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#### Our interpretation is that the negative should not be burdened with rejoinder against affs that defend anything other than the hypothetical implementation of a policy action.

#### To be clear – this means in order to meet our interpretation, they need to only defend the fiated reduction of IPP by member nations of the WTO.

#### This means they don’t get to weigh the discourse of the affirmative – absent articulation of how rhetorical disidentification can be practiced by the member nations of the WTO, they defend a method that is outside of the bounds of the topic.

#### Resolved means to enact a policy by law.

Words & Phrases ’64 (Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

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”**.

#### The WTO is the World Trade Organization – it regulates international trade and has 164 member nations.

**WTO** – The World Trade Organization

WTO, “What is the WTO: Overview” No date, [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/wto\_dg\_stat\_e.htm //](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/wto_dg_stat_e.htm%20//) sam :)

The WTO provides a forum for negotiating agreements aimed at reducing obstacles to international trade and ensuring a level playing field for all, thus contributing to economic growth and development. The WTO also provides a legal and institutional framework for the implementation and monitoring of these agreements, as well as for settling disputes arising from their interpretation and application. The current body of trade agreements comprising the WTO consists of 16 different multilateral agreements (to which all WTO members are parties) and two different plurilateral agreements (to which only some WTO members are parties). Over the past 60 years, the WTO, which was established in 1995, and its predecessor organization the GATT have helped to create a strong and prosperous international trading system, thereby contributing to unprecedented global economic growth. The WTO currently has 164 members, of which 117 are developing countries or separate customs territories. WTO activities are supported by a Secretariat of some 700 staff, led by the WTO Director-General. The Secretariat is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and has an annual budget of approximately CHF 200 million ($180 million, €130 million). The three official languages of the WTO are English, French and Spanish. Decisions in the WTO are generally taken by consensus of the entire membership. The highest institutional body is the Ministerial Conference, which meets roughly every two years. A General Council conducts the organization's business in the intervals between Ministerial Conferences. Both of these bodies comprise all members. Specialised subsidiary bodies (Councils, Committees, Sub-committees), also comprising all members, administer and monitor the implementation by members of the various WTO agreements. More specifically, the WTO's main activities are: — negotiating the reduction or elimination of obstacles to trade (import tariffs, other barriers to trade) and agreeing on rules governing the conduct of international trade (e.g. antidumping, subsidies, product standards, etc.) — administering and monitoring the application of the WTO's agreed rules for trade in goods, trade in services, and trade-related intellectual property rights — monitoring and reviewing the trade policies of our members, as well as ensuring transparency of regional and bilateral trade agreements — settling disputes among our members regarding the interpretation and application of the agreements — building capacity of developing country government officials in international trade matters — assisting the process of accession of some 30 countries who are not yet members of the organization — conducting economic research and collecting and disseminating trade data in support of the WTO's other main activities — explaining to and educating the public about the WTO, its mission and its activities. The WTO's founding and guiding principles remain the pursuit of open borders, the guarantee of most-favoured-nation principle and non-discriminatory treatment by and among members, and a commitment to transparency in the conduct of its activities. The opening of national markets to international trade, with justifiable exceptions or with adequate flexibilities, will encourage and contribute to sustainable development, raise people's welfare, reduce poverty, and foster peace and stability. At the same time, such market opening must be accompanied by sound domestic and international policies that contribute to economic growth and development according to each member's needs and aspirations.

#### There are 4 types of IP the aff could reduce.

**Brewer 19** [Trevor Brewer, 5-16-2019, accessed on 8-11-2021, BrewerLong, "What Are The 4 Types of Intellectual Property Rights? BrewerLong", <https://brewerlong.com/information/business-law/four-types-of-intellectual-property/>] Adam

There are four types of intellectual property rights and protections (although multiple types of intellectual property itself). Securing the correct protection for your property is important, which is why consulting with a lawyer is a must. The four categories of intellectual property protections include: TRADE SECRETS Trade secrets refer to specific, private information that is important to a business because it gives the business a competitive advantage in its marketplace. If a trade secret is acquired by another company, it could harm the original holder. Examples of trade secrets include recipes for certain foods and beverages (like Mrs. Fields’ cookies or Sprite), new inventions, software, processes, and even different marketing strategies. When a person or business holds a trade secret protection, others cannot copy or steal the idea. In order to establish information as a “trade secret,” and to incur the legal protections associated with trade secrets, businesses must actively behave in a manner that demonstrates their desire to protect the information. [Trade secrets are protected without official registration](https://www.wipo.int/sme/en/ip_business/trade_secrets/protection.htm); however, an owner of a trade secret whose rights are breached–i.e. someone steals their trade secret–may ask a court to ask against that individual and prevent them from using the trade secret. PATENTS As defined by the [U.S. Patent and Trademark Office](https://www.uspto.gov/help/patent-help#patents) (USPTO), a patent is a type of limited-duration protection that can be used to protect inventions (or discoveries) that are new, non-obvious, and useful, such a new process, machine, article of manufacture, or composition of matter. When a property owner holds a patent, others are prevented, under law, from offering for sale, making, or using the product. COPYRIGHTS Copyrights and patents are not the same things, although they are often confused. A copyright is a type of intellectual property protection that protects original works of authorship, which might include literary works, music, art, and more. Today, copyrights also protect computer software and architecture. Copyright protections are automatic; once you create something, it is yours. However, if your rights under copyright protections are infringed and you wish to file a lawsuit, then registration of your copyright will be necessary. TRADEMARKS Finally, the fourth type of intellectual property protection is a trademark protection. Remember, patents are used to protect inventions and discoveries and copyrights are used to protect expressions of ideas and creations, like art and writing. Trademarks, then, refer to phrases, words, or symbols that distinguish the source of a product or services of one party from another. For example, the Nike symbol–which nearly all could easily recognize and identify–is a type of trademark. While patents and copyrights can expire, trademark rights come from the use of the trademark, and therefore can be held indefinitely. Like a copyright, registration of a trademark is not required, but registering can offer additional advantages.

