# neg v set col aff

## t implementation

#### A] the aff must implement a plan

#### B] Violation –

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### C. Fairness-

#### 1. Debate is a game: there’s a winner and loser, competitive norms, the tournament invite proves. Alternative impacts like activism or education can be pursued in other places. This makes fairness the most important impact

#### 2. Not defending the topic is not fair

#### A. Preparation- altering the topic gives the aff a huge edge, they can prepare for half a year on an issue that catches us by surprise. Preparation is better than thinking on your feet- research demonstrates pedagogical humility and research skills are the only portable debate training

#### B. Limits- there are a finite amount of government restrictions, but an infinite number of non topical affs. Consider this our “library disad”- not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months.

#### C. Causality- debating the resolution forces the affirmative to defend a cause and effect relationship, the state doing x results in y. Non topical affs establish their own barometer “I think x is good for me” that aren’t negateable. Only the neg promotes switch side debate.

#### D. Exclusionary rule- you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims and inflates the credence of their arguments. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### 1. Debate inevitably involves exclusions on content—making sure that those exclusions occur along reciprocal lines is necessary to foster democratic habits. This process outweighs the content of the aff.

Amanda ANDERSON 6, Andrew W. Mellon Professor for the Humanities at Brown University [*The Way We Argue Now*, Princeton University Press, p. 25-28]

Whether such a procedural approach actually helps to yield any substantive normative guidance is an issue of debate. Habermas has sought to justify communicative ethics through appeal to the principles of respect and reciprocity that he claims are inherent in linguistic practices geared toward reaching understanding. Attempting to redress the overwhelmingly negative forms of critique characteristic of both the Frankfurt School and poststructuralist traditions, he argues that the logocentrism of Western thought and the powerful instrumentality of reason are not absolute but rather constitute “a systematic foreshortening and distortion of a potential always already operative in the communicative practice of everyday life.” The potential he refers to is the potential for mutual understanding “inscribed into communication in ordinary language.” 7 Habermas acknowledges the dominance and reach of instrumental reason—his project is largely devoted to a systematic analysis of the historical conditions and social effects of that dominance—yet at the same time he wishes to retrieve an emancipatory model of communicative [END PAGE 25] reason derived from a linguistic understanding of intersubjective relations. As Benhabib argues, this form of communicative action, embodied in the highly controversial and pervasively misunderstood concept of the “ideal speech situation,” entails strong ethical assumptions, namely the principles of universal moral respect and egalitarian reciprocity (SS, 29). Habermas has famously argued that he does not believe any metaphysical grounding of such norms is possible; he insists instead that we view the normative constraints of the ideal speech community as “universal pragmatic presuppositions” of competent moral actors who have reached the postconventional stage of moral reasoning. Habermas’s theory combines a “weak transcendental argument” concerning the four types of validity claims operative in speech acts with an empirical reconstruction of psychosocial development derived from Lawrence Kohlberg. Benhabib, though she, too, appeals to socialization processes, distinguishes her position from Habermas’s “weak transcendental argument” by promoting a “historically self-conscious universalism” that locates the ethical principles of respect and reciprocity as “constituents of the moral point of view from within the normative hermeneutic horizon of modernity” (SS, 30). Benhabib’s work thus constitutes, like Habermas’s, a strong defense of specific potentialities of modernity. She differs from him in two key respects, besides the emphasis already outlined. First, she believes that Habermas’s emphasis on consensus seriously distorts his account of communicative ethics. Like others who have argued against the conflation of understanding and consensus, Benhabib champions instead a discourse model of ethics that is geared toward keeping the conversation going: When we shift the burden of the moral test in communicative ethics from consensus to the idea of an ongoing moral conversation, we begin to ask not what all would or could agree to as a result of practical discourses to be morally permissible or impermissible, but what would be allowed and perhaps even necessary from the standpoint of continuing and sustaining the practice of the moral conversation among us. The emphasis now is less on rational agreement, but more on sustaining those normative practices and moral relationships within which reasoned agreement as a way of life can flourish and continue. (SS, 38)8 [END PAGE 26] The second significant difference between Habermas and Benhabib is that Benhabib rejects Habermas’s rigid opposition between justice and the good life, an opposition that effectively relegates identity-based politics to a lower plane of moral practice, and that for Benhabib undercuts our ability to apprehend the radical particularity of the other. While she believes in the importance of self-reflexive interrogations of conventional identities and roles, she strongly opposes any ethics or politics that privileges the unencumbered or detached self over the concrete, embodied, situated self. She argues in particular against those liberal models that imagine that conversations of moral justification should take place between individuals who have bracketed their strongest cultural or social identifications and attachments. Instead she promotes what she calls an “interactive universalism”: Interactive universalism acknowledges the plurality of modes of being human, and differences among humans, without endorsing all these pluralities and differences as morally and politically valid. While agreeing that normative disputes can be settled rationally, and that fairness, reciprocity and some procedure of universalizability are constituents, that is, necessary conditions of the moral standpoint, interactive universalism regards difference as a starting point for reflection and action. In this sense, “universality” is a regulative ideal that does not deny our embodied and embedded identity, but aims at developing moral attitudes and encouraging political transformations that can yield a point of view acceptable to all. Universality is not the ideal consensus of fictitiously defined selves, but the concrete process in politics and morals of the struggle of concrete, embodied selves, striving for autonomy. (SS, 153) This passage encapsulates the core of Benhabib’s position, which attempts to mediate between universalism and particularism as traditionally understood. On the one hand, universalism’s informing principles of rational argumentation, fairness, and reciprocity adjudicate between different positions in the ethicopolitical realm, enabling crucial distinctions between those notions of the good life that promote interactive universalism and those that threaten its key principles. It insists, in other words, that there is a specifiable moral standpoint from which—to take a few prominent examples—Serbian aggression, neo-Nazism, and gay bashing can be definitively condemned. On the other hand, universalism “regards difference as a starting point.” It understands identity as “embodied and embedded” and promotes encounters with otherness so as to nurture the development of a moral attitude that will “yield a point of view acceptable to all.” Of course it must simultaneously be recognized that the “all” here cannot coherently include those who have, according to universalism’s own principles, forfeited their place as equal participants in the ethicopolitical [END PAGE 27] community. Ironically, then, Benhabib’s redefinition of universalism insists on inevitable exclusion, but not in the sense that many poststructuralist and postmodernist cultural critics do, as the hardwired effect of universalism’s false claims to inclusiveness, and as victimizing those disempowered by race, class, gender, or sexuality. Against naive conceptions of inclusiveness and plurality, which ultimately prove self-undermining in their toleration of communities, individuals, and practices that exclude others arbitrarily, interactive universalism claims that certain exclusions are not only justified, but indeed required by the principles of recognition and respect that underpin democratic institutions and practices.

