

1AC

We affirm the resolution

**Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.**

The standard is consequentialism

Prefer it: 3 warrants

1] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions that other theories presuppose

2] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that's not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first. Intuitions outweigh—they're the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can't deductively determine why.

3] Phenomenal introspection --- it's the most epistemically reliable --- historical moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality such as questions of race, gender, class, religion prove the fallibility of non-observational based ethics --- introspection means we value happiness because we can determine that we each value it --- just as I can observe a lemon's yellowness, we can make those judgments about happiness.

With that Consequentialism is the most effective way in evaluating the round

**Global health inequality threatens progress in the fight vs COVID-19 encouraging vaccine-resistant mutations**

**Fink 7-30-21**

(Jenni, <https://www.newsweek.com/who-warns-world-blind-understanding-covid-spread-hurting-ability-end-pandemic-1614722>

A lack of testing for COVID-19 in parts of the world is preventing countries from having a clear picture of how the virus is spreading and therefore hurting the world's chances at fighting the virus and ending the pandemic, according to the World Health Organization. **Health inequities** throughout the world **have plagued** the **global response to COVID-19** from the outset and WHO has pushed higher income countries to help lower income countries in the interest of ending the pandemic. Along with restricted access to vaccines, lower income countries have struggled to have sufficient testing, meaning the virus is likely going undetected in certain areas, further enabling its ability to spread. Low testing rates is "leaving the world blind to understanding where the disease is and how it's changing," Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, director general of the WHO said on Friday during a press briefing. Without improving global testing rates, Ghebreyesus said the world can't "fight the disease" or mitigate the risk it poses to people around the globe. who blind covid spread cases On Friday, the World Health Organization warned the world is "blind" to how COVID-19 is spreading because of a lack of testing in certain places. WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus attends a daily press briefing on the new coronavirus dubbed COVID-19, at the WHO headquarters on March 2, 2020, in Geneva. FABRICE COFFRINI//AFP/GETTY IMAGES NEWSWEEK NEWSLETTER  
SIGN-UP > One of Ghebreyesus' biggest frustrations with the pandemic response is the **failure to evenly distribute the vaccine** around the world. In some

countries, like the United States and other higher-income nations, significant portions of the population have been vaccinated. While those large vaccinated populations help reduce the spread of the virus in some areas, other countries, especially those in Africa, haven't been able to vaccinate even 10 percent of their population. This **puts the entire world at risk** because **when the virus is able to spread** throughout communities **it has the ability to mutate**, thereby **increasing the possibility** that **a mutation could evade the vaccines**. It's a scenario public health officials have been warning about for months and Ghebreyesus said on Friday that "hard won **gains are in jeopardy**" or have already been lost because the virus has been able to spread. Nearly 30 countries have high or rising oxygen needs and the shortage of life-saving oxygen could lead to increased deaths. More than 196 million cases of COVID-19 have been reported around the world, according to a Johns Hopkins University tracker, and more than 4.2 million people have died. Ghebreyesus suspected the number of cases would top 200 million within the next two weeks and warned that **health systems** in many countries **are being overwhelmed**. Preventing hospitals from exceeding capacity was a massive concern when the pandemic first broke out and a year later, parts of the U.S. are having their health systems strained as **the** more transmissible **Delta variant** spreads. On Thursday, Arkansas Governor Asa Hutchinson declared a public health emergency that allows the state to bring in health care workers from outside Arkansas and makes it easier for retired health care workers and medical students to become licensed. The goal is to help alleviate stress on health care systems and Hutchinson said they've had people waiting in ambulances because there wasn't an open spot in a hospital. That strain **will only become more exacerbated if a mutation occurs** that evades the vaccine, as inoculations have proven effective at helping to keep people out of the hospital. Ghebreyesus warned that more variants will emerge if global access to vaccines and testing doesn't improve. "The pandemic will end when the world chooses to end it. It is in our hands. We have all the tools we need. We can prevent this disease. We can test for it and we can treat it," Ghebreyesus said.

## IP protection waivers are key to reducing vaccine inequality. Empirics disprove all pro-patent arguments

Kumar, PhD, <sup>7-12</sup>21

(Rajesh, Associate Fellow Manohar Parrikar Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis, <https://www.idsa.in/issuebrief/wto-trips-waiver-covid-vaccine-rkumar-120721>)

