# 1NC

## Off

### 1NC – T

#### 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

#### Independently, extra t is a voting issue – they defend funding and enforcement in the plan, which aren’t words that are in the topic. That skirts the core question of the resolution, which doesn’t ask if COVID vaccines are good/bad but rather would waiving IP be able to solve COVID because of production and funding disparities, which they fiat out of. Extra t is a voting issue since it allows them to add infinite planks to the plan that aren’t predictable, ruining fairness and clash.

#### 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.

### 1NC – CP

#### CP: The member nations of the European Union should:

#### substantially increase COVID vaccine production to meet the global demand

#### sign bilateral intellectual property licensing contracts with low and middle-income countries to share vaccines

#### donate all necessary vaccines at no cost to low and middle-income nations unable to license intellectual property rights

#### That solves – the EU can ramp up production

Sam Fleming 21, Brussels Bureau Chief, “EU to back expansion of vaccine production capacity in Africa,” Financial Times, 5-17-2021, https://www.ft.com/content/d2a47c7e-0b00-4e31-92ab-cd3ff0b9070b

The EU plans to throw its weight behind a push to expand vaccine manufacturing in Africa after the coronavirus pandemic has underscored a need to broaden the production of life saving jabs. Ursula von der Leyen, European Commission president, is expected to back proposals to establish strategic manufacturing hubs in African countries at a global health summit in Rome on Friday, officials said. The EU move comes as the coronavirus crisis adds urgency to longstanding efforts to cut African countries’ dependence on imports of drugs to combat deadly diseases that ravage the continent. The bloc is also keen to promote initiatives to increase international vaccine production, which it argues is a better way to improve poor nations’ access to Covid-19 vaccines than the patent waivers proposed by the US this month. The EU’s contribution could include both direct EU aid and funding from national development agencies and the European Investment Bank, European officials said. Alongside the funding, which could extend into the hundreds of millions of euros, Brussels wants to help build up regulatory capacity, including the establishment of the African Medicines Agency — a continent wide drug regulator that was conceived in 2014 but has yet to get off the ground. Commission officials have also held preliminary talks about the plans with pharmaceutical industry representatives, people familiar with the matter said. The European efforts are designed to mesh with an African Union goal set in April for up to 60 per cent of Africa’s routine vaccine needs to be supplied from within the continent by 2040, up from just 1 per cent now. Given the long timeframes involved in creating manufacturing capacity, the changes would be aimed at dealing with possible future pandemics and perennial threats such as yellow fever.

#### Eliminating IPR for vaccines gives China a massive competitive edge on innovation broadly – tanks pharma, undermines pandemic response, and tech leadership – BUT domestic production and distribution solves

Okutsu & Sharma 21 [Akane, staff writer for Nikkei International, and Kiran, LPC, The College of Law, Guildford, 1997 BA (Hons), Law, Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge University, 1996. “Vaccine Patent Waiver: COVID Stopper or Innovation Killer?” https://asia.nikkei.com/Spotlight/Coronavirus/COVID-vaccines/Vaccine-patent-waiver-COVID-stopper-or-innovation-killer]

Western pharmaceutical companies are telling U.S. officials that they fear exposing their technologies to China, the Financial Times reported. The still-under-wraps expertise could be used not only for COVID-19 shots but other vaccines and therapeutics, stripping the companies of their competitive edge.

Pfizer and Moderna have produced what are called messenger RNA vaccines, a new technology that does not contain live virus and instead instructs cells to produce a protein found in the coronavirus, creating immunity. China's vaccine producers, meanwhile, have relied on conventional methods using weakened virus.

The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America released a statement that the U.S. stance on the waiver means "handing over American innovations to countries looking to undermine our leadership in biomedical discovery."

But some say the waiver would not be an automatic win for China.

One reason is that its pharmaceutical companies would not be immune if prices fall. "There would be competitive pressure and a negative impact on pharmaceutical companies in and outside of the U.S." including China, said Banri Ito, professor at Japan's Aoyama Gakuin University.

The stock market seems to agree. Chinese vaccine makers including CanSino Biologics and Shanghai Fosun Pharmaceutical Group fell after the U.S. announcement, just like the shares of Pfizer and Moderna.