#### 2. The topic, like all social movements, is an imperfect starting point. Arguments about exclusion miss the point- no beginning can ever be perfectly inclusive, the work of politics is asymptotically pursuing perfection. This is crucial to building real world activism skills

#### Aruzza, PhD Rome Tor Vergata, 17

(Cinzia, MA/PhD Philosophy, Philosophy @New School, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/02/womens-march-washington-trump-inauguration-protest/)

Every single analysis of what happened on January 21 and of what will come next should start with the insight that hundreds of thousands of people with no previous political experience and even with no previous participation in any demonstration whatsoever decided to take to the streets against the Trump administration. January 21 has created the potential for a new mass movement. Granted, it is a very fragile possibility, and the way we handle it will be crucial for its actualization or its irremediable loss. Whatever criticisms we may have of the limitations of this event should be articulated with a sense of political responsibility because the stakes are high. The main criticisms of the women’s march have emphasized that the march was too white, that it was hegemonized by liberals, and that it was an “interest group” or an “identity based” march, when what we really need is a universalistic mobilization involving everybody. The first two criticisms have a point: the march was indeed too white and it was hegemonized by liberals in mainstream media (although this liberal self-representation in the media did not exactly reflect the much more articulated composition of the marches). But the relevant question, here, is the one asked by Alicia Garza: More than a moral question, it is a practical one. Can we build a movement of millions with the people who may not grasp our black, queer, feminist, intersectional, anticapitalist, anti-imperialist ideology but know that we deserve a better life and who are willing to fight for it and win? . . . Hundreds of thousands of people are trying to figure out what it means to join a movement. If we demonstrate that to be a part of a movement, you must believe that people cannot change, that transformation is not possible, that it’s more important to be right than to be connected and interdependent, we will not win. The third criticism, on the contrary, entirely misses the point. It’s useful to recall that women’s marches have started a number of rather important revolutions like the French Revolution and the February revolution in Russia. In Western Europe students and the radicalized youth started the ’68 movement. In the United States the Civil Rights Movement began a wave of struggles that then expanded to campuses and to the 1960s antiwar movement. The connection between the events that triggered or prepared the grounds for subsequent struggles and the struggles themselves is not necessarily a politically coherent one; contingent — and often unpredictable facts — coalesced to determine the specific dynamic of each wave of movements over the course of many years. The relevant question, then, is not “when will we stop mobilizing on the basis of identity or interest groups and start the serious revolutionary mobilization?” It is rather: “Can this mobilization function as a catalyst for a larger struggle and open a new political space that can be inhabited by a number of different political and social subjectivities in solidarity with each other?” We have good reason to believe that this may be the case in the United States today. Indeed, women’s marches around the country have already worked as a catalyst for the convergence of other struggles. For example, Fight for $15 took part in women’s rallies in a number of cities on January 21. Moreover, the women’s march in the United States is part of a global process that has seen women mobilizing in a number of countries — from the women’s strikes in Argentina, Poland, and Ireland to the massive women’s demonstration in Italy last November. What next, then? An international coalition regrouping feminist and women’s groups from around thirty countries has called for an international women’s strike on March 8 against heterosexist violence. Women, trans women, and all the people who support their struggle will strike, march, and protest in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Uruguay, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, Turkey, South Korea, and other countries. In this vein, it wouldn’t be absurd to suggest that the first step for women and LGBTQ people after January 21, in the United States, could be the creation of grassroots coalitions and possibly a national coalition to join the international women’s strike on March 8. This would expand the scope of the mobilization beyond opposition to Trump’s administration and would contribute to making the movement less white. It would also help us rethink what a strike means, and how we can include diverse populations, including those outside the formal labor market, in our struggles.