#### Vote negative for predictable limits---allowing the affirmative to pick any grounds for the debate makes negative engagement impossible by skirting a predictable starting point, which makes all our preparation and research useless.

#### Two impacts---

#### 1---Fairness---a predictable limit is the only way to give the neg a chance---radical aff choice shifts the grounds for the debate and puts the aff far ahead. Pre-tournament negative preparation is structured around topical plans as points of offense, which means anything else structurally favors the aff.

#### That’s an intrinsic good---debate is a game and requires effective competition between the aff and the neg---the only way for any benefit to be produced from debate is if the judge can make a decision between two sides who have had a relatively equal chance to prepare for a common point of debate.

#### 2--- Clash---debates over a stasis point incentivize argumentative refinement and self-questioning. Defending our position against a well-prepared opponent is key---it makes us more persuasive, informed, and forces us to adjust our position to become more effective advocates.

#### Topical version of the aff – just defend that the member nations of the WTO reduce IPP for medicine without weighing the discourse stuff.

#### Competing interps – anything else invites judge intervention absent a clear brightline and this will be a debate about models of debate – if you have no idea what debates would look like in the world of the aff you should vote negative.

#### Drop the debater – the entirety of the aff is being criticized which means drop the argument is incoherent.

#### At best they are extra-topical – that’s an independent voter for fairness because the 1ac can always defend however they talk about the aff being good – that explodes aff ground because we can never weigh disads against the mere discussion of the aff being good – vote negative.

#### Clash is ideological – you’ve said ip is bad, so we should be able to criticize that assumption even if the aff isnt topical

### 1NC

#### The biotech industry is strong now---it’s weathered the COVID storm.

Cancherini et al. 21 – Consultant in M`cKinsey’s Brussels office

Laura Cancherini, Joseph Lydon, Jorge Santos da Silva, Alexandra Zemp, “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?,” McKinsey & Company, April 2021, https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/life-sciences/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide

Unlike most industries in these extraordinarily challenging times, biotech is experiencing a high. Executives in many other sectors are becoming more pessimistic about the outlook for their businesses as the global pandemic continues to spread.1 But the search to understand and find treatment or preventive solutions to COVID-19 has focused intense government, media, and public attention on science and medicine, reinforcing the perception that biotech acquisitions and partnerships represent a good investment.

In an effort to understand worldwide biotech financing in the context of the COVID-19 crisis, McKinsey analyzed the sector’s financial performance and interviewed 20 C-level executives from small and midsize biotechs and venture-capital (VC) firms.

The pandemic has had an enormous financial impact on many sectors, but biotech has weathered the storm: after a brief downturn early in the crisis, it recovered quickly (Exhibit 1). Between January 2020 and January 2021, the average share price for European and US biotechs increased at more than twice the rate of the S&P 500, and Chinese biotechs performed more than six times better, with their average share price more than doubling in a year. Overall, biotech is outperforming its sister industry, pharmaceuticals, as well as many household-name consumer-goods and technology companies.

With acquisitions, partnerships, IPOs, and fundraising still increasing, biotech’s star has, if anything, risen higher than it was before the pandemic. The industry’s response to the crisis, its record of innovation, and its reputation as a safe haven for investment have all served it well. But whether biotech can sustain this performance is open to question. This article looks at the industry’s record of growth, its resilience during the global pandemic, and the factors that could determine whether the biotech wave continues.

#### Biotech is key to climate change solutions---waiving IP rights decks it by setting a sweeping precedent that chills innovation.

Brand 21 – Assistant General Counsel and Director of Intellectual Property at the Biotechnology Innovation Organization

Melissa Brand, “TRIPS IP Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors,” IP Watchdog, May 2021, https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/

While 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.