In October 2020, India and South Africa had submitted a proposal to the World Trade Organization (WTO), suggesting a waiver of certain provisions of the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement for the "prevention, containment and treatment of COVID-19". The proposal seeks the waiver of "the implementation, application, and enforcement of sections 1, 4, 5 and 7 of part II of the TRIPS agreement", which are stipulations referring to copyright, industrial design, patents, and undisclosed information (trade secrets).<sup>1</sup> The proponents of the proposal argue that **a waiver will enable** timely and equitable **access to affordable health products** and technologies, **including vaccines**. Though many member countries had supported and co-sponsored the proposal, a small but influential group of countries, mainly Australia, Canada, the European Union (EU), Japan, the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States (US), opposed it. They argued that existing exceptions under the TRIPS Agreement are sufficient to address the concerns mentioned in the proposal. This resulted in sidelining of the waiver proposal for months. However, on 5 May 2021, the Joseph Biden administration announced its support for waiving intellectual property protections for COVID-19 vaccines.<sup>2</sup> It was a significant step towards breaking the seven-month gridlock, and led to many more countries modifying their position on the waiver proposal. On 25 May 2021, the co-sponsors of the waiver proposal submitted a revised proposal that specified the scope of the waiver as applying to "health products and technologies" and also added a section on the proposed duration of the waiver, i.e., three years.<sup>3</sup> At present, more than 100 countries, including the US and China support this proposal. The principal opponent of the waiver is the EU and in June 2021, it submitted an alternative proposal to the TRIPS Council, which requested to keep TRIPS' provisions intact and focused on compulsory licensing and removing vaccine export restrictions to address the concerns raised by India and South Africa.<sup>4</sup> The EU proposal also stated that the TRIPS Agreement does not prevent countries from taking measures to protect public health.<sup>5</sup> At the meeting of the TRIPS Council on 8–9 June 2021, the member states agreed to text-based negotiations focusing on two proposals tabled by members. The members also decided to hold a series of meetings till the end of July 2021 to take stock of the text-based negotiations. However, the latest developments show that the waiver discussions hit a hurdle due to a split between the developed and developing countries over the negotiation text. This brief discusses how TRIPS becomes a barrier to the equitable access of COVID-19 vaccines. It also examines how a waiver will help India in its fight against COVID-19 at home and abroad. TRIPS and its Exceptions TRIPS, a comprehensive multilateral agreement on Intellectual Property (IP), was an outcome of the Uruguay Round (1986–94) of negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The Agreement came into force on 1 January 1995 and offers a minimum standard of protection for Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).<sup>6</sup> In WTO, IPR are divided into two main categories. First, copyright and related rights (Articles 9 to 14, Part II of the TRIPS Agreement). Second, industrial property that includes trademarks, geographical indications, industrial designs, patents, integrated circuit layout designs, and undisclosed information (Articles 15 to 38, Part II of the TRIPS Agreement).<sup>7</sup> Article IX.3 and IX.4 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO deals with TRIPS waivers. Article IX.3 says that in "exceptional circumstances" the Ministerial Conference may waive off an obligation imposed on WTO member countries.<sup>8</sup> Such a decision requires the support of three-fourths of the WTO membership. According to Article IX.4, any waiver granted for more than one year will be reviewed by the Ministerial Conference. Based on the annual review, the Conference may extend, modify, or terminate the waiver. The TRIPS Agreement provides some flexibility primarily in the form of compulsory licensing and research exceptions through Articles 30 and 31. While Article 30 permits WTO members to make limited exceptions to patent rights, Article 31 provides a detailed exception, provided certain conditions are met. Compulsory licensing is the process of granting a license by a government to use a patent without the patent holder's consent. Article 31 permits granting compulsory license under circumstances such as "national emergencies", "other circumstances of extreme urgency", "public noncommercial use", or against "anti-competitive" practices.<sup>9</sup> In addition to these original waivers, the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted at the 2001 Doha Ministerial Meeting, also recognises some exceptions, for instance, in situations of a public health emergency, member countries have the freedom to determine the grounds upon which compulsory licenses are granted. Similarly, under Article 66.1, the least developed countries (LDCs) are given waivers for implementing TRIPS on pharmaceuticals till 1 January 2033. COVID-19 and TRIPS Waiver Two significant factors rekindled the debate on TRIPS waiver for essential medical products—first, vaccine inequity, and second, the insufficiency of existing waiver provisions in fighting the COVID-19 pandemic. **COVID-19 is an exceptional circumstance**, and equitable global access to the vaccine is necessary to bring the pandemic under control. However, the world is witnessing quite the reverse, i.e., vaccine nationalism. Vaccine nationalism is "my nation first" approach to securing and stockpiling vaccines before making them available in other countries. A TRIPS waiver would be instrumental in addressing the growing inequality in the production, distribution, and pricing of the COVID-19 vaccines. Vaccine Inequity According to Duke Global Health Innovation Center, which monitors COVID-19 vaccine purchases, rich nations representing just **14 per cent of the world** population **have bought** up to **53 per cent of the** most promising **vaccines** so far. As of 4 July 2021, the high-income countries (HICs) purchased more than half (6.16 billion) vaccine doses sold globally. At the same time, the **low-income countries** (LICs) **received only 0.3 per cent** of the vaccines produced. The low and middle-income countries (LMICs), which account for 81 per cent of the global adult population, purchased 33 per cent, and COVAX (COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access) has received 13 per cent.<sup>10</sup> Many HICs bought enough doses to vaccinate their populations several times over. For instance, Canada procured 10.45 doses per person, while the UK, EU and the US procured 8.18, 6.89, and 4.60 doses per inhabitant, respectively.<sup>11</sup> Source: "Tracking COVID-19 Vaccine Purchases Across the Globe", Duke Global Health Innovation Center, Updated 9 July 2021. Consequently, there is a significant disparity between HICs and LICs in vaccine administration as well. As of 8 July 2021, 3.32 billion vaccine doses had been administered globally.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, only one per cent of people in LICs have been given at least one dose. While in HICs almost one in four people have received the vaccine, in LICs, it is one in more than 500. The