## t reduce

#### Interp: the aff plan must *reduce* IP protections for medicines

#### Violation: elimination isn’t the same as delaying

#### Reduce excludes eliminate

**Words and Phrases, 2** (vol 36B, p. 80)

Mass. 1905. Rev.Laws, c.203, § 9, provides that, if two or more cases are tried together in the superior court, the presiding judge may “reduce” the witness fees and other costs, but “not less than the ordinary witness fees, and other costs recoverable in one of the cases” which are so tried together shall be allowed. Held that, in reducing the costs, the amount in all the cases together is to be considered and reduced, providing that there must be left in the aggregate an amount not less than the largest sum recoverable in any of the cases. The word “reduce,” in its ordinary signification, does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state.—Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363.

#### Smaller in size/amount

**POPATTANACHAI, 18** – PhD dissertation at Nottingham Trent University (NAPORN, “REGIONAL COOPERATION ADDRESSING MARINE POLLUTION FROM LAND-BASED ACTIVITIES: AN INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE 207 OF THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION FOCUSING ON MONITORING, ASSESSEMENT, AND SURVEILLANCE OF THE POLLUTION” <http://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/33374/1/Naporn%20Popattanachai%202018.pdf>

For the second question, the provision demonstrates that the goal of adoption of such laws and regulations must be to ‘prevent, reduce, and control’ MPLA. In so doing, the LOSC obliges States to ‘taking into account internationally agreed rules, standards, and recommended practices and procedures’.480 Having considered the ordinary meanings of the term ‘prevent, reduce, and control’, ‘prevent’ means ‘to stop something from happening or someone from doing something.’481 The word ‘reduce’ means ‘to make something smaller in size, amount, degree, importance etc.’482 and the word ‘control’ means ‘to order, limit, or rule something or someone's actions or behaviour.’ 483 From the meanings, the term ‘prevent’ suggests an action to stop the future occurrence of something, whereas the terms ‘reduce’ and ‘control’, noting their difference, point to an action dealing with something that has already happened and continues to occur, but needs to be made smaller, limited or regulated. Also, control also applies to future pollution in the sense that it limits the future pollution to be created or emitted not to exceed the specified level. Therefore, the preliminary reading of these terms suggests that laws and regulations adopted to deal with MPLA must yield the result that conforms with these terms. In so doing, the adoption of laws and regulations to prevent, reduce, and control MPLA can be done by legislating primary or secondary regulations with the use of various legal techniques and procedures and are underpinned by some rules and principles of international law discussed in the previous chapter. These legal techniques and procedures can be used to achieve the prevention, reduction and control of MPLA depending on the design and use of them. Noting that the measures outlined below are not exhaustive and not exclusively limited to implement any specific obligation, these are typical legal techniques and procedures used to prevent, reduce, and control pollution and therefore protect the environment. They can be categorised into two groups, that is, (1) substantive and (2) procedural legal techniques and measures. They can be discussed hereunder.

#### Reduce means decrease – excludes the possibility or result of increasing

**Friedman, 99** – Senior Circuit Judge, US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CUNA MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. UNITED STATES, Defendant-Appellee. 98-5033 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT 169 F.3d 737; 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 1832; 99-1 U.S. Tax Cas. (CCH) P50,245; 83 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 799 February 9, 1999, Decided, lexis)

B. CUNA's position has another fatal flaw. Section 808 is captioned "Policy Dividends Deduction," and § 808(c) states:

(1) In general

Except as limited by paragraph (2), the deduction for policyholder dividends for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to the policyholder dividends [\*\*15]  paid or accrued during the taxable year.

(2) Reduction in case of mutual companies

In the case of a mutual life insurance company, the deduction for policyholder dividends for any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount determined under section 809.

"The amount determined" under § 809, by which the policyholder dividend deduction is to be "reduced," is the "excess" specified in § 809(c)(1). Like the word "excess," the word "reduced" is a common, unambiguous, non-technical term that is given its ordinary meaning. See San Joaquin Fruit & Inv. Co., 297 U.S. at 499. "Reduce" means "to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number." Webster's Third International Dictionary 1905. Under CUNA's interpretation of "excess" in § 809(c), however, the result of the "amount determination" under § 809 would be not to reduce the policyholder dividends deduction, but to increase it. This would directly contradict the explicit instruction in § 808(c)(2) that the deduction "be reduced." The word "reduce" cannot be interpreted, as CUNA would treat it, to mean "increase."

