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#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they have none

A screenshot of a computer
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A screenshot of a computer
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#### Standards:

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for them to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy against them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it's an impact multiplier.

#### 2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can't afford coaches to prep out affs.

#### 3] Pre-round prep –1ARs gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could go for 1AR theory every round– otherwise I enter every round unknowing whereas you have an idea of what you want to go for from the start – key to good clash

#### 4] Data collection – round reports are key to statistical analysis of LD debate

Zhang 1/22 Peter Zhang, 1-22-2021, "Disclosure in Numbers by Peter Zhang," Briefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2021/01/22/disclosure-in-numbers-by-peter-zhang/?fbclid=IwAR0q5uCO74vLhYipH8QEO0PrLhY7CiIOwlEJUWEmnIVdqCmlM-jC4A-8rk0> // LEX JB

**I scraped the wikis (during off-hours) of every season starting 2014**. Schools and teams with egregiously misformatted wiki pages (i.e. a handful of PF-ers) were omitted. **I collected the round info, cite names, and round reports of each team’s page.**

**I also collected Tabroom data on every LD bid tournament**, with historical records reaching back as far as available. Tournaments that weren’t hosted on Tabroom or which didn’t have entries pages were excluded. For the 295 remaining tournaments, I scraped the Novice, JV, and Varsity entries of LD, PF, and Policy. I made some judgement calls in categorizing these, but generally, Novice was open to middle schoolers, Varsity had a TOC bid, and JV was in between the two.[[2]](https://www.vbriefly.com/2021/01/22/disclosure-in-numbers-by-peter-zhang/?fbclid=IwAR0q5uCO74vLhYipH8QEO0PrLhY7CiIOwlEJUWEmnIVdqCmlM-jC4A-8rk0#_ftn2)

**I matched teams** and tournament by using team names and school names. The losses are moderate (think 10%-ish), but significant enough that you should treat the results with caution. The aff and neg pages were combined for the analysis—if they only open-sourced on the aff, that still counts.

Let’s start with the state of disclosure theory. This season’s debaters love it. About a third of Varsity LD entries had a cite that mentioned disclosure. One-third is huge compared to last season and the season before, when the proportion plateaued at around 20%. It must have to do with the online environment—e-debaters are, on average, more [engaged](https://www.vbriefly.com/2020/12/31/five-trends-among-e-debate-competitors-by-peter-zhang/), more tech savvy, and much less likely to just ask for the aff in person.

Of course, “disclose citations” isn’t a revolutionary idea. **The real changes were in** the **other** disclosure **interps**: open source, new affs bad, full-text, and **round reports**. Full-text blew up in 2017 and has steadily declined since; it seems to have been replaced by open source, which is now fairly popular. Round reports is still a fringe interp (as it should be). New affs bad, on the other hand, has grown exponentially: one in every seven debaters demands the plan text!

Ok, so there’s more disclosure theory—have the sacrifices of substance been worth it?

It appears so, and along every metric too. **Two-thirds of debaters disclose and the proportion has been growing each year. As we may have expected from the earlier chart, there was a bump in this season of about 10%. Of those who post cites, the share who post round reports and open source has grown consistently since 2016 and now is at almost 90%.**

#### Data collection outweighs on norming – a) allows us to be accurate with our findings to see which norms are good and which norms are aren’t b) data collection allows us to see if norming is working – means it comes lexically prior to any shells read in this round

#### [1] DTD on disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence, also dropping them is key now because it’s the beginning of the season which is key to norms creation

#### [2] Reject all responses to disclosure – they disclose open source which concedes the validity of disclosure being good – anything else is a doubleturn

#### [3] No RVI on disclosure – a) prevents people from checking back for bad disclosure – means we never get better wikis because they’re afraid to lose off the RVI b) they know that people will read disclosure on them so they prep a counterinterp just to win off the RVI – leads to infinitely abusive norms

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] bites judge intervention cuz they have to gut check what they think is good 3] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL 4] norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

#### [5] Disclosure outweighs – it’s key to assessing the honesty of the form of your argumentation and how you presented arguments which means it precludes 1AC claims.

#### [6] Fairness is a voter because debate is a game governed by rules and you can’t tell who actually won if the layer was skewed.
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#### Interpretation: Reductions are permanent