World Health Organization (WHO) notes that about 90 per cent of African countries will miss the September target to vaccinate at least 10 per cent of their populations as a third wave looms on the continent.<sup>13</sup> South Africa, the most affected African country, for instance, has vaccinated less than two per cent of its population of about 59 million. This is in contrast with the US where almost 47.5 per cent of the population of more than 330 million has been fully vaccinated. In Sub-Saharan Africa, vaccine rollout remains the slowest in the world. According to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), at current rates, by the end of 2021, a massive global inequity will continue to exist, with Africa still experiencing meagre vaccination rates while other parts of the world move much closer to complete vaccination.<sup>14</sup> This vaccine **inequity is** not only morally indefensible but also clinically **counter-productive**. If this situation prevails, LICs could be waiting until 2025 for vaccinating half of their people. Allowing most of the world's population to go unvaccinated will also spawn new virus **mutations**, more contagious viruses leading to a steep rise in COVID-19 cases. Such a scenario **could cause twice as many deaths** as against distributing them globally, on a priority basis. Preventing this humanitarian catastrophe requires removing all barriers to the production and distribution of vaccines. TRIPS is one such barrier that prevents vaccine production in LMICs and hence its equitable distribution. TRIPS: Barrier to Equitable Health Care Access The opponents of the waiver proposal argue that IPR are not a significant barrier to equitable access to health care, and existing TRIPS flexibilities are sufficient to address the COVID-19 pandemic. However, history suggests the contrary. For instance, when South Africa passed the Medicines and Related Substances Act of 1997 to address the HIV/AIDS public health crisis, nearly 40 of world's largest and influential pharma companies took the South African government to court over the violation of TRIPS. The Act, which invoked the compulsory licensing provision, allowed South Africa to produce affordable generic drugs.<sup>15</sup> The Big Pharma also lobbied developed countries, particularly the US, to put bilateral trade sanctions against South Africa.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, when Indian company Cipla decided to provide generic antiretrovirals (ARVs) to the African market at a lower cost, Big Pharma retaliated through patent litigations in Indian and international trade courts and branded Indian drug companies as thieves.<sup>17</sup> Another instance was when Swiss company Roche initiated patent infringement proceedings against Cipla's decision to launch a generic version of cancer drug, "erlotinib". Though the Delhi High Court initially dismissed Roche's appeal by citing "public interest" and "affordability of medicines," the continued to pressure the generic pharma companies over IPR. <sup>18</sup> Likewise, Pfizer's aggressive patenting strategy prevented South Korea in developing pneumonia vaccines for children.<sup>19</sup> A recent document by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), or Doctors Without Borders, highlights various instances of how IP hinders manufacturing and supply of diagnostics, medical equipment, treatments and vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, during the peak of the COVID-19 first wave in Europe, Roche rejected a request from the Netherlands to release the recipe of key chemical reagents needed to increase the production of diagnostic kits. Another example was patent holders threatening producers of 3D printing ventilators with patent infringement lawsuits in Italy.<sup>20</sup> The MSF also found that **patents pose a** severe **threat to** access to **affordable versions of** newer **vaccines**.<sup>21</sup> Source: "COVID-19 Vaccine R&D Investments", Global Health Centre, Graduate Institute, Geneva, Updated 9 July 2021. The opponents of the TRIPS waiver also argue that IP is the incentive for innovation and if it is undermined, future innovation will suffer. However, most of the COVID-19 **medical innovations**, particularly vaccines, **are developed with public financing** assistance. **Governments spent billions** of dollars **for** COVID-19 **vaccine research**. Notably, **out of \$6.1 billion in investment** tracked up to July 2021, **98.12 per cent was public funding**.<sup>22</sup> The US and Germany are the largest investors in vaccine R&D with \$2.2 billion and \$1.5 billion funding. Source: "COVID-19 Vaccine R&D Investments", Global Health Centre, Graduate Institute, Geneva, Updated 9 July 2021. **Private companies received 94.6 per cent** of this funding; Moderna received the highest \$956.3 million and Janssen \$910.6 million. Moreover, governments also invested \$50.9 billion for advance purchase agreements (APAs) as an incentive for vaccine development. A recent IMF working paper also notes that **public research institutions** were a key driver of the COVID-19 R&D effort—**accounting for 70 per cent of all COVID-19 clinical trials globally**.<sup>23</sup> The argument is that vaccines are developed with the support of substantial public financing, hence there is a public right to the scientific achievements. Moreover, **private companies reaped billions in profits** from COVID-19 vaccines. Source: Katharina Buchholz, "COVID-19 Vaccines Lift Pharma Company Profits", Statista, 17 May 2021. One could argue that since the US, Germany and other HICs are spending money, their citizens are entitled to get vaccines first, hence vaccine nationalism is morally defensible. Nonetheless, it is not the case. The **TRIPS** Agreement includes several provisions which **mandates promotion of technology transfer** from developed countries to LDCs. For instance, Article 7 states that "the protection and enforcement of IP rights should contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users of technical knowledge and in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, and to a balance of rights and obligations."<sup>24</sup> Similarly, Article 66.2 also mandates the developed countries to transfer technologies to LDCs to enable them to create a sound and viable technological base. The LMICs opened their markets and amended domestic patent laws favouring developing countries' products against this promise of technology transfer. Another argument against the proposed TRIPS waiver is that a waiver would not increase the manufacturing of COVID-19 vaccines. Indeed, one of the significant factors contributing to vaccine inequity is the lack of manufacturing capacity in the global south. Further, a TRIPS waiver will not automatically translate into improved manufacturing capacity. However, **a waiver would be the** first but **essential step to increase manufacturing capacity worldwide**. For instance, **to export** COVID-19 **vaccine-related products, countries need to ensure** that **there are no IP restrictions** at both ends – exporting and importing. The market for vaccine materials includes consumables, single-use reactors bags, filters, culture media, and vaccine ingredients. **Export blockages** on raw materials, equipment and finished products **harm** the **overall output** of the vaccine supply chain. If there is no TRIPS restriction, more governments and companies will invest in repurposing their facilities. Similarly, the **arguments** such as **that** no other manufacturers can carry out the complex manufacturing process of COVID-19 vaccines and **generic manufacturing** as that **would jeopardise quality, have** also **been proven wrong** in the past. For instance, in the early 1990s, when Indian company Shantha Biotechnics approached **a Western firm** for a technology transfer of Hepatitis B vaccine, the firm **responded** that "India cannot afford such high technology vaccines... And even if you can afford to buy the technology, **your scientists cannot understand recombinant technology** in the least."<sup>25</sup> Later, **Shantha** Biotechnics **developed its own vaccine at \$1 per dose**, and the **UNICEF** (United Nations Children's Emergency Fund) mass inoculation programme **uses this vaccine** against Hepatitis B. In 2009, Shantha sold over 120 million doses of vaccines globally. India also produces high-quality generic drugs for HIV/AIDS and cancer treatment and markets them across the globe. Now, a couple of Indian companies are in the last stage of producing mRNA (Messenger RNA) vaccines.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, Bangladesh and Indonesia claimed that they could manufacture millions of COVID-19 vaccine doses a year if pharmaceutical companies share the know-how.<sup>27</sup> Recently, Vietnam also said that the country could satisfy COVID-19 vaccine production requirements once it obtains vaccine patents.<sup>28</sup> Countries like the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Turkey, Cuba, Brazil, Argentina and South Korea have the capacity to produce high-quality vaccines but lack technologies and know-how. However, Africa, Egypt, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa and Tunisia have limited manufacturing capacities, which could also produce COVID-19 vaccines after repurposing. Moreover, COVID-19 vaccine IPR runs across the entire value chain – vaccine development, production, use, etc. A mere patent waiver may not be enough to address the issues related to its production and distribution. What is more important here is to share the technical know-how and information such

as trade secrets. Therefore, the **existing TRIPS flexibilities**, such as compulsory and voluntary licensing, **are insufficient** to address this crisis. Further, compulsory licensing and the domestic legal procedures it requires is cumbersome and not expedient in a public health crisis like the COVID-19 pandemic.

## Four Impacts

### First

#### Failure to contain COVID-19 causes extinction

Guy R. **McPherson, PhD, 20** [PhD Range Science, Professor Emeritus, University of Arizona School of Natural Resources and Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology], "Will COVID-19 Trigger Extinction of All Life on Earth?" *Eart & Envi Scie Res & Rev*, Volume 3 Issue 2, 4-8-2020, <https://opastonline.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/will-covid-19-trigger-extinction-of-all-life-on-earth-eesrr-20-.pdf>

Small lives matter. Indeed, the "human body contains about 100 trillion cells, but only maybe one in 10 of those cells is actually — human" [1]. We are comprised of bacteria and other tiny living organisms, as well as non-living entities such as viruses. One such virus has captured the attention of the world, and with good reason. The novel **coronavirus could trigger extinction** of humans, and therefore the extinction of all life on Earth. I frequently hear and read that COVID-19 is a nefarious attempt by the so-called "elite" among us to depopulate the burgeoning human population on Earth. Other conspiracy theories abound, including COVID-19 as an attempt to further reduce human rights, promote expensive medical therapies, and otherwise enrich the wealthy at the expense of the bamboozled masses. I do not doubt the ability of the informed wealthy to fleece the ignorant masses. Nor do I doubt the ability of the informed wealthy to turn virtually any situation into an opportunity for monetary gain. A quick glance at the past two centuries provides plenty of examples. However, I doubt the monetarily wealthy among us are interested in accelerating human extinction, even for financial gain. As I explain below, the ongoing **reduction in industrial activity as a result of COVID-19** almost certainly **leads to loss of habitat for human** animals, hence **putting us on** the fast **track to human extinction**. I doubt the knowledgeable "elite" are interested in altering the sweet deal they are experiencing with the current set of living arrangements. The aerosol masking effect, or global dimming, has been described in the peer-reviewed literature since at least 1929 [2, 3]. **Coincident with** industrial activity adding to greenhouse gases that warm the planet, **industrial activity** simultaneously **cools the planet by adding aerosols** to the atmosphere. **These** aerosols **block incoming sunlight**, thereby keeping cool our pale blue dot. **Reducing industrial activity by** as little as **35 percent is expected to cause a global-average temperature rise of 1 degree Celsius within a few weeks** according to research on the aerosol masking effect [4]. Such research was deemed collectively too conservative by a paper in the 17 January 2019 issue of *Science* [5]. As pointed out by the lead author of the latter paper on 22 January 2019 "Global efforts to improve air quality by developing cleaner fuels and burning less coal could end up harming our planet by reducing the number of aerosols in the atmosphere, and by doing so, diminishing aerosols' cooling ability to offset global warming" [6].