#### Reduce means to diminish to a smaller number

**Oxford English Dictionary, 89** (online, at Emory)

reduce, *v.*

**26. a.** To bring down, diminish to a smaller number, amount, extent, etc., or *to* a single thing.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – the aff is underlimited – the aff doesn’t fit within the definitions or topic lit; reducing is fundamentally different from eliminnating so they’re able to use any plan that pertains to wto ip protections and overexplodes the topic making neg prep impossible

#### 2] Ground – defending elimination means we lose ground on generic positions like innovation da or econ because we lose links; it’s skirted from the core so we are forced to read positions on the fringes of the lit which destroys topic edu and clash

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### 1] Drop the debater –

#### a] The 1AC set up the entire round so we already felt their abuse

#### b] Deterrence – DTD actually prevents people from reading abusive / nontopical aff plans in the future

#### c] Topicality DTA means dropping the aff so vote neg on presumption

#### 2] Competing Interps –

#### a] C/I is better for norm setting and prevents arbitrary and subjective judge intervention – it’s the best model to ensure faireness

#### b] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical

#### 3] No RVIs –

#### a] The aff burden is to be topical so they shouldn’t win for meeting the bare minimum, you don’t win for being fair

#### b] Encourages theory baiting and substance crowdout

#### c] Discourages checking real abuse if people can just win for reading friv theory

## cp

#### Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The following 164 countries listed in the speech doc ought to independently and without influence from the wto

Afghanistan

Albania

Angola

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Armenia

Australia

Austria

Bahrain, Kingdom of

Bangladesh

Barbados

Belgium

Belize

Benin

Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Botswana

Brazil

Brunei Darussalam

Bulgaria

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cabo Verde

Cambodia

Cameroon

Canada

Central African Republic

Chad

Chile

China

Colombia

Congo

Costa Rica

Côte d’Ivoire

Croatia

Cuba

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Denmark

Djibouti

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Egypt

El Salvador

Estonia

Eswatini

European Union (formerly EC)

Fiji

Finland

France

Gabon

Gambia

Georgia

Germany

Ghana

Greece

Grenada

Guatemala

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

Hong Kong, China

Hungary

Iceland

India

Indonesia

Ireland

Israel

Italy

Jamaica

Japan

Jordan

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Korea, Republic of

Kuwait, the State of

Kyrgyz Republic

Lao People’s Democratic Republic

Latvia

Lesotho

Liberia

Liechtenstein

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Macao, China

Madagascar

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Mali

Malta

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mexico

Moldova, Republic of

Mongolia

Montenegro

Morocco

Mozambique

Myanmar

Namibia

Nepal

Netherlands

New Zealand

Nicaragua

Niger

Nigeria

North Macedonia

Norway

Oman

Pakistan

Panama

Papua New Guinea

Paraguay

Peru

Philippines

Poland

Portugal

Qatar

Romania

Russian Federation

Rwanda

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Samoa

Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of

Senegal

Seychelles

Sierra Leone

Singapore

Slovak Republic

Slovenia

Solomon Islands

South Africa

Spain

Sri Lanka

Suriname

Sweden

Switzerland

Chinese Taipei

Tajikistan

Tanzania

Thailand

Togo

Tonga

Trinidad and Tobago

Tunisia

Turkey

Uganda

Ukraine

United Arab Emirates

United Kingdom

United States

Uruguay

Vanuatu

Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia

Zimbabwe

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

### Heg Bad

#### Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony

Bello, PhD, 2000

(Walden, Sociology @ Stanford, https://users.ox.ac.uk/~magd1352/ecologist/Should%20WTO%20be%20abolished.pdf)

The idea that the world needs the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of the biggest lies of our time. The WTO came about, in 1995, mainly because it was in the interest of the US and its corporations. The European Union, Japan and especially the developing countries were mostly ambivalent about the idea; it was the US which drove it on. Why? Because though the US, back in 1948, blocked the formation of an International Trade Organisation (ITO), believing that, at that time, the interests of its corporations would not be served by such a global body, it had changed its mind by the 1990s. Now it wanted an international trade body. Why? Because its global economic dominance was threatened. The flexible GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) system, which preceded the WTO, had allowed the emergence of Europe and East Asia as competing industrial centres that threatened US dominance even in many high-tech industries. Under GATT’s system of global agricultural trade, Europe had emerged as a formidable agricultural power even as Third World governments concerned with preserving their agriculture and rural societies limited the penetration of their markets by US agricultural products. In other words, before the WTO, global trade was growing by leaps and bounds, but countries were using trade policy to industrialise and adapt to the growth of trade so that their economies would be enhanced by global trade and not be marginalised by it. That was a problem, from the US point of view. And that was why the US needed the WTO. The essence of the WTO is seen in three of its central agreements: the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA), and the Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs). The purpose of TRIPs is not to promote free trade but to enhance monopoly power. One cannot quarrel with the fact that innovators should have preferential access to the benefits that flow from their innovation for a period of time. TRIPs, however, goes beyond this to institutionalise a monopoly for high-tech corporate innovators, most of them from the North. Among other things, TRIPs provides a generalised minimum patent protection of 20 years; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and – contrary to the judicial principle of presuming innocence until proven guilty – places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. What TRIPs does is reinforce the monopolistic or oligopolistic position of US high tech firms such as Microsoft and Intel. It makes industrialisation by imitation or industrialisation via loose conditions of technology transfer – a strategy employed by the US, Germany, Japan, and South Korea during the early phases of their industrialisation – all but impossible. It enables the technological leader, in this case the US, to greatly influence the pace of technological and industrial development in the rest of the world.