China's state media has been lukewarm toward the U.S. move, calling it a "political tactic."

How would it affect the pharmaceutical industry over the long term?

One major concern is a loss of incentives for costly research and development.

Pharmaceutical research has a low success rate and requires enormous sums of money. Without the profits generated from intellectual property rights, "there would be no new drugs," as companies would have no hope of recouping their investments, a JPMA spokesperson said.

Ito said this raises "concerns about how to respond to future pandemics." Speedy vaccine development, he said, is driven in part by the chance to corner the market.

If the patents are to be waived, Ito suggested other steps to spur innovation will be needed, such as establishing a fund to buy such knowledge. But setting prices and deciding how to deal with the technical secrets would be no easy task.

Ito said a quicker solution might be for Group of Seven countries to "consider policies to expand production capacity and strengthen the [World Health Organization's] COVAX initiative to purchase and distribute vaccines to developing countries."

#### Biopharma innovation is key to overall competitiveness – US still has a razor thin lead but IP is uniquely key

Ezell 20 [Stephen Ezell, Director of Global Innovation Policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation (ITIF). "Ensuring U.S. Biopharmaceutical Competitiveness." 7/16/20. https://itif.org/publications/2020/07/16/ensuring-us-biopharmaceutical-competitiveness]

Nations are competing for increased market share in a wide array of advanced-innovation industries, understanding that these industries are the key to competitiveness, national security, and good jobs. China’s “Made in China 2025” strategy is perhaps the most visible of these efforts, but by no means the only one.

Many nations, including China, have targeted the biopharmaceuticals industry—an industry which the United States has long led—especially in drug innovation. One result has been that over the last decade U.S. biopharmaceutical manufacturing value-added output has fallen by almost one-third, as the U.S. trade deficit in drugs and inputs has increased. Fortunately, America still leads in innovation and drug development, in large part due to effective life-science policies, including significant federal investment in life-sciences basic research, robust intellectual property (IP) protections, effective technology transfer policies, investment incentives, and, importantly, drug pricing policies that enable companies to invest in high-risk drug development.

But if the story of the past decline, and even loss, of other critical U.S. industries provides any guide, loss of U.S. production will ultimately lead to the loss of innovation capabilities as well. It is not enough for the United States to lead in drug development, it must also at least hold its own in drug production. This is especially true given the coming challenge from China, which intends to dominate the global drug industry, at all phases, from innovation to production to marketing.

Now is not the time for free-market complacency, hoping that America’s entrepreneurial spirit and rule of law will somehow suffice (the United States didn’t gain its biopharma lead from a laissez faire approach, and it certainly won’t keep its lead with it alone). Nor is it the time for drug populism, a political movement that both sides of the aisle, but especially progressives, have unfortunately embraced. Drug populism and its accompanying policies of weaker IP protections and draconian drug price controls would likely result in cheaper drugs. But there should be no confusion that it will lead to a hollowing out of U.S. capabilities, not just in production but also in innovation (and, not to mention, fewer new lifesaving drugs). If the United States is serious about competitiveness overall, and competitiveness in the biopharma sector specifically, an industry that the United States still has strong capabilities in—unlike the telecom equipment or flat-panel display industries, to name just two—then it’s time for Washington to articulate and embrace a robust national biopharmaceutical competitiveness strategy.

#### Chinese tech leadership causes nuke war

Kroenig & Gopalaswamy 18, \*Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council. \*\*Director of the South Asia Center at the Atlantic Council. He holds a PhD in mechanical engineering with a specialization in numerical acoustics from Trinity College, Dublin. (Matthew & Bharath, 11-12-2018, "Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/)

Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict.

International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage.

You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power.

For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine.

Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”

If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war.

If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.

Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation.

This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly.

### 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

### 1NC – DA

#### **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.”

## Case

### 1NC – Underview

#### They get 1AR theory but it’s not always drop the debater – evaluate it on a case by casis basis to avoid frivolous theory shells that ruin substance and education. Topicality comes before 1AR theory – the aff was untopical first which forced us to read positions that might be abusive

### 1NC – COVID

#### We’ll concede extinction first – that means none of their arguments about morality or the COVAX model being steeped in whiteness is offense since it doesn’t cause extinction. Independently, the plan itself can’t solve for those things so don’t let them weigh it.