The cooling effect is "nearly twice what scientists previously thought," and the paper by Rosenfeld et al. [5] cites the conclusion by Levy et al. [4], indicating as little as 35% reduction in industrial activity drives a 1 C global-average rise in temperature, thereby suggesting that as little as a 20% reduction in industrial activity will drive a 1 C spike in temperature within a few weeks [7]. Additional, recent support for the importance of the aerosol masking effect comes from [8, 9]. Furthermore, loss of aerosols exacerbates heat waves [10]. Human extinction might have been triggered several years ago when the global-average temperature of Earth exceeded 1.5 C above the 1750 baseline. According to a comprehensive overview published by European Strategy and Policy Analysis System in April, an "increase of 1.5 degrees is the maximum the planet can tolerate; ... at worst, [such a rise in temperature above the 1750 baseline will cause] the extinction of humankind altogether" [11, 12]. Earth's global-average temperature hit 1.73 C above the 1750 baseline by April, 2018 the highest global-average temperature experienced by Homo sapiens on Earth [13, 14].

By 13 March 2020, 2 C above the 1750 baseline was crossed [11]. In other words, human extinction via the death-by-a-thousandcuts route might be locked in with no further heating of Earth. In light of the ongoing pandemic, the ongoing Mass Extinction Event, and abrupt, irreversible climate change, it is pleasantly surprising that humans still occupy Earth. The pandemic-induced reduction in industrial activity may have already reduced the aerosol masking effect sufficiently to trigger a 1 C temperature spike. The outcome is not yet obvious because the timing of the outbreak of the novel coronavirus was favorable for human habitat. Trees produced leaves in the Northern Hemisphere spring of 2020 as a result of carbohydrates stored the previous year and grain crops were harvested before the novel coronavirus emerged. Results of the recent and ongoing rise in temperature, which have already been reported in China and India, will become obvious to most humans when many more trees die. Large-scale die-off of trees likely will approximately correspond with catastrophic crop failure. This might occur by the end of this year, although I would rather it not. Every civilization requires bread and circuses. There is little doubt the circuses attendant to industrial civilization will continue until the end of the planetary show for Homo sapiens. Bread, however, requires wheat. **Wheat production requires a delicate** balance of **growing conditions** that, like habitat for

humans, teeters on the brink [15]. The path to near-term human extinction thus runs from a tiny virus underlying a pandemic through a **reduction of industrial activity** that **overheats a planet already running a fever**. The outbreak of COVID-19 could very well be the event that accelerates human extinction via reduction of industrial activity, hence loss of habitat for Homo sapiens. As a result of the rapid environmental change likely to follow, we are almost certain to lose all life on Earth [16]. History is replete with examples of human hubris. We thought we were mighty, and we certainly have left our mark on Earth. How embarrassing for the big-brained human species that a microscopic virus could pull the trigger on our extinction [15].

### Second

#### Continued COVID spread causes great power war and kills multilateralism - diversion, nationalism, psychology

Kitfield 20

(James, the only three-time winner of the prestigious Gerald R. Ford Award for Distinguished Reporting on National Defense, <https://breakingdefense.com/2020/05/will-covid-19-kill-the-liberal-world-order/>, 5-22)

