### Underview

#### T before 1ar theory – you set the limits of the debate everything else is reactionary

#### 1ar theory should only be read if the advocacy was abusive to a point where they could barely answer it not bc they didn’t know how

#### Don’t assume they meet – we aren’t infinitely regressive and we will have to debate about whether they meet or no. assuming they always meet is overly aff biased

#### No new 2ar arguments – there is no 3NR. All arguments should be extensions and you can have things blocked out ahead of time

#### Yes new 2nr theory args – otherwise no way to check back against cheaty perms – no warrant

## T reduce

**Interp: Reduce means permanent reduction**

**Reynolds 59** – Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13]  The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The **plain dictionary meaning** of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate **permanency**.

**Violation – the plan grants a trips waiver, it doesn’t eliminate intellectual property protections for medicines. Also, it is only for novel pandemics which can allow for more IP protections and does not lower IP**

**Standards –**

**Limits – infinite conditions, new laws, and waivers could be placed on the plan – kills predictability and decks a stable nexus of IPR research**

**Ground – adding to the squo allows them to be shifty about what the plan does and get out of generic das and cp – magnified by not specing what the waiver is going to do in the context of the aff or at all in the 1ac allows the 1AR to recharacterize, which functionally makes the aff conditional**

# Manufacturing cp

#### The United States federal government should commit to purchasing sufficient doses of COVID-19 vaccines to meet global demand and establish public-private partnerships to expand global vaccine manufacturing capacity.

#### Buying and exporting vaccines solves while avoiding the china DA.

Gianna **Gancia 21**, (IT, ID) is a member of Parliament’s Development Committee, “Why waiving patents on vaccines is not a good idea,” Parliament Magazine, 5-14-2021, https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/why-waiving-patents-on-vaccines-is-not-a-good-idea

In fact, there would be no incentive for pharmaceutical companies to conduct research, not only into COVID-19 (let's not forget that much still needs to be done to achieve an effective and minimally invasive therapeutic treatment in case of infection and severe symptoms) **but also for future pandemic crises that, in a globalised world, are unfortunately entirely predictable.** But the negative effects would not stop with pandemic crises. What would happen if one day, hopefully very near, an extremely effective anti-cancer drug was discovered by a pharmaceutical company? Would patents be suspended yet again? **It is obvious that investment in cancer drug research would be drastically reduced.** I strongly believe that the US position is short-sighted in this case, and to align with it would mean thwarting efforts to build an autonomous, strategic, and resilient European pharmaceutical sector. Such a decision would strongly disincentivise private investors and would effectively undermine the European sector's ability to be a world leader in research. We must remember that the United States has contributed very marginally to the export of vaccine doses, unlike the European Union which has exported 200 million doses, as many as the US has administered to its own citizens. Suspending the patents is a very hypocritical decision. If the United States really wants to help eradicate the virus from the world, the only thing they have to do is **heavily subsidise, with public money, the production of a large number of vaccines by their pharmaceutical companies**. “Giving” the patent to these countries is a cynical way of appearing good and humanitarian, without contributing in any way to actually helping them.

# China DA

#### China is using vaccine diplomacy to cement global leadership – the plan reverses this

Purvaja **Modak 2**1, FDI Associate, “China’s Vaccine Diplomacy, the “Health Silk Road” and a Global Pledge,” Future Directions International, 7-15-2021, https://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/chinas-vaccine-diplomacy-the-health-silk-road-and-a-global-pledge/

Since late 2020, China has promised vaccines to more than 80 countries under its “Health Silk Road” initiative, an emerging diplomatic initiative to promote health co-operation. Those rollouts have faced scepticism, since the data on clinical trials have not been released for scientists to assess the efficacy of the vaccines. Critics of China’s so-called “vaccine diplomacy” do not view its efforts as an altruistic gesture. While China has indeed donated vaccines to a few countries, the majority have had to purchase their supplies, in some instances using loans offered by China to do so. China’s “vaccine diplomacy” is underpinned by geopolitical motivations. According to an April 2021 report by Think Global Health, of the 56 countries to which China pledged doses, 55 were participants in the BRI. That is China’s way of ensuring that those countries will remain indebted to Beijing and will continue to support and allow Chinese infrastructure and connectivity projects on their territories. That initiative has a secondary goal: China is now trying to give its pharmaceutical industry, which has been criticised for having low efficacy rates and poor credibility, a degree of legitimacy. China wishes to take its Sinovac and Sinopharm vaccines around the world to change those perceptions. **To achieve its geopolitical objectives and regain its global standing, China has sought to provide its vaccines to countries of almost every continent**. As the tables below demonstrate, China has managed to penetrate many countries despite suspicion about the efficacy of the vaccines and opaque data on its clinical trials. China’s COVID-19 vaccines have been shipped to more than 60 countries for emergency use, according to an official of the Chinese Commerce Ministry. It has supplied its vaccines to five countries in India’s neighbourhood, to 27 African countries, twelve countries in Western and Central Asia, twelve more in South-East Asia and the Pacific, fifteen countries in Latin America and signed agreements to supply its vaccines to over twenty more countries. On 2 June 2021, China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that China had provided ‘more than 350 million doses’ of vaccines to the international community by that date.