#### Biotech innovation is uniquely key to combatting climate change.

McMurry-Heath 21 – Physician-scientist and the president and CEO of the Biotechnology Innovation Organization

Michelle McMurry-Heath, “To help solve climate change, look to the biosciences,” STAT News, May 2021, https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/21/climate-change-solutions-from-biosciences/

President Biden’s pledge to cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions in half by 2030 is an admirable and ambitious undertaking. It’s nearly double the goal set by President Obama in 2015. And it establishes the United States as a world leader in battling climate change.

But reaching the president’s target in just under 10 years is a monumental task. It’s so big, in fact, that we’ll never get there by government action alone. No amount of vehicle efficiency standards, forest conservation efforts, or gas taxes can fully solve the problem.

We have to science our way out of it.

The biosciences, including biotechnology, will play a pivotal role in the fight against climate change. It is already leading the way on several fronts. According to a report from BIO, the organization I work for, the biotech industry’s green initiatives could mitigate the equivalent of 3 billion tons of carbon dioxide every year by 2030, or about half of the country’s annual CO2 emissions.

Take food, for example.

Food consumption — and production — is central to human existence. Global food production accounts for one-quarter of greenhouse gas emissions. A recent report from an international team of researchers concluded that even if all other fossil fuel emissions were eliminated, emissions from food production alone would prevent us from reaching a key goal of the climate change agreement signed in Paris: preventing the global temperature from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius.

Halting food production isn’t an option, so biotech companies are helping farmers become part of the climate solution. Take, for example, Boston-based Joyn Bio. It is engineering bacteria that pull nitrogen directly from the atmosphere. These microbes then pass the nitrogen to crops like wheat and corn, reducing the need to make, transport, and apply nitrogen fertilizers, which reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

Minnesota-based Acceligen is using a technique it calls precision breeding that improves the health of livestock while reducing their waste, greenhouse gas emissions, and water usage.

Biotechnology can also help protect food from climate change. As fungal and bacterial infections accelerated by human-driven environmental disturbances threaten to wipe out Cavendish bananas, Tropic Biosciences in the United Kingdom is using CRISPR gene-editing technology to engineer infection-resistant bananas.

Companies are also rethinking how food is packaged to reduce plastic pollution and open high-tech paths to broader adoption of biodegradables. This would be a game-changer in the interlinked fight to modulate climate change and protect the oceans.

Globally, 100 million tons of plastic are produced every year, 8 million of which ends up in the oceans. The production of plastic requires at least 8% of the world’s petroleum. Greenhouse gas emissions from plastic production and incineration could rise from the current 850 million tons a year to 3 billion tons a year by 2050. And discarded plastic that ends up in the ocean slowly breaks down in sunlight, releasing greenhouse gases and toxic microplastics.

Georgia-based Danimer Scientific — partnering with the Mars Wrigley candy company — is working on biodegradable packaging that uses plant oils to manufacture “plastic” that dissolves in soil and water. Bioplastics and biopolymers can reduce greenhouse gas emissions reductions by up to 80% more compared to their petroleum-based counterparts.

Fuel is another target for biotechnology. Transportation accounts for the highest percentage of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. While electric cars are gaining popularity, and the $174 billion allocated to support the transition to electrics in Biden’s American Jobs Plan is important, biofuels — which are carbon neutral — will be needed to help reduce emissions in transportation and need comparable support.

The biotech company Synthetic Genomics, for instance, is utilizing saltwater algae, which convert sunlight and carbon dioxide into biomass, to make sustainable auto fuel. By 2025, 10,000 barrels of the algal biofuel could be produced per day for commercial use.

Biofuels will also play an important role in air travel. While flying accounts for less than 3% of global CO2 emissions a year, on a per-mile calculation it’s the least green form of travel. With the number of air travel passengers expected to double by 2040, the Biden administration is upping the financial incentives — through tax credits — for companies that produce sustainable aircraft fuels.

Biotech firms are already stepping up. Companies like Neste, Gevo, and World Energy are using everything from algae to used or wasted cooking oil to create sustainable jet fuels. LanzaTech recycles carbon from industrial emissions and other sources and turns it into aviation fuel — and has recently partnered with other corporations to bring that fuel to market for commercial airline use.

With help from biotechnology, the U.S. can achieve the climate change goals outlined by the Biden administration and the Paris Agreement. Human progress and technology got us into this mess. That same ingenuity can help get us out.