For a brief moment **it seemed** that **the** worst global **pandemic** in a century **might lead to increased comity** between the United States, China and Russia after years of geopolitical eye-gouging. As the virus spread there were early signs of a pause in the escalating cycle of military brinksmanship, cyberattacks, disinformation campaigns and trade wars that has badly shaken the rules-based international order in this era of great power competition. Beijing seemed to initially embrace a spirit of cooperation when it donated protective gear and testing equipment to hard hit countries in Europe. President Trump for months was uncharacteristically effusive in his praise of Chinese President Xi Jinping's efforts to combat the virus. Russian President Vladimir Putin got into the soft power act in early April when he dispatched an An-124 military transport to New York filled with donated masks and ventilators. (Of course, you can also argue it was a highly effective information operation designed to undermine U.S. standing in the world.) That moment was short lived. "Unfortunately, **this crisis is likely to unfold in** three consecutive waves, with a **public health** crisis **followed by** an **economic** crisis, quite possibly **followed by** a **security crisis**," said David Kilcullen, author of the recent book "The Dragons and Snakes: How the Rest Learned to Fight the West," and a former special adviser to Gen. David Petraeus in Iraq, and the U.S. Secretary of State. **The U** **S** **is already experiencing** high levels of **domestic unrest** at a time of paralyzing partisan rancor, he noted, and the discord will certainly increase as the presidential election nears in November. **Adding** to that combustible mixture **is likely to be a second wave** of the virus expected to hit in the fall, **and foreign actors like Russian and China** determined to use disinformation to stoke domestic divisions during the election. "Given the likelihood of internal instability and anti-government anger here and around the world, there will be a huge incentive for **leaders** who personalize politics like Trump, [Russian President Vladimir] Putin and [Chinese President] Xi Jinping to **look for external scapegoats** for their domestic troubles, which has already started to happen," said Kilcullen. "This crisis also comes at a point when **the international system** that we've known since the end of World War II **was already rotting** and weaker than it appears. It may only take **one big shock to bring that whole structure down**," and, if we're not very careful, the pandemic could be that shock. So this is the **most dangerous geopolitical dynamic** I have seen in my entire career." Chinese President Xi Jinping inspects PLA troops As it became clear the Chinese Communist Party covered up the initial outbreak of the novel coronavirus in Wuhan, wasting precious time and allowing it to blossom into a global pandemic, **Beijing launched a campaign of** intimidation and economic **threats to mute** international **criticism**. Borrowing a page from Russian disinformation operations, Beijing posited the conspiracy theory that the virus originated with the U.S. military. Both China and Russia pushed alarmist narratives about the pandemic on social media to sow division and panic inside the United States. Much of the **protective equipment** Beijing "donated" to the West **carried a price tag and turned out** to be **defective**. In his own campaign of blame shifting and heated rhetoric, President Donald Trump accused China of being responsible for an attack on the United States that "is worse than Pearl Harbor," and "worse than the World Trade Center" that fell in the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Chinese incompetence in dealing with the virus, Trump tweeted this week, is responsible for "mass Worldwide killing!" Trump darkly hinted in mid-April that he had information that a virology lab in Wuhan played an important role in the virus' creation, even though the U.S. Intelligence Community consensus was that the virology lab in Wuhan had nothing to do the virus' creation or origins. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo insisted there is "enormous evidence" the coronavirus originated in that lab. "We greatly underestimated the degree to which Beijing is ideologically and politically hostile to free nations," Pompeo told reporters this week, after sending a rare, high-level message of congratulations to recently reelected Taiwanese President Tsai Ing-Wen, who has rejected the "one country, two systems" construct that has kept the peace between China and Taiwan for nearly half a century. As **the Trump administration** weighs retribution against **China, it has continued to ratchet up** the **rhetoric and provocations, angering and worrying allies** by cutting critical funding to the World Health Organization (WHO) in the midst of the pandemic, and boycotting a virtual meeting of G-20 nations that attempted to coordinate an international response to the crisis, leaving a leadership gap that China was happy to help fill. Open Skies surveillance plane On the Russian front, the Trump administration has reportedly decided to withdraw from the three-decade old Open Skies Treaty that allows 34 countries to fly over each other's territory with sensors to confirm they are not preparing military action. The trump White House says the Russians are violating the accord by forbidding flights over military exercises and using its own flights over the United States to identify critical infrastructure that can be hit by cyberattacks. Meanwhile, populist leaders and autocratic regimes around the world are using the threat of the pandemic to assume extraordinary powers and crack down on their political opposition in what the United Nations Special Rapporteur for Counterterrorism and Human Rights called an "an epidemic of authoritarianism," according to the The New York Times. Shaky World Order Even before the pandemic the post-WW II international order that the United States constructed and led for more than half a century was on shaky ground. The global institutions, alliances and rules governing international relations has been challenged by assertive autocratic regimes like China and Russia, and eroded from within by inward-looking nationalist-populists movements spreading throughout the Western democracies. The liberal international order has also been largely abandoned by its leader as Donald Trump's administration retreats further into "America First" isolationism. The Trump doctrine in international affairs actively seeks to undermine the institutions of global order, whether it's the World Health and Trade Organizations, the UN, the European Union or NATO. The administration has rejected or abolished all manner of multilateral agreements and treaties designed to peacefully constrain international rivalries, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, the Paris Climate Agreement, the Iran nuclear deal, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces treaty, and quite possibly next year the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START). A Dark History History is rife with cautionary examples of natural disasters or economic crises conflating with geopolitical tensions, with cataclysmic results. **The** catastrophic 1918 **Spanish flu** pandemic, which killed more than 20 million victims worldwide, **was accelerated** and spread **by** troop movements during **World War I**. With many Americans disillusioned by the war and loss **the U** **S** **turned** insular and **isolationist** during the 1920s, rejecting the League of Nations, dramatically curtailing immigration and erecting steep tariff barriers to trade. Much of the rest of the world followed suit. The U.S. stock market crash of 1929 was compounded the next year by one of the worst droughts in history. When the Japanese invaded China two years later, and Adolf Hitler became German chancellor soon after, there was no League of Nations nor stabilizing trading systems to contain the war fever that swept the globe and became World War II. "When you think back to 1918 and the Spanish flu, it's worth remembering that **more people died in the second wave** than the first, and the Great Depression and the 1930s taught us that bad economic conditions can be transformative," said Joseph Nye, a professor emeritus and former Dean of the Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, speaking recently on a videoconference organized by The National Interest. "The point is, in the current pandemic we're likely only in **Act 1 of a multi-act play**." Combustible Leadership The very real potential for the pandemic crisis to propel the major powers towards outright military conflict was noted recently by the Chinese Ministry of State Security, Beijing's top intelligence agency. In a report for Xi Jinping and the senior Chinese leadership it reportedly concluded that **global anti-China sentiment** being stoked by the Trump administration **has reached its** highest **peak** since the 1989 Tiananmen Square crackdown, and as a result China needs to be prepared for a worst-case scenario of **armed confrontation with the United States**. Despite the warnings, **Xi** **has doubled down** in recent months **on provocative military maneuvers** in its neighboring seas, sending its Liaoning carrier battle group and military flights off the coast of Taiwan; conducting

anti-submarine exercises in contested areas of the South China Sea; ramming and sinking a Vietnamese fishing boat near the disputed Paracel Islands; dispatching a fishing boat “militia” to harass Philippine counterparts near the contested Spratly Islands; and harassing a Malaysian drillship. The littoral combat ship USS Montgomery conducts operations near drillship, the West Capella, in Malaysian waters. Some analysts see those moves as an attempt by Xi Jinping to show strength and bolster his image at home among a Chinese populace wearied by the pandemic shutdowns and economic disruptions. Those provocations are exactly the kind of saber-rattling that can escalate **dangerously in a time of crisis**. George Beebe is a former director of the CIA’s Russia analysis section, and author of the book “The Russia Trap: How Our Shadow War with Russia Could Spiral into Catastrophe.” “My concern is that the major power leaders Putin, Xi and Trump all tend to personalize international relations and politics. They are all going through severe economic and political distress. Each of them is convinced that their rivals are trying to **exploit the pandemic crisis, and not one of them is dealing from a position of strength and confidence**,” he told me. Putin has long felt betrayed and threatened by the United States, Beebe noted, and Xi Jinping is convinced that America is trying to thwart China’s rise. One of the few constants in Trump’s worldview is the conviction that China has taken advantage of the United States with trade going back decades. “So there’s a lot of fear and emotion and very little trust in the relationships between these leaders during a time of great strain, and their communications and diplomatic mechanisms to manage a crisis if one occurs have atrophied,” said Beebe. “Given that personalities and personal relationships among national leaders are far more important in international affairs than a lot of people appreciate, I do worry that we’re entering a very dangerous period when cooler heads may not prevail among the great power leaders.”