#### 1] 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.

#### 2] MRNA expert shortages.

Garde et al 21 [Damian Garde (National Biotech Reporter), Helen Branswell (Senior Writer, Infectious Disease)Matthew Herper (Senior Writer, Medicine, Editorial Director of Events), 5/6/21, Waiver of patent rights on Covid-19 vaccines, in near term, may be more symbolic than substantive, <https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/06/waiver-of-patent-rights-on-covid-19-vaccines-in-near-term-may-be-more-symbolic-than-substantive/>] Justin

In October, Moderna vowed not to enforce its Covid-19-related patents for the duration of the pandemic, opening the door for manufacturers that might want to copy its vaccine. But to date, it’s unclear whether anyone has, despite the vaccine’s demonstrated efficacy and the worldwide demand for doses.

That underscores the drug industry’s case that patents are just one facet of the complex process of producing vaccines.

“There are currently no generic vaccines primarily because there are hundreds of process steps involved in the manufacturing of vaccines, and thousands of check points for testing to assure the quality and consistency of manufacturing. One may transfer the IP, but the transfer of skills is not that simple,” said Norman Baylor, who formerly headed the Food and Drug Administration’s Office of Vaccines Research and Review, and who is now president of Biologics Consulting.

While there are factories around the world that can reliably produce generic Lipitor, vaccines like the ones from Pfizer and Moderna — using messenger RNA technology — require skilled expertise that even existing manufacturers are having trouble sourcing.

“In such a setting, imagining that someone will have staff who can create a new site or refurbish or reconfigure an existing site to make mRNA [vaccine] is highly, highly unlikely,” Yadav said.

#### 3] The aff can’t solve – but creates low-quality vaccines and discourages investment in critical areas.

CPIP 21 [Center for Intellectual Property x Innovation Policy; “A View from Both Sides: COVID-19, the TRIPS Waiver, IP Rights, and How to Increase the Supply of Vaccines,” Antonin Scalia Law School / George Mason University; 6/22/21; <https://cip2.gmu.edu/2021/06/22/a-view-from-both-sides-covid-19-the-trips-waiver-ip-rights-and-how-to-increase-the-supply-of-vaccines/>] Justin

A waiver on patent rights, even with the corresponding trade secrets, can only give permission to manufacture. But Eva Bishwal of Fidus Law Chambers writes that the real problems in India “are state inaction, dearth of raw materials and low production capacity.”

According to Patrick Kilbride of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Global Innovation Policy Center, and as cited in Pharmaceutical Technology, “[p]roposals to waive intellectual property rights are misguided and a distraction from the real work of reinforcing supply chains and assisting countries to procure, distribute and administer vaccines to billions of the world’s citizens.”

Low-quality vaccines could do more harm than good

Former USPTO Director Andrei Iancu voiced concern recently at a World IP Day event, asking, “if we waive IP rights, and exclude the original manufacturers, how are we going to control the quality of the vaccines that go into people’s arms? How are we going to control for the fake vaccines? Just last week we saw fake Pfizer vaccines.” And as Philip Thompson points out for IPWatchdog, when investigators are forced to “determine if adverse events or sub-par effectiveness originate from ‘real’ vaccines or fake doses, we should expect global production starts and stops to become much more frequent.”

It will discourage investment in the most critical areas

Pharmaceutical developers invest unfathomable amounts of money into bringing drugs to market. The path to success is long, expensive, and highly uncertain. But what is certain is that successful drugs can yield a profit that covers the loss from failures. Now critics are deeply worried that this waiver will skew future cost-benefit analyses against important classes of medicine. All other things being equal, a developer has a better chance at a positive return by investing in drugs that pose no risk of seizure during a global emergency. As Amanda Glassman of the Center for Global Development writes, the waiver sends the wrong message to innovators and investors: “don’t bother attacking the most important global problems; instead, throw your investment dollars at the next treatment for erectile disfunction, which will surely earn you a steady return with far less agita.” The scramble amongst pharmaceutical giants to develop a vaccine was an all-out race, with good reason, and that’s exactly how it should be. If those companies believe that forfeiture is waiting at the finish line next time around, we might see fewer contestants.