#### That’s necessary to solve a litany of global problems.

Shen **Yamei 18**, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. **The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced**. The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but **the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness.** Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous state **in such key areas as global economic governance and climate change**. **Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics**. **The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily**. All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other civilizations. **So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations.** Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced. China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. **Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability.** C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. **China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”**. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

#### Extinction

Robert Bailey 18, Vision of Earth contributor and computer science masters, 9-5-2018, "Why do we need global governance?," Vision of Earth, https://www.visionofearth.org/social-change/global-governance/

Global governance is necessary because humanity increasingly faces both problems and opportunities that are global in scale. Today, transnational problems such as violence and pandemics routinely reach across borders, affecting us all. At the same time, the increasingly integrated global system has also laid the necessary foundations for peace and spectacular prosperity. Effective global governance will allow us to end armed conflict, deal with new and emerging problems such as technological risks and automation, and to achieve levels of prosperity and progress never before seen.1 **The most important challenge for humanity to overcome is that of existential risks**. One way to look at the danger of an existential risk is to quantify the level of global coordination needed to deal with it. While best-shot risks, at one end of the spectrum only require that a single nation, organization or even individual (i.e., superhero) has the means and the will to save everyone, weakest-link risks, at the other end of the spectrum, are dangers that might require literally every country to take appropriate action to prevent catastrophe, with no room for failure.2 3 We’ve always been at risk of natural disaster, but with advances in our level of technology the risk we pose to ourselves as a species becomes ever greater. Nuclear weapons are a well-known risk that we still live with to this day. **The progress of technological research exposes us to new dangers such as bioengineered superbugs, nanotechnological menaces, and the risk of an out-of-control artificial intelligence with ill-intent**. Increased levels of global coordination are needed to combat many of these risks, as described in our article on the cooperation possibilities frontier. There are other problems that don’t necessarily threaten the species or even civilization as we know it, but which are holding back the development of prosperity and progress. Armed conflict, around since the dawn of history, still haunts us today. Even though wars between great powers appear to be a thing of the past, regional conflicts still account for tremendous human suffering and loss of life in parts of the world without stable governance.4 Other problems have emerged precisely because of our successes in the past. The unprecedented advancement of human wellbeing and prosperity over the past century has been based in large part on the use of fossil fuels, thus exposing us to climate change. Widespread automation, already a stressor on society, will put increased pressure on the social and economic fabric of our societies over the next few decades. Global governance can help alleviate these issues in various ways – we refer the interested reader to the very detailed work in Ruling Ourselves. Finally, global governance will increasingly be judged not only by the extent to which it prevents harm, but also by its demonstrated ability to improve human wellbeing.5 Progress has let us set our sights higher as a species, both for what we consider to be the right trajectory for humanity and for our own conduct.6 Major advances in human wellbeing can be accomplished with existing technology and modest improvements in global coordination. Effective global governance is global governance that tackles these issues better than the regional governments of the world can independently. Global governance is key to solving global problems. **Without it, we may not be able to avoid weakest-link existential risks or regulate new and dangerous technologies.** With it, we may be able to prosper as we never have before. The next step is to determine how effective global governance can be achieved.

# Case

## Adv 1

### Econ Growth Bad

#### Stopping econ growth solves extinction from eco collapse – decoupling is impossible even under perfect conditions, and transition dangers are overhyped

**Hickel 18** [Jason Hickel is an anthropologist, author, and a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. Why Growth Can’t Be Green. Foreign Policy Magazine. September 12, 2018. https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/09/12/why-growth-cant-be-green/]

Warnings about **ecological breakdown** have become ubiquitous. Over the past few years, major newspapers, including the Guardian and the New York Times, have carried alarming stories on **soil depletion**, **defo**restation, and the collapse of **fish stocks** and **insect populations**. These crises are being **driven by** global economic **growth**, and its accompanying consumption, which is **destroying the** Earth’s **biosphere** and **blowing past** key **planetary boundaries** that scientists say must be respected to avoid **triggering collapse**.