#### It’s existential---a number of warrants.

Tonn 21 – Professor of Political Science at the University of Tennesse Knoxville

Bruce E. Tonn, “Anticipation, Sustainability, Futures and Human Extinction: Ensuring Humanity’s Journey into The Distant Future,” Routledge, May 2021, https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781003000105/anticipation-sustainability-futures-human-extinction-bruce-tonn

Year 2100 – The earth appears to be on an irreversible path toward further climate change over the next century. We are already witnessing: increases in mean global and regional temperatures; sea-level rise; disappearances of glaciers; changes in geographic locations of the habitats of flora and fauna; and increases in the severity of extreme weather events, from droughts to storms.13 It can be argued that climate change is an existential risk, meaning that it could lead to the extinction of the human race. It can also be argued that climate change is just one of many existential risks facing humanity. The next chapter, Chapter 3, takes an in-depth look at a comprehensive set of such risks. The important points here are that existential risks like climate change ought not be ignored and that those seemingly being caused by humanity need to be dealt with much sooner than later. One can anticipate that this sanguinity could result in globally catastrophic collapse of our technological infrastructure, our economies, and even in the world’s population.14

Take-Home Point #4: Reducing existential risks is an essential component of long-term sustainability thinking. We can anticipate our world being in the throes of catastrophic climate change, maybe even at an unacceptably high risk of human extinction, if by the year 2100 we have not completely solved our GHG emissions problem.

#### Waiving IP protections sends a signal that encourages China to further erode U.S. IP---makes sustaining competitiveness impossible.

Staudt 21 – Current President of the Intellectual Property Owners Association, an international trade association representing members that own, or are interested in, intellectual property (IP) rights

Daniel J. Staudt, “Waiving IP Rights: The Wrong Path to the Right Goals,” IP Watchdog, June 2021, https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/06/15/waiving-ip-rights-the-wrong-path-to-the-right-goals/id=134546/

Waiving intellectual property (IP) protections for COVID-19 vaccines will hinder rather than further three meritorious objectives of the current U.S. Presidential Administration: ending the pandemic as soon as possible, leveling the IP playing field with China, and pursuing a worker-centric trade policy. Ensuring equitable, widespread, and successful distribution of vaccines across the globe to meet the challenges of COVID-19, ending the erosion of U.S. IP at the hands of China, and putting Americans back to work are goals that most of us in the U.S. share. An examination of the facts, however, demonstrates that waiving IP rights in the name of COVID-19 relief undermines each of these three U.S. government goals.

Waiver Would Hurt, Not Help

In terms of ending the pandemic as soon as possible, the Washington Post got it right in its May 4 editorial when it stated, “Sharing doses and know-how is better than stripping patents.” It is noteworthy that, during this global debate over whether IP protections should be waived, there have been no instances identified where IP has been used to limit access to vaccines or other COVID-related technologies. In contrast, there are many examples of innovator companies from a wide array of industries who have partnered and shared IP to create testing, vaccines, and therapies to address this pandemic. In fact, IP has enabled this innovation and facilitated this collaboration by providing the incentives that have enabled innovators to devote the resources, technical knowledge, and know-how necessary to counter the pandemic. As a result, our innovative industries have been able to create vaccines and other measures to fight the pandemic. Should an IP waiver be implemented, however, there would not be a stable framework in place to provide confidence to innovators that they can take the necessary risks associated with their inventions and creations as we continue to combat COVID-19. In fact, a waiver would have an immediate chilling effect on continued research and collaborations that are needed, for example, to overcome new variants of the virus, create vaccines for special populations, and develop new tools to help defeat the pandemic and for future vaccine development for other infectious deceases.

Waiver Would Be a Windfall for U.S. Competitors

A second stated goal of the Administration is to become more competitive with countries such as China. To that end, the Senate just passed legislation totaling well over $200 billion that’s designed to strengthen U.S. competitiveness against China. However, to achieve that goal, the United States needs to protect our IP against forced tech-transfer from foreign governments, not give it away. Providing a windfall to U.S. competitors at the same time we are purportedly trying to level the playing field with regards to IP not only makes a farce out of U.S. attempts to “get tough,” but it also sends a dangerous message – that the United States is willing to cave to global pressure and waive Word Trade Organization IP commitments, even if the efficacy of the waiver is not supported by the facts. Unfortunately, we have no reason to think that will be the last of the calls to waive such commitments.

#### Short-term competition key to prevent U.S.-China war.

Beckley & Brands 20 – Associate Professor of Political Science at Tufts University and Jeane Kirkpatrick Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Henry A. Kissinger Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute

Michael Beckley, Hal Brands, “Competition With China Could Be Short and Sharp: The Risk of War Is Greatest in the Next Decade,” Foreign Affairs, December 2020, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-12-17/competition-china-could-be-short-and-sharp

The good news for the United States is that over the long term, competition with China may prove more manageable than many pessimists believe. Americans may one day look back on China the way they now view the Soviet Union—as a dangerous rival whose evident strengths concealed stagnation and vulnerability. The bad news is that over the next five to ten years, the pace of Sino-American rivalry will be torrid, and the prospect of war frighteningly real, as Beijing becomes tempted to lunge for geopolitical gain. The United States still needs a long-term strategy for protracted competition. But first it needs a near-term strategy for navigating the danger zone.

