 1997; Gartzke, Li, and Boehmer 2003; Polachek and Xiang 2010) reinforces these claims, having found consistent empirical (and theoretical) links between trade and peace. At the same time, however, there is certainly evidence that trade can exacerbate rivalry and conflict between states. Throughout history, states have fought their competitors for advantage (i.e., access to inputs and markets) in the global marketplace. For instance, in his authoritative account of the Anglo-German rivalry before World War I, Kennedy (1980, 464) concludes that “the most profound cause [of the conflict], surely, was economic”. More specifically, the cause was “the detectable increase in Anglo-German trade rivalry since Bismarck’s time as the latter country steadily became more competitive.” Moreover, while modern empirical international relations research has largely come down on the side of the neoliberals, it has not been monolithic. Indeed, numerous studies by Barbieri (1996, 2002) have demonstrated that increased trade actually has the potential to aggravate tensions between states. These inconsistencies in both the historical and analytical records raise questions about the simplicity of the link between trade and conflict. Additionally, the vast majority of previous work considers only the bilateral effects of trade, neglecting the way in which trade between two actors can affect a third. We remedy this oversight by analyzing the effects of trade competition, arguing that the tension produced by export competition can be an important source of international conflict. More specifically, we highlight that economic actors who face foreign competition have an incentive to use military power to gain an advantage in international markets. These domestic actors can use their economic power to influence their nation’s political elites and increase the likelihood that economic conflict erupts into war. We support this theoretical argument with several well-established historical cases including the seventeenth-century Dutch-English commercial rivalry, the pre-World War I Anglo-German rivalry, and the 1990 invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. Our argument suggests that, although trade can have a pacifying direct effect at the dyadic level, it also has strong indirect effects, which can be conflict aggravating. We test this argument using commodity-level trade data from 1962 to 2000. We measure each country pair’s portfolio similarity along nearly 1,300 commodity categories and test the effect of this variable on several indicators of international conflict. Our results strongly support our claim that countries that produce and export similar goods are significantly more likely to fight, even taking into account their bilateral trade. These findings are robust to several checks on model specification as well as alternative explanations. We also show that our findings are not driven by oil or other strategic resources and that they hold for both raw and manufactured goods. In light of these results, we are confident that we have identified a significant and practically important cause of war.