#### Primacy causes endless war, terror, authoritarianism, prolif, and Russia-China aggression.

Ashford, PhD, 19

(Emma, PoliSci@UVA, Fellow@CATO, Power and Pragmatism: Reforming American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century, in New Voices in Grand Strategy, 4, CNAS)

Humility is a virtue. Yet in the last quarter century, American policymakers have been far more likely to embrace the notion of America as the “indispensable nation,” responsible for protecting allies, promoting democracy and human rights, tamping down conflicts, and generally managing global affairs. Compare this ideal to the U.S. track record – endless Middle Eastern wars, the rise of ISIS, global democratic backsliding, a revanchist Russia, resurgent China, and a world reeling from the election of President Donald Trump – and this label seems instead the height of hubris. Many of the failures of U.S. foreign policy speak for themselves. As the daily drumbeat of bad news attests, interventions in Iraq and Libya were not victories for human rights or democracy, but rather massively destabilizing for the Middle East as a whole. Afghanistan – despite initial military successes – has become a quagmire, highlighting the futility of nation- building. Other failures of America’s grand strategy are less visible, but no less damaging. NATO expansion into Eastern Europe helped to reignite hostility between Russia and the West. Worse, it has diluted the alliance’s defensive capacity and its democratic character. And even as the war on terror fades from public view, it remains as open-ended as ever: Today, the United States is at war in seven countries and engaged in “combating terrorism’ in more than 80.1 To put it bluntly: America’s strategy since the end of the Cold War – whether it is called primacy or liberal internationalism – may not be a total failure, but it has not been successful either. Many have tried to place blame for these poor outcomes.2 But recrimination is less important than understanding why America’s strategy has failed so badly and avoiding these mistakes in future. Much of the explanation is the natural outcome of changing constraints. Iraq and Libya should not be viewed as regrettable anomalies, but rather the logical outcome of unipolarity and America’s liberal internationalist inclination to solve every global problem. It’s also a reliance on flawed assumptions – that what is good for America is always good for the world, for example. Support for dangerous sovereignty-undermining norms adds to the problem; just look at the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which has proved not to protect populations or stabilize fragile states, but to provoke chaos, encourage nuclear proliferation, and undermine the international institutions. Perhaps, if nothing else had changed, a form of watered-down liberal internationalism that foreswore interventionism and drew back from the war on terror might have been possible.3 But international politics are undergoing a period of profound transformation, from unipolarity to regional or even global multipolarity. Primacy – and the consistent drumbeat of calls in Washington to do more, always and everywhere – is neither sustainable nor prudent. Nor can we fall back on warmed-over Cold War–era strategies better suited to an era of bipolar superpower competition.

### Colonialism

#### The WTO as an institution is unethical and perpetuates colonialism

Godrej 20

(Dinyar, Co-editor @ New Internationalist, 4-20, https://newint.org/features/2020/02/10/brief-history-impoverishment)

For countries that were undergoing economic ravishment by structural adjustment, the 1990s brought new torments in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a club dominated by rich nations. In the name of creating a ‘level playing field’, the WTO required poorer countries to sign up to an all-or-nothing, binding set of rules, which removed protections for domestic industries and allowed foreign capital unhindered access. This was strongly prejudicial to the interests of local industries, which were not in a position to withstand foreign competition. Influence within the WTO is weighted by the size of a nation’s economy – thus even if all poorer nations joined forces to demand policy changes they would still not have a chance against wealthy nations. This trade injustice has drawn widespread protests and pressure for the WTO to reform. Meanwhile, wealthy nations are increasingly going down the route of bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Usually negotiated in secret, the interests of their corporations are paramount in FTAs and include the ability to sue states for eye-watering sums (should they, for example, want to terminate a contract or nationalize an industry) with no provision for states to do the same. Such instruments are working to create a utopia for transnational corporations, creating a business-friendly climate, which translates as the demolition of labour protection, tax cuts for the wealthiest and a supine regulatory environment. Tax havens operated by the richest countries are home to huge sums of illicit wealth draining out of some of the poorest. Today, due to how the global economy has been engineered, for every dollar of aid sent to poorer countries, they lose 10 times as much in outflows – and that’s before one counts their losses through unfair trade rules and underpaid labour. Foreign investors take nearly $500 billion a year in profits from the Global South, and trade-power imbalances cost poorer nations $700 billion a year in lost export revenue. 7 CONCENTRATION In the 21st century wealth increasingly flows through corporate hands towards a small super-elite. In a trend that began in the 1990s, the lion’s share of equity value is being realized through squeezing workers: the classification ‘working poor’ so familiar in the Global South is now increasingly also being used in the wealthy North, where neoliberal capitalism is leading inevitably to wage erosion and work precarity, coupled with the withdrawal of state support. Inequality is rising dramatically. In 2018 the richest 26 people owned wealth equivalent to the poorest half of the world’s population. And their wealth was increasing at the rate of $2.5 billion a day. Meanwhile 3.4 billion people – nearly half the world – were living on less than $5.50 a day.

#### The CP is competitive because it doesn’t include WTO action and is mutually exclusive to the 1AC plan.

#### The aff only gets one perm [for each CP] and it must be in the speech doc – we only get one CP and allowing infinite aff advocacies all with their own details and net benefits makes the NR impossible. Multiple short perms are impossible to flow and exact language is important for solvency and competition.