RED FLAGS

Much debate on Washington’s China policy focuses on the dangers China will pose as a peer competitor later this century. Yet the United States actually faces a more pressing and volatile threat: an already powerful but insecure China beset by slowing growth and intensifying hostility abroad.

China has the money and muscle to challenge the United States in key areas. Thanks to decades of rapid growth, China boasts the world’s largest economy (measured by purchasing power parity), trade surplus, financial reserves, navy by number of ships, and conventional missile force. Chinese investments span the globe, and Beijing is pushing for primacy in such strategic technologies as 5G telecommunications and artificial intelligence (AI). Add in four years of disarray in the U.S.-led world order under President Donald Trump, and it is hardly surprising that Beijing is testing the status quo from the South China Sea to the border with India.

Yet China’s window of opportunity may be closing fast. Since 2007, China’s annual economic growth rate has dropped by more than half, and productivity has declined by ten percent. Meanwhile, debt has ballooned eightfold and is on pace to total 335 percent of GDP by the end of 2020. China has little hope of reversing these trends, because it will lose 200 million working-age adults and gain 300 million senior citizens over the next 30 years. And as economic growth falls, the dangers of social and political unrest rise. Chinese leaders know this: President Xi Jinping has given multiple speeches warning about the possibility of a Soviet-style collapse, and Chinese elites are moving their money and children abroad.

Meanwhile, global anti-China sentiment has soared to levels not seen since the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre. Nearly a dozen countries have suspended or canceled participation in Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) projects. Another 16 countries, including eight of the world’s ten largest economies, have banned or severely restricted use of Huawei products in their 5G networks. India has been turning hard against China since a clash on their shared border killed 20 soldiers in June. Japan has ramped up military spending, turned amphibious ships into aircraft carriers, and strung missile launchers along the Ryukyu Islands near Taiwan. The European Union has labeled China a “systemic rival”; and the United Kingdom, France, and Germany are sending naval patrols to counter Beijing’s expansion in the South China Sea and Indian Ocean. On multiple fronts, China is facing the blowback created by its own behavior.

HISTORY RHYMES

Many people assume that rising revisionists pose the greatest danger to international security. But historically, the most desperate dashes have come from powers that had been on the ascent but grew worried that their time was running short.

World War I is a classic example. Germany’s rising power formed the strategic backdrop to that conflict, but German fears of decline triggered the ultimate decision for war. Russia’s growing military power and mobility menaced Germany’s eastern flank; new French conscription laws were changing the balance in the West; and a tightening Franco-Russian-British entente was leaving Germany surrounded. German leaders ran such catastrophic risks in the July crisis for fear that geopolitical greatness would elude them if they did not act quickly.

The same logic explains imperial Japan’s fatal gamble in 1941, after the U.S. oil embargo and naval rearmament presented Tokyo with a closing window of opportunity to dominate the Asia-Pacific. In the 1970s, Soviet global expansion peaked as Moscow’s military buildup matured and the slowing of the Soviet economy created an impetus to lock in geopolitical gains.

Given that China is currently facing both a grim economic forecast and a tightening strategic encirclement, the next few years may prove particularly turbulent. The United States obviously needs a long-term strategy to compete with China. But it also needs to blunt a potential surge of Chinese aggression and expansion this decade.

The early Cold War offers a useful parallel. At that time, American leaders understood that winning the long-term struggle against the Soviet Union required not losing crucial battles in the short term. The Marshall Plan, unveiled in 1947, was meant to prevent economic collapse in Western Europe, because such a breakdown might allow Moscow to extend its political hegemony over the entire continent. The creation of NATO and rearmament during the Korean War forged a military shield that allowed the West to thrive. Strategic urgency was the prelude to strategic patience: the United States could exploit its lasting economic and political advantages only if it closed off more immediate vulnerabilities.

Today, the United States again needs a danger-zone strategy, which should be based on three principles. First, focus on denying China near-term successes that would radically alter the long-term balance of power. The most pressing dangers are a Chinese conquest of Taiwan and Chinese preeminence in 5G telecommunications networks. Second, rely on tools and partnerships available now or in the near future rather than assets that require years to develop. Third, focus on selectively degrading Chinese power rather than changing Chinese behavior. Seduction and coercion are out; targeted attrition is in. Such an approach entails greater risk. But the United States must act assertively now to prevent more destabilizing spirals of hostility later.

#### U.S.-China war is likely and goes nuclear.

Kulacki 16 – China Project Manager in the UCS Global Security Program

Gregory Kulacki, “The Risk of Nuclear War with China: A Troubling Lack of Urgency,” Union of Concerned Scientists, 2016, https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/05/Nuclear-War-with-China.pdf

It is not difficult to imagine situations that could trigger an inadvertent or accidental nuclear war. For example, PRC leaders could underestimate U.S. willingness to use nuclear weapons to stop a conventional war. U.S. leaders could underestimate PRC willingness to retaliate after a tailored U.S. nuclear attack. The PRC could launch a retaliatory nuclear attack if the United States were to launch conventional missile strikes that China mistakenly believed were nuclear. The United States could make the same mistake. Equipment in the command and control network of either nation could be destroyed or malfunction, especially given the interest of both countries in anti-satellite weapons. Decision makers may not have timely access to accurate information in the fog of a conflict.