#### 4] Vaccine diplomacy fails---every empirical example shows no impact

Ilan **Kelman 14,** Reader in Risk, Resilience and Global Health at University College London, Senior Research Fellow at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Thematic Director for Global Environmental Sustainability at the UCL Institute of Global Governance, “Does Disaster Diplomacy Improve Inter-State Relations?”, e-International Relations, 11-4, http://www.e-ir.info/2014/11/04/does-disaster-diplomacy-improve-inter-state-relations/

Does Disaster Diplomacy Work? Disasters place human suffering on display—of friends and enemies alike. As part of the common human spirit, we often hope that, no matter who is troubled by calamity, we would be moved to help and that help would be graciously accepted. That process turns out to be tricky in international politics, when countries experience cataclysms and multilateral relations determine who provides and who accepts humanitarian aid. Research into ‘disaster diplomacy’ investigates this topic. Disaster diplomacy investigates how and why disaster-related activities do and do not influence conflict and cooperation (Kelman, 2012). The key phrase is ‘disaster-related activities’ covering (i) pre-disaster efforts including prevention, preparedness, planning, and damage mitigation, and (ii) post-disaster actions including response, reconstruction, and recovery. Disaster diplomacy case studies are not just about what happens when a volcano erupts in a war zone (Klimesova, 2011) or when enemies consider sending and accepting humanitarian aid (Akcinaroglu et al., 2011). They also examine the situation before a disaster manifests, such as how a flood warning system could potentially bring together communities (Ahmad and Ahmed, 2003) or how **vaccination campaigns** might generate lasting ceasefires (Hotez, 2010). Based on the **empirical evidence** of case studies, the overall conclusion from disaster diplomacy is that disaster-related activities do **not** create new initiatives in achieving peace or reducing conflict, but a diplomatic process with pre-existing conditions can be catalysed or supported (Kelman, 2012). If that catalysis occurs, then the disaster-related activities influence diplomacy in the short-term, but not in the long-term. In the short-term, over weeks and months, all forms of disaster-related activities have the potential to affect diplomacy, such as by spurring it on or by providing a space in which peace efforts can be pursued. For that to occur, a pre-existing basis must exist for the reconciliation. This could be ongoing negotiations, formal or informal cultural connections, or trade links. **Even over the short-term**, disaster diplomacy is not necessarily successful, since disaster-related activities can sometimes foment conflict and reduce diplomatic opportunities—or have **no impact at all** on peace and conflict. Irrespective of what happens over the short-term, over longer time periods, non-disaster factors have a **more significant impact** on diplomacy than disaster-related activities. Examples of non-disaster factors are leadership changes, **mutual distrust**, belief that an **historical grievance** should supersede current humanitarian considerations, or a desire for conflict due to the advantages gained from it. These conclusions have been **corroborated through case studies** covering inter-state conflict, intra-state conflict, disaster risk reduction, disaster response, bilateral relations, and multilateral relations. The analysis and conclusions have been extended to sub-national case studies, including para-diplomacy (international relations conducted by non-sovereign jurisdictions) and non-state-level relations and conflicts. Thus far, the evidence shows that disaster diplomacy has the potential (not inevitability) for improving inter-state, and other, relations only in the short-term and only if a non-disaster-related pre-existing basis is available. Case Study 1: The 26 December 2004 Earthquake and Tsunami On 26 December 2004, a large-magnitude, shallow earthquake shook Aceh, Indonesia, causing tsunamis which raced across the Indian Ocean, inundating communities in more than a dozen countries around Asia and Africa. The two countries with the highest death tolls, Indonesia and Sri Lanka, were each embroiled in long-standing, internal political conflicts which had been particularly violent over the previous three decades. Aceh, Indonesia, and eastern Sri Lanka were particularly badly hit by the tsunami and were also centres for the violence. Consequently, clear disaster diplomacy opportunities emerged. Both areas sorely needed major efforts at post-conflict and post-tsunami reconstruction, neither of which could be completed by the local or national authorities alone. With a large international presence, with the world watching as survivors were assisted, and with the need for extensive efforts to clean up and rebuild from the waves and the wounds, would this disaster bring the warring parties together and reconstruct a society alongside the infrastructure? Amidst the international humanitarian response, the Indonesian government and militants in Aceh negotiated for and eventually signed a peace deal on 15 August 2005. Despite violence flaring on occasion and, still ten years after, many aspects of the post-tsunami