Many policymakers have responded by pushing for what has come to be called “**green growth**.” All we need to do, they argue, is invest in more efficient technology and introduce the right incentives, and we’ll be able to keep growing while simultaneously reducing our impact on the natural world, which is already at an unsustainable level. In technical terms, the goal is to achieve “**absolute decoupling**” of GDP from the total use of natural resources, according to the U.N. definition…Study after study shows the same thing. Scientists are beginning to realize that there are physical limits to how efficiently we can use resources. Sure, we might be able to produce cars and iPhones and skyscrapers more efficiently, but we can’t produce them out of thin air. We might shift the economy to services such as education and yoga, but even universities and workout studios require material inputs. Once we reach the limits of efficiency, pursuing any degree of economic growth drives resource use back up.

These problems throw the entire concept of green growth into doubt and necessitate some radical rethinking. Remember that each of the three studies used highly optimistic assumptions. We are nowhere near imposing a global carbon tax today, much less one of nearly $600 per metric ton, and resource efficiency is currently getting worse, not better. Yet the studies suggest that even if we do everything right, decoupling economic growth with resource use will remain elusive and our environmental problems will continue to worsen.

Preventing that outcome will require a whole new paradigm. High taxes and technological innovation will help, but they’re not going to be enough. The only realistic shot humanity has at averting ecological collapse is to impose hard caps on resource use, as the economist Daniel O’Neill recently proposed. Such caps, enforced by national governments or by international treaties, could ensure that we do not extract more from the land and the seas than the Earth can safely regenerate. We could also ditch GDP as an indicator of economic success and adopt a more balanced measure like the genuine progress indicator (GPI), which accounts for pollution and natural asset depletion. Using GPI would help us maximize socially good outcomes while minimizing ecologically bad ones.

But there’s no escaping the obvious conclusion. Ultimately, bringing our civilization back within planetary boundaries is going to require that we **liberate ourselves** from our **dependence on economic growth**—starting with **rich nations**. This might **sound scarier than it really is**. Ending growth doesn’t mean shutting down economic activity—it simply means that next year we can’t produce and consume more than we are doing this year. It might also mean shrinking certain sectors that are particularly damaging to our ecology and that are unnecessary for human flourishing, such as advertising, commuting, and single-use products.

But ending growth doesn’t mean that living standards need to take a hit. Our planet provides more than enough for all of us; the problem is that its resources are not equally distributed. We can improve people’s lives right now simply by sharing what we already have more fairly, rather than plundering the Earth for more. Maybe this means better public services. Maybe it means basic income. Maybe it means a shorter working week that allows us to scale down production while still delivering full employment. Policies such as these—and countless others—will be **crucial** to not only **surviving the 21st century** but also flourishing in it.

#### Warming causes extinction – a confluence of nonlinear and unpredictable effects will make human and natural systems inhospitable while increasing escalatory conflicts – even if the impacts are far off, only drastic action now solves

**Melton 19** [Michelle Melton is a 3L at Harvard Law School. Before law school, she was an associate fellow in the Energy and National Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, where she focused on climate policy. Climate Change and National Security, Part II: How Big a Threat is the Climate? January 7, 2019. https://www.lawfareblog.com/climate-change-and-national-security-part-ii-how-big-threat-climate]

At least until 2050, and possibly for decades after, climate change will remain a **creeping threat** that will **exacerbate and amplify** existing, **structural** global **inequalities**. While the developed world will be negatively affected by climate change through 2050, the consequences of climate change will be felt most acutely in the developing world. The national security threats posed by climate change to 2050 are likely to differ in degree, not kind, from the kinds of threats already posed by climate change. For the next few decades, climate change will **exacerbate humanitarian crises**—some of which will result in the deployment of **military personnel**, as well as material and financial assistance. It will also **aggravate** natural **resource constraints**, potentially contributing to political and economic **conflict** over **water**, **food** and **energy**.

The question for the next 30 years is not “can humanity survive as a species with 1.5°C or 2°C of warming,” but, “how much will the existing disparities between the developed and developing world widen, and how long (and how successfully) can these widening political/economic disparities be sustained?” The urgency of the climate threat in the next few decades will depend, to a large degree, on whether and how much the U.S. government perceives a widening of these global inequities as a threat to U.S. national security.