#### the cp solves for the alt but better – because it’s actually in the topic literature

## case

### Innovation

#### Striking a balance is K2 innovation – development won’t be financially viable without protections

Krattiger 13

(Anatole Krattiger; Global Challenges Division at WIPO, Adjunct Prof. School of Integrative Plant Science Plant Breeding and Genetics Section, works on strategic and intellectual property aspects related to ag-biotech and global health at the crossroads of development, government, science, businesses and philanthropy; (September 2013) Promoting access to medical innovation; WIPO Magazine; <https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2013/05/article_0002.html>; CKD)

Striking an appropriate balance between encouraging medical innovation and enabling access to it has been a major preoccupation of policymakers, health activists and the private sector, since the 1990s when concerns about access came to the fore in relation to the treatment of HIV/AIDS in many African countries. The WTO′s Doha Declaration on the TRIPs Agreement and Public Health of 2001, clarified a number of rules specific to IP and helped reassure the global community that IP should not prevent access to the medicines needed in developing countries. Medical technologies are usually very expensive to develop but relatively cheap to reproduce. Without the protection conferred by a patent it would not be financially viable for companies to continue investing in research, product development and regulatory approval. If competitors could “free ride” on the cost of developing a product and were able to immediately introduce their own versions, the inventor would not get the expected financial returns thereby weakening any incentive to develop new products.

#### Strong IP protections encourage private sector cooperation, investments and research

Donohue no date

(Thomas J. Donohue; served as president and chief executive officer of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from 1997 to 2019,  established the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, served for 13 years as president and CEO of the American Trucking Association, bachelor’s degree from St. John’s University and a master’s degree in business administration from Adelphi University; (accessed 08-24-21) Why Intellectual Property Protection Matters in the Time of Coronavirus; <https://www.theglobalipcenter.com/why-intellectual-property-protection-matters-in-the-time-of-coronavirus/>; CKD)

The coronavirus is placing a huge strain on hospitals, doctors, and nurses. While some states are beginning to see a plateau or decline in cases, others have yet to be hit with the full force of this terrible pandemic.  Meanwhile, its economic impact is proving to be relentless and wide ranging. But the American people are proving resilient and are finding ways to adapt. Only through an “all-of-society” approach will we be able to beat this virus and get ourselves back on track. Just a quick scan of the headlines shows how much the business community is doing to help our human family. In the spirit of scientific inquiry, U.S. Chamber member companies continue to work alongside government research labs and universities to find a cure for COVID-19. Front and center in this fight is a silent partner—strong intellectual property protections—a cornerstone of the American tradition. The average person might not know it, but today 57% of all new medicines come from the United States and private biopharmaceutical companies make up more than 80% of the investment in the research and development of those new drugs. Supported by strong patenting norms, companies like Johnson & Johnson, Gilead, Novartis, and Bayer—to name a few—have announced promising developments in the use of existing drugs, breakthrough trials, and innovative tests for COVID-19. To aid this all-of-society approach, scientific and medical journal publishers such as Elsevier have made COVID-19, SARS, and MERS-related studies available free of charge to researchers and data miners worldwide. In our information-saturated age, trusted sources of information have become ever more difficult to find. Scientific and medical journals’ role in the R&D ecosystem keep the spirit of science alive by ensuring that such information is not only high quality, but accurate. Across the country, the technology industry has made remote work and collaboration part of our everyday lives. Many of these breakthroughs would not be possible without 21st century patent protections for software and other intangible goods. Meanwhile on nights and weekends, we stream the latest digitally-delivered music, movies, and television shows— all possible because creators are protected by strong copyright norms. In 2000, the [World Intellectual Property Organization](https://www.wipo.int/portal/en/) created “World IP Day” to “raise awareness of how patents, copyrights, trademarks, and designs impact daily life.” In years since, scientists, creators, researchers, designers, and policymakers have used this day in late April to truly celebrate the innovations that have benefited humankind. But this year’s World IP Day is, frankly, different than in years past. But in times like these, IP is more important than ever and its benefits are even greater. To truly fight back, we need millions of dollars’ worth of private sector research, manufacturing, and distribution know-how. Take patents, for instance. Every researcher, scientist, business owner—you name it—relies on a patent to put a great idea on paper. Patents also have many benefits: They prevent good ideas from being stolen; they help formalize developing economies by encouraging cooperation between government and the private sector; they encourage increased investments in biomedical and biopharmaceutical research; and they reward the hard work of inventors and creators everywhere ensuring not only that better music and movies are on the way, but that better medicines are too. Here at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, we believe in strong, consistent rules on intellectual property for these very same reasons. Prioritizing these policies—as well as the hard work of researchers, creators, and extraordinary people all around the world—will be key in beating back this immense challenge. It’s just another reason to support strong IP protections for all.