and post-conflict reconstruction being unresolved or incomplete, the peace is lasting in Aceh. Surely this is a classic case of disaster diplomacy succeeding? The answer is ‘no’ because negotiations had started between the two parties on 24 December 2004, just 48 hours before the earthquake and tsunami (Gaillard et al., 2008). There is no doubt that the catastrophe provided a diplomatic space in which peace could succeed if the parties involved sought that. We will never know if the ongoing negotiations would have succeeded in the absence of a disaster, as many previous efforts had failed. But when the shaking and waves struck Aceh, the conflicting parties were already in the process of reducing conflict and aiming for long-term peace. Consequently, the disaster could be used as an excuse to achieve their long-term goal of an agreement if they wanted it—and that happened (see also Enia, 2008; Klimesova, 2011; Le Billon and Waizenegger, 2007). Simultaneously in Sri Lanka, distribution of the humanitarian aid, access to areas in the north and east of the country which were not under government control, and perceptions that people affected in the south were not being treated fairly led to a spiralling of the violent and non-violent conflict. Deals were reached and then broken or overturned. In November 2005, Sri Lanka elected a hard-line president who campaigned on pursuing military means for ending the conflict. That was achieved in 2009, when Sri Lanka’s military could finally declare that they had ended the armed struggle against Colombo. An uneasy peace continues in Sri Lanka. Why did disaster diplomacy never take off in Sri Lanka? The major parties involved had other reasons for not seeking peace, with examples being the personal power given by continuing the conflict, concern that dealing with the violent parties in the north and east would legitimise them, and mistrust of the other side (see also Beardsley and McQuinn, 2009; Hyndman, 2011; Wickremesinghe, 2006). These aspects dominated efforts at conflict resolution through disaster response and further hindered distribution of post-tsunami aid. Case Study 2: Low-lying Islands under Climate Change Contemporary climate change is causing major impacts for communities of low-lying island atolls such as in Papua New Guinea, the Maldives, and Tuvalu. While no certainty exists of island disappearance or islander evacuation (Kelman, 2014; Webb and Kench, 2010), some communities, such as on the Carteret Islands of Papua New Guinea, have been forced to move due to climate change (Connell, 1997). This situation has led to a discourse of so-called ‘climate refugees’ who are said to be waiting in huge hordes to invade other countries, leading to massive ‘climate conflict’—a discourse which is politically constructed and so far unsupported by empirical evidence (Hartmann, 2010; Kelman, 2014). Nonetheless, the possibility remains that numerous island communities might need to leave due to climate change impacts, ranging from lack of freshwater and diminishing food supplies to coral reef deaths and sea-level rise. In planning for potential movement, negotiating with other countries is necessary regarding who pays for moving, where to resettle, and how to govern the migrants. Given the global political ramifications of answering these questions and the depth to which identities, cultures, and countries are being affected, it would seem to have strong potential for bringing countries together to seek a common good from the global challenge of climate change to which all of humanity has contributed. Yet climate change diplomacy has not yet succeeded. The climate change negotiations under United Nations auspices—the annual United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties—is wracked by major disagreements and political conflict. So far, a lasting, legally binding agreement on stemming climate change causes and dealing with its consequences has not emerged, despite twenty years of meetings. Island governments and islanders, frustrated by the lack of progress and worried about the increasingly visible impacts of climate change on their communities and countries, are instead pursuing initiatives of their own, rather than waiting for the world to come together over climate change. One such initiative is Many Strong Voices, which is about developing and implementing collaborative and strategic actions on climate change for the Arctic and small island developing states (SIDS). Recognising the need to act for themselves irrespective of the global political conflict over dealing with climate change, the Arctic and SIDS peoples are pursuing climate change adaptation (one subset of disaster risk reduction) for themselves on their own terms, especially seeking their own choices and pathways for potential migration (Kelman, 2010; McNamara and Gibson, 2009). That is difficult, given their small populations and often limited resources, meaning that they are using their ‘Many Strong Voices’ to seek external support—which so far remains limited. This case study illustrates the disaster diplomacy pattern. Despite a long lead-time and a global political mechanism for addressing climate change, agreement has thus far not been reached, forcing those affected to address disaster risk reduction on their own. Even with a pre-existing basis in the form