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

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway. The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency. Aside from the practical aspect indicating permanency other indicia point to the same conclusion. From 1924 (L. 1924, ch. 619) to 1947 (L. 1947, ch. 841) a provision appeared in the Civil Service Law which read substantially as follows: "If the pension of a beneficiary is reduced for any reason, the amount of such reduction shall be transferred from the pension reserve fund to the pension accumulation fund during that period that such reduction is in effect." (See L. 1924, ch. 619, § 2 [Civil Service Law, § 58, subd. 4]; L. 1947, ch. 841 [Civil Service Law, § 66, subd. e].) This provision reappears in the 1955 Retirement and Social Security Law as subdivision f of section 24. This provision is useful for interpretative purposes. Since it prescribes that moneys not paid because of reduction should be transferred back to the accumulation fund the conclusion is inescapable that such reductions were meant to be permanent. If temporary suspensions were intended this bookkeeping device would result in a false picture of the funds, i.e., the reserve fund would be depleted when it would contain adequate funds to meet eventual payments 57\*57 to present pensioners. Likewise, the accumulation fund would be improperly inflated with respect to the present pensioners. Section 64 of the Retirement and Social Security Law (§ 85 under the 1947 act) provides that any disability pension must be reduced by the amount payable pursuant to the Workmen's Compensation Law if applicable. In Matter of Dalton v. City of Yonkers (262 App. Div. 321, 323 [1941]) this court interpreted "reduce" to mean "offset" in holding that under then section 67 (relating to Workmen's Compensation benefits as do its successors sections 85 and 64), pensions were to be offset by compensation benefits. This is merely another indication that "reduce" means a diminishing of the pension pursuant to a given formula rather than a mere recoverable, temporary suspension during the time other benefits or salaries are being received by the pensioner. (Also, cf., Retirement and Social Security Law, § 101 [§ 84 under the 1947 act].)

#### Violation: the COVID enforcement cards talk about a temporary waivering

#### Vote negative for textuality – the actors in the resolution are members of the WTO and evidence from court operates within the WTO’s jurisdiction.

#### [1] Predictability – the resolution is the stasis point for contestation, anything else would be unpredictable and an unfair prep burden for the negative. Their counterinterp will justify jettisoning any possible aspect of the topic which explodes predictable limits for prep

#### [2] Topic education – only our interpretation allows for the most nuanced clash pertaining to what parameters in which the actors in the resolution act. Anything else doesn’t actually talk about the topic because it’s not what the actors are allowed to fiat.
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#### The member nations of the World Trade Organization should reduce intellectual property protections for medicines except for marijuana.

#### It competes! – Marijuana is medicine and has multiple medical uses

Grinspoon 20 [Peter Grinspoon, 4-10-2020, "Medical marijuana," Harvard Health, [https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/medical-marijuana-2018011513085 //](https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/medical-marijuana-2018011513085%20//) JB]

The most **common use for**[**medical marijuana**](https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/cannabis-is-medicine-dont-make-it-taste-good-2019060516764) in the United States is for pain control. While marijuana isn’t strong enough for severe pain (for example, post-surgical pain or a broken bone), it **is** quite **effective for the chronic pain that plagues millions of Americans, especially as they age**. Part of its allure is that it is clearly safer than opiates (**it is impossible to overdose on and far less addictive**) and it can take the place of NSAIDs such as Advil or Aleve, if people can’t take them due to problems with their kidneys or ulcers or [GERD](https://www.health.harvard.edu/diseases-and-conditions/gastroesophageal-reflux-disease). In particular, **marijuana appears to ease the pain of multiple sclerosis, and nerve pain in general**. This is an area where few other options exist, and those that do, such as Neurontin, Lyrica, or opiates are highly sedating. **Patients claim that marijuana allows them to resume their previous activities without feeling completely out of it and disengaged**. Along these lines, **marijuana is said to be a fantastic muscle relaxant**, and people swear by its ability to lessen tremors in [Parkinson’s disease](https://www.health.harvard.edu/diseases-and-conditions/the-facts-about-parkinsons-disease). I have also heard of **its use** quite **successfully for fibromyalgia, endometriosis,**[**interstitial cystitis**](https://www.health.harvard.edu/diseases-and-conditions/treating-interstitial-cystitis)**, and most other conditions where the final common pathway is chronic pain. Marijuana is also used to manage nausea and weight loss and can be used to treat glaucoma**. A highly **promising area of research is its use for PTSD in veterans** who are returning from combat zones. Many veterans and their therapists report drastic improvement and clamor for more studies, and for a loosening of governmental restrictions on its study. **Medical marijuana is also reported to help patients suffering from pain and wasting syndrome associated with HIV, as well as irritable bowel syndrome and Crohn’s disease**. **This is** not intended to be an inclusive list, but rather to **give a brief survey of the types of conditions for which medical marijuana can provide relief**. As with all remedies, claims of effectiveness should be critically evaluated and treated with caution.

#### Weed booming now.

Agustin et al. 20 [Alejandro Agustin, Jorge Alvarado, Gerardo Cardenas, Talia Towe, Breonna Vann, December 7, 2020, “The Economic Rise of Marijuana”, [https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/4c839fb0499a453d88be4ab862a96f37 //](https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/4c839fb0499a453d88be4ab862a96f37%20//) JB]

The U.S. cannabis industry could be making up to $130 billion annually by the year 2024. Cannabis, or marijuana, is the most commonly used illicit drug in the United States. The drug is illegal at the federal level, but more and more states are taking action to legalize marijuana for recreational use. California Proposition 64 legalized using and growing marijuana for personal use in 2016 and allowed for the sale and taxation of recreational marijuana in 2018. The legalization of cannabis has significant implications for state economies, as well as the national economy. In 2018, the U.S. cannabis industry made $46.2 billion, with California alone raking in $345.2 million in tax revenue from legal cannabis in the same year. The estimates reflect the marijuana industry’s rapid transition from an illicit market to a mainstream economic powerhouse, generating scores of new jobs, providing fresh business opportunities and creating significant ripple effects across the country.
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#### IP is the driving factor for innovation, participation, and operation of the weed industry.