By contrast, if emissions continue to **creep upward** (or if they do not decline rapidly), by 2100 climate-related national security threats could be **existential**. The question for the next hundred years is not, “are disparities politically and economically manageable?” but, “can the **global order**, premised on the **nation-state system**, itself based on territorial sovereignty, **survive** in a world in which **substantial swathes of territory** are potentially **uninhabitable**?”

National Security Consequences of Climate Change to 2050

Scientists can predict the consequences of climate change to 2050 with some measure of certainty. (Beyond that date, the pace and magnitude of climate change—and therefore, the national security threat posed by it—depend heavily on the level of emissions in the coming years, as I have explained.) There is relative agreement across modeled climate scenarios that the world will likely warm, on average, at least 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels by about 2050—but perhaps as soon as 2030. This level of warming is likely to occur even if the world succeeds in dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as even the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report implicitly admits. In other words, a certain amount of additional warming—at least 1.5°C, and probably more than that—is presumptively unavoidable.

Looking ahead to 2050, it can be said with relative confidence that the national security consequences of climate change will vary in degree, not in kind, from the national security threats already facing the United States. This is hardly good news. Even **small differences** in global average **temperatures** result in **significant environmental changes**, with attendant **social**, **economic** and **political consequences**. By 2050, climate change will **wreak increasing havoc** on **human** and **natural systems**—predominantly, but not exclusively, in the developing world—with attenuated but **profound consequences** for **national security**…Within the next few decades, the most likely scenario involves manageable, but costly, consequences on infrastructure, food security and natural disasters, which will be borne primarily by the world’s most impoverished citizens and the members of the military who provide them with humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. But **while** the head-turning national security **impacts** of climate change are **probably** several **decades away**, the **nature of the threat** is such that **waiting until** these **changes manifest** is **not a viable option**. By the time the climate consequences are severe enough to compel action, there is likely to be little that can be done on human timescales to undo the changes to **environmental systems** and the **human societies dependent upon them**.

#### 2. doesn’t solve for equal access – jecker states that people need to expand manufacturing which the aff doesn’t do only the cp does.

## Adv 2

#### WTO can’t solve – 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.

### China Turn

#### Credible international trade undermines Chinese centralized involvement in the economy—hurts growth.

**Zeng** 2/7/**13** (Ka, Professor of Political Science at University of Arkansas and co-author, most recently, of: Greening China: The Benefits of Trade and Foreign Direct Investment, “China, America and the WTO”, http://thediplomat.com/2013/02/china-america-and-the-wto/)

Growing tensions in U.S.-China trade relations generated by the rapid expansion of Chinese exports to the U.S. have led both countries to frequently resort to the World Trade Organization (WTO)’s dispute settlement mechanism (**DSM**).  Noticeably, both Washington and Beijing seem to be more frequently using the DSM to target issues of critical concern to their respective domestic constituencies. While the U.S.’ WTO trade disputes against China tend to target Chinese industrial policy and challenge the dominance of **state-owned enterprises** (SOEs), cases involving antidumping duties (ADs) and countervailing duties (CVDs) have taken up a disproportionate share of China’s WTO disputes against the United States. Since its WTO accession, China has been the target of 29 WTO disputes initiated by its trading partners, with the United States accounting for the lion’s share of these cases. The Chinese measures being challenged by the United States include semiconductors, auto parts, intellectual property rights, trading rights and distribution services for certain products, grants and loans and, more recently, wind power equipment, renewable energy, and access to resources. Many of these cases involve the Chinese government supporting domestic enterprises through tariffs, subsidies, grants, refunds, and exemptions from taxes that either provided an unfair advantage to Chinese exporters, or restricted foreign market access in China. Washington's focus on Chinese industrial policy and the Chinese government’s continued support for domestic enterprises needs to be viewed

#### 3. winning solvency means they cant solve for this adv – meyer 21 says they need a meaningful solution – that is not what the aff is going to do

## Solvency

#### Double bind – what constitutes a novel pandemic will change by the country so either they interpret it to be vague then it links to the da bc they will always have IP removed or it won’t mean anything then they can’t solve the plan

#### At jecker and atuire: card proves that them wanting the waiver has done nothing to get it passed or help it in any way.

#### WTO already did the AFF – Doha Declaration nullifies medical patents for developing countries struggling with pricing

#### Plan not prereq – the card never mentions and it will probably take the funding needed away from it to do the plan. At best it is helping it but removing IP protections does not trigger the transfer hub to start

#### Doesn’t solve – aff doesn’t have direct government support which means that can’t properly combat, lindsey 21 doesn’t list any impact