a negotiating forum, trying to prevent disaster emerging from the hazard driver of climate change has not yet catalysed climate change diplomacy. The Disaster Diplomacy Process The disaster diplomacy analyses demonstrate that, fundamentally, disaster-related activities are **not a high political priority**. **Perceived historic wrongs** and **domestic politics** can **outweigh** accepting assistance, as shown by Cuba’s refusal to accept American aid during the 1998 drought and the USA’s refusal to accept Cuba’s, Venezuela’s, and Iran’s offers of aid following Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Gaining and retaining political power can supersede peace, demonstrated by **Ethiopia’s and Eritrea’s intransigence** to link drought relief to conflict resolution from 1998-2000. Such examples emerge from national governments, mainly decisions made by Heads of State, Heads of Government, and their administrations. There might yet be hope for disaster diplomacy when considering diplomacy tracks beyond government-to-government relations. Glantz (2000) details the long history of Cuban and American weather and climate scientists collaborating while Fidel Castro led Cuba. These collaborations fed into disaster risk reduction and occurred most likely because the governments were not aware of them. Ker-Lindsay (2007) explains how the media and vociferous grassroots expectations fuelled Greece-Turkey earthquake diplomacy after lethal tremors struck each country three weeks apart in 1999. He then examines how the push from below nearly derailed the careful, measured approaches towards rapprochement which the elites in each country had been enacting before the disasters. The complex web of interactions involving all disaster and diplomacy activities means that any linear analysis of correlations and connections is likely to be **flawed**. A given starting point for analysing disaster diplomacy does not necessarily give a specific, predictable outcome for a case study. Given the importance of pre-existing conditions in determining whether or not disaster diplomacy becomes even a short-term catalyst, it is hard to determine where the starting point for analysis should be. Consequently, disaster diplomacy is best viewed as a long-running process with multiple parties interacting, rather than as a snapshot phenomenon which either works or does not work. Disaster-related activities are indeed one influence amongst many on all forms of diplomacy, but trade, resource management, sports, culture, personalities, domestic politics, and non-domestic politics are also major influences. The diplomacy tracks to emphasise are choices, deliberate or inadvertent, by all parties, including politicians, civil servants, the media, business leaders, movie and sports stars, and grassroots movements (amongst others). Similarly, the disaster-related activities to pursue are choices. Combining disaster-related and diplomatic-related activities therefore becomes a complex combination of choices and actions by a complex combination of parties. If someone or a group decides that disaster diplomacy is desirable, then actively lobbying for, supporting, and implementing it are pathways to follow. If someone or a group decides that disaster diplomacy is not desirable, then actively lobbying against it and undermining efforts for it are pathways to follow. Attempting to influence disaster diplomacy pathways could backfire. A leader, upon being informed about how to implement disaster diplomacy, could decide that linking disaster-related activities and conflict resolution is not wanted and, consequently, might stop disaster risk reduction programmes or avoid humanitarian relief. Open attempts at reconciliation which are rebuffed by the other side would prove to be a political nightmare. Openly blocking disaster diplomacy could polarise others who then become determined to make it succeed. An overarching challenge is that disaster diplomacy might be attractive because it appears to be a quick fix for solving conflict. It is **naïve** to expect that decades or centuries of differences could be overcome overnight, simply because a tornado destroyed a town or a multinational building code was promulgated. In contrast, it is a truism that successfully dealing with both disaster and diplomacy are long-term processes, requiring thoughtful, careful steps, whilst ensuring that all key parties continue to be on board to support the long-term goals and to serve mutual interests—at least, in theory. In practice, too much of diplomacy and disaster-related activities is done reactively with limited planning—which could mean that a disaster diplomacy case study might eventually succeed through luck. Because, in the end, the scientific truism holds that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. **No successful examples** of new diplomacy based only on disaster-related activities have yet been identified, but many historical archives have not been explored while future disaster risk reduction or disasters could overturn the current conclusions. Nonetheless, for the moment, the evidence available shows not only that disaster diplomacy is **not an effective way** for improving inter-state relations, but also that disaster diplomacy should not be relied on to be effective for improving any relations over the long term.