#### IP protections incentivize innovation – our pandemic response would be hindered without innovation through strong IP systems

Van Etten 07-15

(Megan Van Etten; senior director of public affairs at PhRMA, responsible for leading the association’s public affairs efforts on international issues, including trade, intellectual property and access to medicines, was director of media and external communications at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; (07-15-21) Promoting global vaccine equity while protecting innovation; Pharma; <https://catalyst.phrma.org/promoting-global-vaccine-equity-while-protecting-innovation>; CKD)

America’s biopharmaceutical companies have successfully researched, developed and distributed billions of doses of multiple vaccines and therapeutics to halt the spread of COVID-19. The availability of COVID-19 vaccines has shifted the trajectory of the pandemic and is undoubtedly saving lives. Further, the approval of the first ever mRNA vaccines has the potential to usher in an era of groundbreaking mRNA applications beyond COVID-19. But the transformative promise of these vaccines only extends as far as patients’ ability to access them. Equitable distribution worldwide is critical. Despite significant cross-sector and multi-stakeholder efforts like COVAX, we are still seeing vaccine access and distribution challenges across many regions of the world due to complex barriers. Unfortunately, [some have focused](https://catalyst.phrma.org/the-biden-administration-allows-politics-to-upend-a-pragmatic-pandemic-response) their attention on a short-sighted and misguided “solution” that seeks to waive international commitments to honor intellectual property (IP) rights for COVID-19 vaccines under the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). The approach fails to examine and address the real barriers to equitable vaccine distribution and could undermine the global pandemic response. Biopharmaceutical manufacturers, governments and non-governmental organizations must work together to take urgent steps to further address this inequity by: Stepping Up Dose Sharing A handful of countries secured contracts for COVID-19 vaccines during the early research and development phases, and as a result, have a larger supply of vaccines than needed. Manufacturers and governments in these countries must continue to work together to urgently and responsibly redirect meaningful proportions of these doses to low- and middle-income countries through COVAX and other established mechanisms. Continuing to Optimize Production The vaccine manufacturing process depends on a complex global network of suppliers of raw materials and equipment. The scale and speed at which these vaccines must be produced to keep up with the current demand is unprecedented. To address this challenge, vaccine manufacturers must work with governments and suppliers to undertake all practicable efforts to maximize COVID-19 vaccine output without compromising safety and quality. Calling out Trade Barriers To ensure supply chains are globally integrated, and for distribution systems to work efficiently, officials must remove trade barriers. It is critical that governments, in coordination with the WTO, work to eliminate all trade and regulatory barriers standing in the way of vaccine distribution and the procurement of the raw materials and components needed for the manufacturing process. Supporting Country Readiness Serious gaps in readiness across a significant number of countries need to be swiftly addressed to ensure that supplied doses are used and not destroyed. We urgently need cross-stakeholder collaboration—particularly in low- and middle-income countries—that supports vaccine roll-out and ensures countries are ready and able to deploy vaccines as efficiently as possible. Driving Further Innovation While the development of COVID-19 vaccines has been a remarkable feat, stakeholders must continue to prioritize policies and legal mechanisms that foster a strong innovation ecosystem, supported by IP incentives. Without this commitment to continuous innovation, our ability to swiftly address emerging COVID-19 variants and future pandemics is hindered. The COVID-19 innovations available today would not have been possible without strong IP systems that encourage innovation, protect novel ideas, enable critical partnerships and incentivize continued progress against deadly diseases. To ensure that patients around the world can access and realize the benefits of this astonishing progress, governments, the biopharmaceutical industry and non-governmental organizations must invest in solutions that comprehensively address the real issues driving inequities in vaccine distribution. America’s biopharmaceutical companies are focused on saving lives. Right now, that means more vaccines in more arms in countries around the world – without sacrificing safety or endangering production supply chains.

### at health

**Western healthcare isn’t mutually exclusive with traditional care - the alt forces Natives to choose, which is worse**

**LeMasters 15**

**(Katherine, MPH-PhD student in Maternal and Child Health at UNC Chapel Hill Gillings School of Global Public Health, Injustice in Healthcare: A Navajo Case Study,** [**https://repository.wlu.edu/bitstream/handle/11021/32380/RG38\_LeMasters\_Poverty\_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y**](https://repository.wlu.edu/bitstream/handle/11021/32380/RG38_LeMasters_Poverty_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)**, JKS)**

The use of non-hybrid, or monolithic, healthcare models that prevent the Navajo from having true choice must then be criticized. Providing only Western care to the Navajo imposes a concern for physical health and psychological diagnosis, while disregarding their own health concerns (i.e., spirituality). **But, providing only traditional care removes the Navajo’s opportunity to receive Western healthcare**, which the Navajo have had for the past two centuries. In fact, the want for incorporating traditional medicine with modern care grew out of perceived shortcomings in Western medicine, so reverting back to only traditional medicine requires the Navajo to erase their past two centuries of healthcare, which is now imbedded in society (Moghaddam, 2014; Henson et al., 2008; Wikler, 1978). For example, many Navajo with depression go to behavioral health counselors and take prescription medication alongside speaking with traditional healers about their mental health. By removing behavioral health counselors from the reservation, Navajo patients would not have the option of using these providers and accessing the type of medical care that they have had their whole lives. Thus, **offering only traditional or Western medicine also does not allow the Navajo true freedom and is unjust** (Moghaddam, 2014). A model based in medical pluralism, a syncretic medico-ritual system that blends medical cultures and allows people the freedom to choose the type of healthcare they want to receive may then be just (Pappas, 2007; Capps, 1994). Medical pluralism exists when any one community has patients and providers using differentially designed and conceived medical systems that are at least minimally integrated so that there is not one ultimate principle guiding medical care (Hsu, 2008; Janzen, 1978; Reeve, 2000). In medical pluralism, individuals’ treatment choices are often shaped by the type of disease, the seriousness of the illness, and whether treatment is sought for the physical symptoms causing the illness, spiritual difficulties, an imbalance with the natural order, or other purposes (Reeve, 2000). So, **patients do not treat health systems as mutually exclusive, but often use them in tandem** (Pappas et al., 2007).