## Even a limited nuclear war would cause extinction – best science.

### Cribb 17

(Julian, BA Classics@WesternAustralia, FoundingEditor@ScienceAlert, Surviving the 21st Century, Springer)

The most publicised horrors of nuclear war, over the past half-century, were blast damage, fireball burns and radiation sickness, as they were in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, leading to a perception that those well away from target areas might be spared. Scientists however demur, arguing **that the biggest killer of all is likely to be a ‘nuclear winter’**, triggered by the immense quantities of dust and smoke from burning cities and forests lofted into the upper atmosphere, and the simultaneous stripping of the Earth’s protective ozone layer. “In the aftermath... vast areas of the earth could be subjected to prolonged darkness, abnormally low temperatures, violent windstorms, toxic smog and persistent radioactive fallout.” This would be compounded by the collapse of farming and food production, transport, energy grids, healthcare, sanitation and central government. Even in regions remote from the actual blasts people would starve, die from freezing temperatures as much as 30 °C below normal, from radiation sickness and a pandemic of skin cancers, pollution and loss of immunity to ordinary diseases. The nuclear winter is in effect the antithesis of global warming, a shock cooling of the entire planet, but one lasting several years only. However, “A number of **biologists contend the extinction of many species— including the human species—is a real possibility**,” they say (Turco et al. 2012 ). In the 1980s a group of courageous scientists alerted the leaders of both the US and Russia to the dangers of a nuclear winter. In an atomic war, they warned, there will be no winners. Then Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev took their counsel to heart: “Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on Earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act in that situation,” he subsequently related (Hertsgard 2000 ). US President Ronald Reagan concurred: “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought,” he said in his State of the Union Address in 1984 (Reagan 1984 ). Marking this watershed moment in history Al Gore recounted in his Nobel Prize oration in 2007 “More than two decades ago, scientists calculated that nuclear war could throw so much debris and smoke into the air that it would block life- giving sunlight from our atmosphere, causing a ‘nuclear winter.’ Their eloquent warnings here in Oslo helped galvanize the world’s resolve to halt the nuclear arms race.” How large a nuclear release is required to precipitate a nuclear winter is still subject to technical debate, but with the **greatly improved models developed for climate science, recent estimates suggest as few as 50 Hiroshima-sized bombs** (15 kilotonnes each) would do it— **or the use of only one weapon in every 200 from the global nuclear arsenal** (Robock 2009 ). This puts a very different complexion on the contemporary risks facing humanity. First, it suggests that **even a limited conflict among lesser actors in the arms race**, for example between Pakistan and India, India and China or Israel and Iran, and involving mainly the use of “battlefield” nukes **could still imperil the entire world**. In Lights Out: how it all ends , nuclear experts Alan Robock and Brian Toon examined the effects of a regional war (Robock and Toon 2012 ). To begin with, they argue, **a ‘limited nuclear war’ is highly unlikely as**, with the release of a handful of battlefield nukes, **things will very quickly spiral out of control** as communications fail and panic spreads, mushrooming into a more general conflict involving dozens of weapons spread over a much wider region. Firestorms in the megacities would throw up a shocking amount of smoke, ash and dust—around 70 billion tonnes is the estimate for an India/Pakistan clash. Running this through climate models they found it would block out sunlight, chilling the planet by an average 1.25° for up to 10 years—enough to cause crop-killing frosts , even in midsummer. This would sharply reduce and in some regions eliminate farm production for several years. Normal world grain stocks are sufficient to feed humanity for only about 2–3 months, so one of the first round effects of the war would be worldwide panic and financial collapse as food supplies give out and grain prices soar astronomically. **A billion people** living on the margins of hunger **would probably perish within weeks** and **billions more over the ensuing months**. In the early twenty-first century at least eight nations, on this calculus, have the tools to terminate civilisation, and possibly **the human species**, on their own, while at least two more aspire to the power to do so. Meanwhile the shadow of possible nuclear and chemical terrorism, and their consequences, is lengthening.

### Third

## COVID vaccine debate will kill the WTO- there are no alternate causes and solvency is reverse causal

### Meyer 6-18-21

(David, Senior Writer, <https://fortune.com/2021/06/18/wto-covid-vaccines-patents-waiver-south-africa-trips/>)

The World Trade Organization **knows all about crises**. Former U.S. President Donald Trump threw a wrench into its core function of resolving trade disputes—a blocker that President Joe Biden has not yet removed—and there is widespread dissatisfaction over the **fairness of the global trade rulebook**. The 164-country organization, under the fresh leadership of Nigeria’s Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, has a lot to fix. However, **one crisis is more pressing than the others: the battle over COVID-19 vaccines**, and whether the protection of their patents and other intellectual property should be temporarily lifted to boost production and end the pandemic sooner rather than later. According to some of those pushing for the