**5] No impact – their Diamandis card explicitly says that the next pandemic could cause extinction, not COVID – it’s also empirically disproven since humans were able to adapt and resist it**

**6] Disease can’t cause extinction – applies to COVID**

Dr. Toby **Ord 20**, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten **humanity**’s future?10

The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11

When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox.

During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13

Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined.

Yet even events like these **fall short** of being a threat to **humanity**’s longterm potential.15

[FOONOTE]

In addition to this **historical** evidence, there are some **deep**er **biological** observations and theories **suggest**ing that **pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction** of their hosts. These include the **empirical anti-correlation** between **infectiousness** and **lethality**, the **extreme rarity** of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed **tendency** of pandemics to **become less virulent** as they progress and the theory of **optimal virulence**. However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts.

[END FOOTNOTE]

In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but **recover**. The regional 25 to **50 percent** death rate was **not enough** to **precipitate a continent-wide collapse** of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is **likely to make it through** future events with similar death rates, **even if** they were **global** in scale.

The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16

It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the **fossil record** argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above **0.1 percent per century** is **incompatible** with the **evidence** of **how long** humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk.

### 1NC – Nationalism

#### Nonunique – would’ve escalated under Trump, but Biden brought nationalist tensions down

#### No impact to nationalism and tons of alt causes

* Economics make it inevitable, but decline empowers leftists that prevent escalation
* Growing social safety nets check
* Decline makes people more conservative, and decreases propensity for conflict

Huber 20 [Rose, Princeton School of Public and International Affairs, “Polarization Increases with Economic Decline, Becoming ~~Cripplingly~~ Contagious” https://spia.princeton.edu/news/polarization-increases-economic-decline-becoming-cripplingly-contagious]

A model developed by a team of researchers — including Nolan McCarty of Princeton University — shows how group polarization, rising inequality, and economic decline may be strongly connected.

The model develops a theory that group polarization tends to soar in times of economic duress and rising inequality. Yet, even after financial conditions improve, these divisions may remain deeply rooted.

This is why strengthened social safety nets are needed to help minimize conflict across social, ethnic, and racial groups, the researchers argue in Science Advances.

“Times arise when national unity is needed, like we’re seeing now with Covid-19, but we shouldn’t wait for a public health crisis or war to bring people together. Policymakers and those in government should act now by investing in and protecting social safety nets that can prevent widening social and political divisions,” said McCarty, who is the Susan Dod Brown Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at the Princeton School of Public and International Affairs.

McCarty worked on the model with Alexander Stewart of the University of Houston and Joanna Bryson of the Hertie School in Berlin, Germany. Using models of cultural evolution and evolutionary game theory, the team designed their model to examine people’s willingness to interact with people outside their own social group.

The model is based on a few assumptions — the first being that an individual’s economic success is tied to interactions with others and the performance of the underlying economy. They also assume that people tend to mimic the behavior of seemingly “successful” people so that social behaviors can spread through the public.

Lastly they assume that interactions within social in-group behavior is generally less risky with lower rewards while interactions with out-group members are more risky, but entail greater upside. This means that when economic conditions become more challenging, people will tend to prefer the safe bet of interacting with their own kind and avoid interactions with outsiders. As such behavior is mimicked, the interactions across groups declines precipitously.

The model may be helpful in explaining political trends seen around the world. First, the model supports theories arguing that economic shocks embolden those far-right movements predicated on vilifying social out-groups. For example, the Great Depression and Global Financial Crisis both led to increased support for right-wing populists in a number of countries including the United States and the United Kingdom.