**Proven by Navajo patients who integrate traditional and Western care**

**LeMasters 15**

**(Katherine, MPH-PhD student in Maternal and Child Health at UNC Chapel Hill Gillings School of Global Public Health, Injustice in Healthcare: A Navajo Case Study,** [**https://repository.wlu.edu/bitstream/handle/11021/32380/RG38\_LeMasters\_Poverty\_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y**](https://repository.wlu.edu/bitstream/handle/11021/32380/RG38_LeMasters_Poverty_2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)**, JKS)**

While Westernized care has been imposed on the Navajo, many have held onto their traditional beliefs and practices. Over two-thirds of NAI continue to use traditional practices today, often as a complement to Western medicine rather than as a substitute (Buchwald et al., IV.2000). Dr. Kirby David, who is both Navajo and a biomedical physician’s assistant, says that he knows that many patients integrate both types of care at home, which he neither supports nor opposes (David, 2015). So, many patients combine traditional and Western care in informal settings rather than choosing one or the other. Additionally, Fort Defiance Indian Hospital has integrated care on-site in a formal setting by providing a traditional Hogan where spiritual ceremonies take place, having traditional practitioners work alongside biomedical doctors, and more (Coleman, 2015; Jim, 2015). Thus, at least one facility has combined traditional and Western care in order to reflect peoples’ blending of traditional and Western practices, but most facilities have not, which begs the question: should they?

**And, that’s consistent with decolonization.**

**Duwe 16**

**(Elise Ann Geist Duwe is a graduate student in sociology and medical student in the Medical Scholars Program at University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. She graduated from College of Wooster in biochemistry/molecular biology and religious studies. She held an INTERSECT fellowship from American Indian Studies. She was a visiting scholar at the Robert Graham Center for Policy Studies in Primary Care., Toward a Story Powerful Enough to Reduce Health Inequities in Indian Country: The Case of Diabetes, Qualitative Inquiry 2016, Vol. 22(8) 624–635, JKS)**

The themes in this article demonstrate preliminary but success- ful knowledge translation from stories to organized knowledge to accumulated and distilled wisdom (Smylie et al., 2004). Mora (2013) writes, “We have the tools: the medications, the clinic staff, the exercise, the eating habits, the sense of commu- nity, the extended families, the prayers, the connection to Mother Earth” (p. 34). Yet diabetes incidence rates in Indian Country hold steady or worsen. There is a growing movement within health care toward developing innovations that trans- form population health. Other papers have suggested as innova- tions developing a workforce pipeline for Indigenous health care providers (Kenyon, 2013), greater attention to colonization as wounding (Million, 2013), addressing diabetes “as a product and a response to unjust conditions and environments” (Mitchell, 2012, p. 72), and collaborating more with Indigenous leaders (Kenyon, 2013). A story powerful enough to eliminate devastation from diabetes in Indian Country must be both inno- vative, generated from the local context, and transformative, overturning power structures that keep Indian Country unwell. The story powerful enough will benefit from incorporating the three themes described in this article. For Indian Country, decolonization is the ultimate vision—the transformative goal. Simpson and Smith (2014) define decolonization as: requir[ing] the building of mass movements capable of dismantling settler colonialism, white supremacy, and capitalism. The intellectual project of decolonization would necessarily be broad based as anyone and everyone who can help think of and imagine ways out of the moral and political impasse of recognition and into different modes of possibility would have to be enjoined to this intellectual and political process. (p. 11) Self-determination, a primary component of decoloniza- tion, enables a “living model” (Million, 2013, p. 161) of health for social systems, economic systems, political sys- tems, and biological systems deriving from Indigenous knowledges. Decolonizing methodologies focus on rela- tionship-building and ecological preservation (Chino & DeBruyn, 2006; LaFrance, 2004). “Indirect learning is a somewhat different mode, in which life examples, stories, metaphors, myths, and experiences are used to teach important concepts and ideas. This type of teaching and learning has traditionally been used in Native cultures” (Olson, 1999, p. 188). **For diabetes, decolonization may be a pathway to wellness that incorporates the Western way and biomedical worldview in an Indigenous way, that returns to traditional food ways, and that maintains care relationships with the land, self, community, ancestors, and future generations**. “We, as tribal people,” asserts Crazy Bull, want research and scholarship that preserves, maintains, and restores our traditions and cultural practices. We want to restore our homelands; revitalize our traditional religious practices; regain our health; and cultivate our economic, social, and governing systems. Our research can help us maintain our sovereignty and preserve our nationhood. (Quoted in LaFrance, 2004, p. 48) In the safe space of a decolonizing world, the story will become powerful enough to reduce diabetes devastation in Indian Country.