A PRC decision to move to launch on warning would be especially dangerous. The U.S. and Soviet/Russian experience with warning systems shows that false alarms and unexpected situations occur due to human and technical errors, and they are especially likely early in the deployment and operation of such a system. Errors of this sort increased the risk of a nuclear exchange on multiple occasions for the United States and Russia both during and after the Cold War.

No Technical Exit

As long as both sides remain committed to pursuing technical solutions to their unique strategic problems, they are condemned to continue competing indefinitely. But stalemate is not a stable outcome; rather, it is a perpetual high-wire act. Twenty-four hours a day, 365 days a year, the governments of the United States and China are a few poor decisions away from starting a war that could escalate rapidly and end in a nuclear exchange.

Lack of mutual trust and a growing sense that their differences may be irreconcilable incline both governments to continue looking for military solutions—for new means of coercion that help them feel more secure. Establishing the trust needed to have confidence in diplomatic resolutions to the disagreements, animosities, and suspicions that have troubled leaders of the United States and the PRC for almost 70 years is extremely difficult when both governments take every new effort to up the technological ante as an act of bad faith.

The bilateral dialogues on strategic stability aim to manage the military competition, but they do not seek to end it. Although the two governments work very hard at avoiding conflict, they have yet to find a way out of what Graham Allison called their “Thucydides trap”—the risk of conflict between a rising power and an established power invested in the status quo (Allison 2015). Allison’s warning not to minimize the risks of war is sage advice, even if he does not say how the United States and China can escape the trap he describes.

PRC leaders believe it is possible to prosecute a major war without risking a U.S. nuclear attack. The leaders of the United States believe stopping the PRC from prosecuting such a war may depend, in certain contingencies, on a credible threat to use nuclear weapons—a threat U.S. leaders state they are prepared to execute. These mismatched perceptions increase both the possibility of war and the likelihood it will result in the use of nuclear weapons.

Well-informed U.S. officials tend to dismiss the possibility that the United States and the PRC could wander into a nuclear war. For example, Admiral Dennis Blair, a former Director of National Intelligence whose final military post was Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, assured a large gathering of U.S. arms-control experts that “the chances of a nuclear exchange between the United States and China are somewhere between nil and zero.” J. Stapleton Roy, a former U.S. ambassador to the PRC, wholeheartedly agreed (Swaine, Blair, and Roy 2015). Similarly, PRC military strategists and arms control experts believe that the risk of nuclear war with the United States is not an urgent concern even if that risk may not be zero (Cunningham and Fravel 2015).

This lack of urgency is troubling. For example, the United States reportedly told the PRC it would risk military escalation to prevent or stop a proposed PRC island reclamation project in the Scarborough Shoal (Cooper and Douglas 2016). The PRC reportedly responded by committing to move ahead with the project later in 2016 (Chan 2016). This particular contest of wills is part of a steadily increasing number of unresolved diplomatic spats that have escalated to the level of overt military posturing reminiscent of U.S.-Soviet jousting during the Cold War.

The United States and the PRC are decades-old enemies, preparing for war and armed with nuclear weapons. Good faith efforts by the leaders of both nations have failed to stop accelerating preparations for war, including new investments in their nuclear forces. Miscommunication, misunderstanding, or poor judgment could spark a conflict that both governments may find difficult to stop.

### 1NC

#### Text: The member nations of the World Trade Organization should reduce intellectual property protections for medicines, but should maintain patent rights for medicines when owned by Native American tribes.

#### It competes- it’s a PIC. Don’t let them squirrel. If they had exceptions, they’d obviously be specified somewhere in the aff.

#### Native patent rights are justified under sovereign immunity. Tribes utilize medical patents to level the playing field- the Allergan case proves.

Morinville 17

(Paul Morinville, 10-9-2017, the Founder and former President of U.S. Inventor, Inc., which is an inventor organization in Washington D.C. that advocates strong patent protection for inventors and startups. Paul has been as executive at multiple technology startups including computer hardware, enterprise middleware and video compression software in the U.S. and China, and now medical devices. "Native Americans Set to Save the Patent System," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2017/10/09/native-americans-set-save-patent-system/id=88871/>, JKS)