waiver—which was originally proposed last year by India and South Africa—the WTO's future rests on what happens next. "The **credibility** of the WTO **will depend on its ability to find a meaningful outcome** on this issue that truly ramps-up and diversifies production," says Xolelwa Mlumbi-Peter, South Africa's ambassador to the WTO. "Final nail in the coffin" The Geneva-based WTO isn't an organization with power, as such—it's a framework within which countries make big decisions about trade, generally by consensus. It's supposed to be the forum where disputes get settled, because all its members have signed up to the same rules. And one of its most important rulebooks is the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, or TRIPS, which sprang to life alongside the WTO in 1995. **The WTO's** founding agreement allows for rules to be waived in exceptional circumstances, and indeed this has happened before: its **members agreed in 2003 to waive TRIPS** obligations that were **blocking the importation of cheap, generic drugs** into developing countries that lack manufacturing capacity. (That waiver was effectively made permanent in 2017.) Consensus is the key here. Although the **failure to reach consensus** on a waiver could be overcome with a 75% supermajority vote by the WTO's membership, this **would be** an unprecedented and **seismic event**. In the case of the COVID-19 vaccine IP waiver, it would mean standing up to the European Union, and Germany in particular, as well as countries such as Canada and the U.K.—the U.S. recently flipped from opposing the idea of a waiver to supporting it, as did France. It's a dispute between countries, but the result will be on the WTO as a whole, say waiver advocates. **If** in the face of one of humanity's greatest challenges in a century, **the WTO** functionally **becomes an obstacle** as in contrast to part of the solution, I think **it could be the final nail in the coffin** for the organization, says Lori Wallach, the founder of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, a U.S. campaigning group that focuses on the WTO and trade agreements. "If the TRIPS waiver is successful, and people see **the WTO as** being **part of the solution**—saving lives and livelihoods—**it could create goodwill and momentum to address** what are still daunting **structural problems.**" Those problems are legion. Reform needs Top of the list is the WTO's Appellate Body, which hears appeals in members' trade disputes. It's a pivotal part of the international trade system, but Trump—incensed at decisions taken against the U.S. —blocked appointments to its seven-strong panel as judges retired. The body became completely paralyzed at the end of 2019, when two judges' terms ended and the panel no longer had the three-judge quorum it needs to rule on appeals. Anyone who hoped the advent of the Biden administration would change matters was disappointed earlier this year when the U.S. rejected a European proposal to fill the vacancies. "The United States continues to have systemic concerns with the appellate body," it said. "As members know, the United States has raised and explained its systemic concerns for more than 16 years and across multiple U.S. administrations." At her confirmation hearing in February, current U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai reiterated those concerns—she said the appellate body had "overstepped its authority and erred in interpreting WTO agreements in a number of cases, to the detriment of the United States and other WTO members," and accused it of dragging its heels in settling disputes. "Reforms are needed to ensure that the underlying causes of such problems do not resurface," Tai said. "While the U.S. [has] been engaging [with the WTO] it hasn't indicated it would move quickly on allowing appointments to the Appellate Body," says Bryan Mercurio, an economic-law professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, who opposes the vaccine waiver. "This is not a good sign. In terms of WTO governance, it's a much more important step than supporting negotiations on an [intellectual property] waiver." It's not just the U.S. that wants to see reform at the WTO. In a major policy document published in February, the EU said negotiations had failed to modernize the organization's rules, the dispute-resolution system was broken, the monitoring of countries' trade policies was ineffective, and—crucially—"the trade relationship between the U.S. and China, two of the three largest WTO members, is currently largely managed outside WTO disciplines." China is one of the key problems here. It became a WTO member in 2001 but, although this entailed significant liberalization of the Chinese economy, it did not become a full market economy. As the European Commission put it in February: "The level at which China has opened its markets does not correspond to its weight in the global economy, and the state continues to exert a decisive influence on China's economic environment with consequent competitive distortions that cannot be sufficiently addressed by current WTO rules." "China is operating from what it sees as a position of strength, so it will not be bullied into agreeing to changes which it sees as not in its interests," says Mercurio. China is at loggerheads with the U.S., the EU and others over numerous trade-related issues. Its rivals don't like its policy of demanding that Chinese citizens' data is stored on Chinese soil, nor do they approve of how foreign investors often have to partner with Chinese firms to access the country's market, in a way that leads to the transfer of technological knowhow. They also oppose China's industrial subsidies. Mercurio thinks China may agree to reforms on some of these issues, particularly regarding subsidies, but "only if it is offered something in return." All **these** problems won't go away if the WTO manages to come up with a TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and medical supplies, Wallach concedes. "But," she adds, "the will and the good faith to tackle these challenges is increased enormously if the WTO has the experience of being part of the solution, not just an obstacle." Wallach points to a statement released earlier this month by Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) trade ministers, which called for urgent discussions on the waiver. **The WTO must demonstrate that global trade rules can help address the human catastrophe** of the COVID-19 pandemic **and facilitate the recovery.** "the statement read in its section about WTO reform. Okonjo-Iweala's role The WTO's new director general, whose route to the top was unblocked in early 2021 with the demise of the Trump administration, is certainly keen to fix the problems that contributed to the early departure of her predecessor, Brazil's Robert Azevedo. "We must act now to get all our ambassadors to the table to negotiate a text" on the issue of an IP waiver for COVID vaccines, Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, director general of the World Trade Organization, has said. Dursun Aydemir—Anadolu/Bloomberg/Getty Images Earlier this week, when the U.S. and EU agreed a five-year ceasefire in a long-running dispute over Boeing and Airbus aircraft subsidies, Okonjo-Iweala tweeted: "With political will, we can solve even the most intractable problems." However, Mercurio is skeptical about her stewardship having much of an effect on the WTO's reform process. "Upon taking [over she] stated it was time for delegations to speak to each other and not simply past each other, but at the recent General Counsel meeting delegations simply read prepared statements in what some have described as the worst meeting ever," he says. "On the other hand, Ngozi is very much someone who will actively seek solutions to problems, and in this way different to her predecessor. If the role of mediator is welcomed, she could have an impact not in starting discussions but in getting deals over the finish line." A spokesperson for the WTO Secretariat declined to offer comment on Mlumbi-Peter and Wallach's suggestions that the organization's credibility rests on the vaccine patent waiver issue, but pointed to a May speech in which Okonjo-Iweala said **the WTO could help tackle vaccine supply chain monitoring and transparency,** helping manufacturers scale up production, and creating a more geographically diversified manufacturing base. In her speech, the WTO chief also said members "must address issues related to technology transfer, knowhow and intellectual property," including the waiver proposal. "We must act now to get all our ambassadors to the table to negotiate a text," she said.

## The WTO dampens US-China great power conflict which is crucial to solve a laundry list of existential threats. Cooperation on global vaccine distribution is a vital test case

Shaffer, JD Stanford, 21

(Gregory Shaffer is Chancellor's Professor at the University of California, Irvine, and author of the forthcoming book, "Emerging Powers in the World Trading System: The Past and Future of International Economic Law." <https://thehill.com/opinion/international/559049-the-us-must-engage-with-china-even-when-countering-china>, 6-21)

A policy statement heard around the world is that U.S. engagement with China “has come to an end.” It suggests that the Biden administration is taking a hawkish approach toward China. That stance seemed clear as the U.S. worked the G7 and NATO communiqués to confront China with an “alliance of democracies.” Yet, peeling the layers, one comes to the necessity for a much more complex U.S. approach to China. Rather than ending engagement, the U.S. should be thinking about engagement’s different dimensions. Indeed, Kurt Campbell, coordinator for Indo-Pacific affairs on the National Security Council, who made the remark, implicitly addressed three necessary forms of engagement that have been lacking. First, even when the United States aims to counter China, engagement remains essential. The U.S. will most effectively counter Chinese actions in the South China Sea, the Taiwan Strait, along the border with India, and against allies’ economies, if the U.S. works closely with others. The Trump administration was notoriously unreliable and antagonistic towards allies. **The United States and its allies will bolster their position** in relation to China **if they coordinate** — an approach underscored at the recent G7 and NATO summits. ADVERTISEMENT Yet, even in high-conflict situations, **diplomacy and bargaining** with China also **will be important**. **Trade and technology policies** are rife with rivalry and competition. These policies **can trigger harmful** tit-for-tat **escalations if** they are **not grounded in agreed rules** and **understandings**. These risks become particularly salient when economic and financial crises strike. Third-party institutions such as **the World Trade Organization (WTO) can** help parties **manage** their **conflicts so** that **they are not** mutually **destructive**. China will be indispensable in any U.S. effort to update and “reform” WTO rules. Second, **the United States needs to work with China to** effectively **address** common global, existential challenges. Campbell mentioned three: **climate change**, global **pandemics**, and nuclear **proliferation**. A signal success of the Obama administration was getting China to make commitments for the first time on emissions, which gave rise to the Paris Agreement. The U.S. also worked with China to stem **Iran’s** ability to develop nuclear weapons under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. It needs to do the same regarding **North Korea’s** nuclear program. Even in these areas of mutual concern, competition and rivalry are present. Yet such competition also can lead to mutually beneficial outcomes, **such as to provide vaccines globally** and to develop green technologies.