When it comes to inequality, most models suggest that a significant wealth gap tends to empower those on the left, as they will seek income redistribution. The researchers’ new model doesn’t necessarily show such a shift, but instead a general move away from interactions across social identity groups. Since cross-group interactions are economically valuable, society gets poorer.

“Rather than continue the unproductive debate over whether ‘economic anxiety’ or group conflict is most responsible for our deeply divided politics, scholars should spend more effort considering the debilitating feedback between economics and identity,” said McCarty.

#### No impact to russia war or escalation

Trenin 18 [Dmitri Trenin is director of the Carnegie Moscow Center. Fears of World War III are overblown. July 20, 2018. https://www.politico.eu/article/donald-trump-vladimir-putin-nato-crimea-fears-of-world-war-iii-are-overblown/]

Europeans fretted about the end of NATO. But seen from Moscow, the military alliance still appears to be very much alive. Trump's harsh words to his allies on spending haven't changed that. Russia is all too aware that the alliance is focused on its eastern flank, and not only rhetorically. Since it rediscovered Russia as a threat in 2014, there have been new deployments, a higher degree of mobility, and more military exercises along the Russian border, from the Barents to the Black Seas. Hardly a boon for Russia.

It was clear at last week's NATO summit that allies agree on the need to upgrade the bloc’s military efforts. Germany, Italy, France, the U.S. — they all agree members’ defense spending should go up. Whether by 2 percent of GDP as agreed in Wales, or by 4 percent as now demanded by Trump, is, of course, important. However, with Russia’s GDP often likened to that of Spain, or the state of New York, either figure is considered significant in Moscow, given that the money will be spent with Russia in mind.

NATO allies also worry about Trump’s comment this week that it is problematic for the U.S. to come to the defense of smaller NATO allies such as Montenegro. But let’s not forget that at the height of the Cold War it was never 100 percent certain what the U.S. would do in case of an attack on West Germany. Former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt would not have asked for U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe in the 1970s had he had full confidence in NATO's largest member. Nor is NATO enlargement off the table completely. Macedonia has just crossed a major hurdle in its push for membership.

Predictions that Trump would recognize Crimea at the Helsinki meeting were also overblown. There was never any question of the U.S. accepting Crimea’s status as part of Russia, or Washington leaning on Kiev to fulfill its side of the Minsk II accords. In Helsinki, Trump and Putin simply acknowledged the issue, and moved on. The U.S. continues to support both Ukraine and Georgia in their conflicts with Russia and to promote their eventual membership in NATO, which most in the West privately regard as increasingly dangerous.

NATO is still very much exerting pressure on Russia. It's considered more of an annoyance than an immediate threat in Moscow, but also keeps the country in permanent "war mode" vis-à-vis the U.S. Because Moscow is focused on Washington, this means Europeans usually get a pass.

As for Russia’s own intentions, two things are clear. There is no interest in Moscow in attacking the Baltic states or Poland. These countries are as safe now as they were before 2014. Suggestions otherwise simply point to the deep wounds in both nations' psyche, which will not be healed for many decades.

Should Ukraine's leaders decide to repeat Mikheil Saakashvili’s mistake in 2008 and launch a major offensive to retake Donbas — however unlikely — the Russian response could indeed be devastating and lead to Ukraine's loss of sovereignty, as Putin recently stated. But does this mean Russia will move on Ukraine unprovoked? Most certainly not.

Putin's main concerns are largely domestic. He has an ambitious program that logically calls for more economic ties with the West. To move forward, he is looking to ease tensions with the EU and the U.S. What Putin wanted to get out of Helsinki was mainly to start a dialogue with Washington.

Those hopes are now visibly going up in smoke. It is safe to bet that Russia will continue to face the same opposition from a coalition of U.S. and EU interests.

The first détente in the hybrid war between Russia and the West was indeed nipped in the bud by Trump's behavior and the vehemence of his domestic critics. So be it.

Moscow will not capitulate, and will indeed push back. But it's not likely to take the form of an aggressive, overt military attack. Fears of new wars are far from accurate.