As readers of this blog are aware, there has been a great deal of publicity generated by the recent patent sale and assignment by Allergan to the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe. A transaction ostensibly targeting the America Invents Act and designed to avoid the “killing fields” of the Patent Trial and Appeals Board (PTAB). The irony should not go unnoticed that Native Americans who historically had their property and rights taken away by egregious and discriminatory action by the United States government, are now the very same people rescuing inventors who are today losing their property and rights to egregious and discriminatory action by the very same government. Indian tribes are acquiring patents and using tribal sovereign immunity to preclude unjustified takings of patents by the discriminatory and corrupt PTAB, thus saving inventors from losing their private property rights. Yet, this emerging business model by Native American tribes has proven to be controversial, with critics even going so far as to allege these are sham transactions. But interestingly, these very same critics didn’t seem to have any problem when the University of Florida (a public university of the state of Florida) asserted its sovereign immunity to preclude PTAB review of university-owned patents. Why is it now alleged that Native American tribes who are doing the very same thing – using their sovereign immunity to preclude PTAB review of their intellectual property – are engaging in inappropriate or fraudulent behavior or somehow gaming the system? Tribes are sovereign in a similar way that states are sovereign, but there are important differences. Tribal lands are held in trust by the federal government and thus cannot be collateralized for investment and development, and tribes do not have a tax base to speak of. So by treaty the majority of funding that runs tribal governments and supports their native members comes from the federal government. This federal funding and other programs are intended to help the tribes become economically independent. With these funds and programs, a few tribes have been able to start tribal businesses owned by the tribe to create an economic engine that can at least partially support the tribe. Overall, these tribal businesses are successful at bringing economic development and jobs to Indian Reservations. Most people only know about the casinos and tax free cigarette shops, but tribal businesses go far beyond those stereotypical businesses. Tribal businesses are involved in many sectors including electronics, oil & gas, manufacturing, distribution, logistics and much more. Many employ not only natives on the reservation but others across the country. Tribal businesses contribute millions of dollars to the economies of reservations and of the US. States, on the other hand, get their funding by taxing their people and some even attempt to tax the tribes in one way or another. I met recently with one such tribal enterprise in North Dakota, Mandaree Enterprises LLC, which is owned by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold reservation, in order to gain a better understanding of tribal sovereign immunity in the context of intellectual property. Based on my discussions with the folks at Mandaree Enterprises, set forth below is an overview of how patent owners can partner with Native American tribes to create a level playing field with infringers while possibly avoiding the anti-inventor/anti-patent PTAB. It should be noted upfront that I’m not an attorney so you should seek your own independent legal advice and not rely on this article which is not intended to offer legal advice or substitute for obtaining the advice of legal counsel. Also, this article (due to space constraints) is necessarily incomplete in that it focuses on only one aspect of this type of structure, but there are many other benefits of teaming up with a tribe.

#### Any attempt to deny Native Nations their sovereign right to patents is emblematic of racist paternalism.

Gulliford 18

(Michael Gulliford is the Founder and a Managing Principal of Soryn IP Group, a patent advisory and finance firm headquartered in New York City that closed almost $140 million in patent deals in 2017. In addition, Soryn Capital, manages one of the largest funds in the U.S. dedicated to patent litigation finance. Prior to founding Soryn, Michael was a partner in the Intellectual Property group at Kirkland & Ellis LLP. 6-10-18, "Guest Editorial: Yes, Native Americans and Patents Do Go Together," Patently-O, <https://patentlyo.com/patent/2018/06/editorial-americans-together.html>, JKS)

#2 – No One Gives Native Americans Credit

The most recited narrative of the deal is that Allergan “rented” the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe’s sovereign immunity. This point of view is based on racism at worse and paternalism at best. Most can’t fathom that an Indian tribe, itself no stranger to devastating property loss, could be sophisticated enough to appreciate how recent changes to the U.S. patent system have failed innovators, or to have done a deal to right such wrongs. But as I’m sure Allergan quickly appreciated when it visited the Tribe’s reservation, the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe challenges convention. Its leadership is highly sophisticated and entrepreneurial. With limited powers of taxation, and the enormous burden of providing healthcare, addiction treatment, housing and education to its people, the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe innovates to create revenue. The Tribe’s broadband company “Mohawk Networks,” is solving the “last mile” problem in regions of Northern New York by building and expanding its high-speed fiber network. While local auto and aluminum factories have shut down, costing local jobs, the Tribe invested heavily in a new soy bean processing plant located close to the Tribe’s reservation. The plant will support farms that supply the State’s Greek yogurt industry, and create needed jobs. The Tribe’s Office of Technology, Research and Patents, founded well before the Allergan deal, is pursuing a host of patent and commercialization initiatives. All are examples of the Tribe’s desire to steer away from casino gaming as its sole revenue source. And there is more to come.

## Case

### FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing

#### Prefer it:

#### 1. Scenario planning – its good in the context of the resolution – future pandemics will happen and COVID proves we are ill-prepared – means even if they win futurism is bad generically we’ll win its good in the context of the resolution.

#### 2. Reject ‘consequentialism fails’ arguments – they ignore empirical reality and devalue violence – i.e. if I put my hand over a hot stove I immediately pull it away not because of any moral truth about my hand being burnt but the simple fact that it hurts – global warming is killing people right now and ignoring it is violent – you should refuse to evaluate their arguments.