## 4th

### Unchecked protectionism spurred by COVID threatens free trade – WTO legitimacy is key

**Solís 20** [Mireya Solís, Director - Center for East Asia Policy Studies Senior Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center for East Asia Policy Studies Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies. "The post COVID-19 world: Economic nationalism triumphant?," Brookings, 7-10-2020, accessed 9-3-2021, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/07/10/the-post-covid-19-world-economic-nationalism-triumphant/>] HWIC

The damage caused by the worst global health crisis in a century is vast. The new coronavirus has traveled far and fast, infecting more than 8.7 million people and killing more than 460,000. One after another, economies have gone into lockdown to slow down the spread of the **disease**. The combined supply and demand shocks have **ravaged the world economy** with the most severe downturn since the Great Depression; anticipated **drop to international trade** and investment flows **of 30%** and 40%, respectively; and unemployment spikes in many countries. The pandemic has cost lives and livelihoods and has erased the chances of returning to the status quo ante, but it has also brought little clarity regarding what kind of international order it will usher in. Is the future one of deglobalization, decoupling, and reshoring of economic activity? The pandemic hit an already wounded multilateral trading system. The chances that the World Trade Organization (WTO) can deliver a multilateral round of trade negotiations to slash tariffs across the board and update the trade and investment rulebook are nil. But **the WTO** has also **lost its central role as arbiter of trade disputes** among its members. In December 2019, **the Appellate Body ceased to function** due to the U.S. block of new appointments, citing judicial overreach. At a time of rising protectionism, the erosion of a rules-based mechanism to adjudicate disputes bodes ill. **Longstanding challenges** to the WTO have been **exacerbated by** an **abdication** of leadership **from** the **great powers** to ensure its survival. China has been the godchild of globalization, leveraging its accession to the WTO to become workshop for the world and a huge domestic market coveted by foreign firms. But China lost its appetite for economic reform, reinvesting on a state capitalism model that imposes heavy costs on other nations. Unchecked subsidies and privileges awarded to its state-owned enterprises, insufficient protection of intellectual property, foreign investment restrictions, forced technology transfers, and cyber protectionism all make the Chinese government’s self-proclamation as champion of global free trade ring hollow. The Trump administration judges the WTO incapable of tackling the China challenge, but instead of creating coalitions of like-minded countries to bring about effective multilateral trade governance, it appears determined to further cripple the international organization. It has offered no blueprint to fix the dispute settlement mechanism, has abused the national security exemption to raise tariffs against allies, and is gearing up for its most fundamental assault to date on the WTO: a tariff reset through which the U.S. may unilaterally abandon its commitments on bound tariffs and apply larger duties to force other countries to open their markets. Trade spats as other countries retaliate in kind is a more likely result. Tariff wars and the battle for technology supremacy have come to define U.S.-China great power competition. After a grueling trade conflict, **the United States and China reached a limited trade agreement** in January 2020. The deal **marked a pause in the tariff war** and addressed some non-tariff barriers on foreign direct investment and intellectual property; **but it left intact** the core of Chinese industrial policy (public subsidies and **state-owned enterprises**) and retained U.S. duties on \$360 billion worth of Chinese products. China’s massive purchase commitments (\$200 billion) were quickly rendered unattainable by the severe economic downturn in China due to COVID-19. In fighting for the new economic order, setting standards on cutting-edge technologies will be at the forefront. **China is using** all the **levers of industrial policy to gain** technological **primacy in** areas like **AI and quantum computing**. Telecom and the battle over 5G offer a preview of quarrels to come. Deeply concerned with the cybersecurity risks that Chinese telecom giants like Huawei pose, the U.S. government placed the company on its Entity List, banning American exports without a license. It has since tightened the restrictions by barring foreign companies from supplying Huawei with products manufactured with American equipment and technology. **National security concerns are** increasingly **encroaching on** existing webs of economic **interdependence**. Wary of China’s acquisition of critical technology, countries like the United States,



Australia, and Japan have tightened their screening of foreign direct investment. The **pandemic** has only **exacerbated concerns that** **companies in strategic sectors are at risk of foreign takeover.**

COVID-19's impact on the international trading system is twofold. It has reinforced existing trends such as the deceleration and now drop in the volume of international trade, the rise of economic security as governments expand their toolkit to restrict trade and investment flows, and it has laid bare the fallout in U.S.-China relations. But the pandemic also brought new challenges that exposed the extent to which trade cooperation is in short supply. Export protectionism has risen in prominence with national restrictions on shipments of essential medical supplies and personal protective equipment. The WTO allows for such curbs for public health purposes – provided the measures are temporary and transparent. Few countries, however, have bothered to comply with their notification commitments. The blow comes at a time when the WTO is adrift with the decision of Director General Roberto Azevedo to step down early, opening the search for new leadership in a climate of divisiveness. Are we on the eve of a renationalized world economy? That is the aspiration of several American and European public officials who fault extended global supply chains and overdependence on China for the current mishaps in tackling the pandemic. But the view that economic nationalism and reshoring of manufacturing is a fail-safe path to security and prosperity is wrong. For one, it skirts the responsibility of governments to properly stockpile essential medical supplies. Furthermore, the export curbs will be counterproductive, eliminating incentives for producers to expand capacity and increasing the cost of much needed medicines and medical devices. If the recent lockdowns have taught us anything, it is that exclusive reliance on the domestic market is too risky. Diversification of supply, redundancies in the manufacturing chain, and stockpiling programs are better alternatives. In this endeavor, global supply chains are part of the solution, not the problem. COVID-19 will not produce an exodus of foreign companies from the Chinese market. Recent surveys of American companies with operations in China show that most firms intend to stay put. A **February survey** of Japanese companies conducted by **Tokyo Shoko Research** shows that only a fraction (4%) are considering exit from China. Therefore, the Japanese government's \$2.2 billion fund to restructure supply chains should be understood as risk management, not decoupling. When **international companies** map out their business strategies, they **must factor in** heightened risks – **protectionism** national **security controls, and** economic **lockdowns**. Hence, **efforts by** middle powers **to offer an** interim **arbitration mechanism at the WTO** to handle trade disputes and to commit to maintaining open supply chains in essential medical goods **are the right antidote** to rising economic nationalism. As a staunch supporter of rules-based trade and with its decision to forego export protectionism in the current crisis, Japan has much to contribute to these efforts. The requiem for globalization has been sung many times. Announcements of its demise in the COVID-19 era are likely to prove premature. But it will be a harder-edged globalization forged by the crucible of geopolitical risk and pandemic disruption.

## Growth and free trade reduce the likelihood of war

**Tønnesson '15** - Stein Tønnesson 15, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University, 2015, "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino-US peace," *International Area Studies Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311

Several recent works on China and Sino-US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. **Interdependence raises the cost of conflict** for all sides but **asymmetrical** or unbalanced dependencies and **negative trade** expectations **may** generate tensions **leading to trade wars** among inter-dependent states **that** in turn **increase** the **risk of military conflict** (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners.

**Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation.** third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. **If leaders** on either side of the Atlantic **begin to seriously fear** or anticipate their own nation's **decline** then **they may blame this on external dependence,** appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, **contemplate the use of force** to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately **refuse to be deterred** by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that **changes in the world economy alter those circumstances** in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a **trade war could result,** **interrupting transnational production networks,** provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. **Deterrence could lose its credibility**: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.