#### 3. Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness – i.e. if I lie to you about liking your hair that is clearly not as bad as lying to you about whether there’s a serial killer behind you. Only consequentialism explains why the first lie is less bad then the second one.

#### 4. Util is lexically prior – in order for agents to be able to engage in complex moral deliberations they must first be safe and not in danger of death – that means materially reducing violence has to come first.

#### 5. their Petersen card – our impact makes this worse because the possibility of an extinction threat puts much more weight on reproduction

#### Impact calc –

#### Extinction first:

#### That is the only egalitarian metric---anything else collapses cooperation on collective action crises and makes extinction inevitable

Khan 18 (Risalat, activist and entrepreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks,” https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/)

Infinite future possibilities I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is far from immutable. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us. This is a humbling realization. Because faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do is prepare for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum? I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities, only one outcome is truly irreversible: extinction. Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as apocalyptic alarmism. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a straw man argument. The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility. And there have been far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy. As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation: 1. Extinction is the rule, not the exception More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. Deep time is unfathomable to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet. In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed. It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it. 2. Environmental pressures can drive extinction More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”. In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization. 3. Superintelligence: unplanned obsolescence? Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas. Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution. Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050, and a 90% chance by 2075. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today. Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it? 4. Technology: known knowns and unknown unknowns Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century. Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS? Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling. 5. 'The Trump Factor' Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since? The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope. What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves? Common enemy to common cause Throughout history, we have rallied against the ‘other’. Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime. We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion. But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an increasingly unstable island. We may have a violent past, but we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity. We cannot do this unless we are humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction. Survival is life’s primal instinct. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find common cause in survival. Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

#### Even if we don’t win extinction outweighs, the disad causes massive amounts of violence against women which outweighs everything else

### Case

#### Affect can’t explain political or social life

Megan **Boler 18** and Elizabeth Davis, Department of Social Justice Education, OISE/University of Toronto, May 2018, “The affective politics of the “post-truth” era: Feeling rules and networked subjectivity,” Emotion, Space and Society Volume 27, Pages 75-85

While the attention to affective attunement is **potentially useful**, in deploying a definition of affect as quantitative, pre-personal, non-conscious, and non-signifying, one is left with **myriad questions** about how particular emotions are **targeted**, **produced** and **manipulated** within the affective politics of digital media. Papacharissi characterizes affective transmission as follows: “So digital, among other media, invite and transmit affect but also sustain affective feedback loops that generate and reproduce affective patterns of relating to others that are further reproduced as affect — that is, intensity that has not yet been cognitively processed as feeling, emotion, or thought” (23). Following the popular reification of affect, Papacharissi sharply distinguishes affect from emotion (2015, 13). “Affect explains the intensity with which something is experienced; it refers to just that: intensity” (2015, 135). For her, affect is a central component of how stories are formed and circulated within media flows, and affect helps provide an index of how some stories end up being salient in social media, and thus potentially have more or less political impact. While this account of affect resonates prima facie with Hochschild's concept of “deep stories” and felt truths which shape the feeling rules we see defining partisan polarization, readers are **left wanting a full articulation** of the **significance** (rather than simply the **alleged presence**) of affect as it circulates in and through digital media. This reflects a **more widespread tendency** in much scholarship to invoke “affect” in Massumi's “autonomous” sense with **little exploration** of the **complex relational manifestations** of emotions.

Affect **all too often** becomes a **mystified idea** akin to force or energy and intimates an **abstract celebration** of the uncontainable:

Disorder, marginality, and anarchy present the habitat for affect, mainly because order, mainstreaming, and hierarchy afford form that compromises the futurity of affect. Because marginal spaces support the emergence of change, affect is **inherently political**, although it **does not conform** to the structures we symbolically internalize as political. Thus, per affect theory, empowerment lies in liminality, in pre-emergence and emergence, or at the point at which new formations of the political are in the process of being imagined but **not yet articulated**. The form of affective power is pre-actualized, networked, and of a liquid nature.(2015, 19)

“Affect” so understood **pales in analytical resonance** or **utility** in contrast with earlier feminist analyses of emotion, which, as in the bitterness example above, describe the **actual shape** and **flow** of social life as it is intersubjectively produced in **specific micro-** and **macro-political contexts**

#### Reducing IP for medicine does not solve sexism – they only get to weigh the fiated implications – force them to weigh the approximated impacts of what the resolution would solve against the disad

#### Rich countries supporting IP is not offense – just because rich countries support doesn’t mean its bad – just because India and south Africa support reducing IP doesn’t mean its good – we have warranted ev that the aff would collapse innovation which is net worse than rich countries supporting it

#### Just because vaccine nationalism happens doesn’t mean the res is good or the disad is false – make them actually debate the internal link

#### Also no warrant that fiating the aff causes rhetorical disidentification – the cards about it are only about the method of affirming