Sander 16 [Jason Sander. “Patenting Cannabis Strains – Good or Bad?” June 8, 2016, Jason is a versatile writer and marketer with twelve years of experience serving clients. He couples this expertise with a passion for cannabis businesses and the science of medical marijuana, [https://www.marijuanatimes.org/patenting-cannabis-strains-good-or-bad //](https://www.marijuanatimes.org/patenting-cannabis-strains-good-or-bad%20//) JB]

While **copyright and intellectual property has been debated in the music and movie industries for decades, it’s starting to pick up in the cannabis industry**. Proponents of copyright laws and **intellectual property** feel like they **need to have something in place that will protect from their work being stolen and pirated**. Those against copyright and intellectual property say that if your music, screenplay, comic book, or whatever is good enough, then you’ll be willing to compete in a marketplace and accept the reality that people will likely get your material for free no matter what you do. Either no one will hear the song, or read the book, or someone will – and then point you in the direction of who produced it. **Regardless of** **how you feel about intellectual property and copyright law, most cannabis enthusiasts do not realize how close the industry is to this. Cannabis breeders and enthusiasts all over the world have their favorite strains that they or their colleagues developed and they want to patent them, owning them forever. This will allow them to license the strains to other growers, breeders and marijuana businesses. This will** in turn, no doubt **create** a brand **new niche for cannabis patent lawyers**. While **this** might **help some cannabis businesses**, do we really want to throw more money at lawyers? You decide. The progression of the cannabis industry is inevitable. At some point, cannabis will finally be removed from Schedule I status. Once that happens, **big agriculture, the pharmaceutical industry and probably even big tobacco are going to want a piece of the green pie**. As the industry stands right now, basically **every single strain that is publicly available for sale becomes open source. Patent law states that you can’t apply for a patent of any kind anything that’s been being sold for a year or more. Cannabis breeders are trying to perfect their best strains, develop better phenotypes, etc., to boost their credibility in the industry. Once** the **industry moves forward** into this new territory, the **reality is very clear. There’s not a single grower or cannabis business that will have the power to compete with large corporations**. So obviously, **strain patents** could **become integral parts of any new growing operation or cannabis business**. And while **small time breeders obtaining patents for their best individual strains could protect them from the big corporations**, let’s not forget that these corporations will also have the ability to patent their own strains – with the legal and financial muscle to blow any small timer out of the water. To me, it seems like a double-edged sword that could swing back in the faces of the little guys if they’re not careful. What do you think about patenting strains? Is it a good or a bad thing?

#### Otherwise that’s extinction – weed industry collapses 1AC evidence

#### These cards also answer the affirmative and link turn it.
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#### The WTO has been seen as ineffective but has the opportunity to bounce back with strong international buy in

Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, 20, Reviving the WTO, https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/reviving-the-wto/, Brookings, Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala is a nonresident distinguished fellow with the Africa Growth Initiative in the Global Economy and Development program at Brookings. She is an economist and international development expert with over 30 years of experience.

The World Trade Organization is in the news mostly for the wrong reasons nowadays. Many people regard it as an ineffective policeman of an outdated rulebook that is unsuited for the challenges of the twenty-first-century global economy. And WTO members generally agree that the organization urgently needs reforming in order to remain relevant. Recent months have brought further challenges. The WTO’s appellate body, which adjudicates trade disputes among member countries, effectively [ceased functioning](https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/world-trade-organization-revive-appellate-body-by-shang-jin-wei-and-xinding-yu-2019-12) last December amid disagreements regarding the appointment of new judges to the panel. And in May 2020, Director-General Roberto Azevêdo [announced](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/14/business/wto-chief-roberto-azevedo.html) that he would step down at the end of August, a year before his current term was due to end. Whoever Azevêdo’s successor is will face a major challenge. Since its establishment in 1995, the WTO has failed to conclude a single trade-negotiation round of global trade talks, thus missing an opportunity to deliver mutual benefits for its members. The Doha Development Round, which began in November 2001, was supposed to be concluded by January 2005. Fifteen years later, WTO members are still debating whether the Doha process should continue. Some think it has been overtaken by events, while others want to pursue further negotiations. The WTO has so far delivered disappointingly few other notable agreements as well, apart from the [Trade Facilitation Agreement](https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tradfa_e/tradfa_e.htm), which entered into force in February 2017, and the 2015 [decision](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/mc10_e/briefing_notes_e/brief_agriculture_e.htm) to eliminate all forms of agricultural export subsidies. Meanwhile, some of its members have worked together on a raft of much broader regional trade deals that cover pressing issues such as the digital economy, investment, competition, the environment, and climate change. The Doha Development Round, which was intended to modernize the WTO’s rulebook, covers very few of these topics. And even some of the organization’s existing rules can easily be circumvented, thereby upsetting the balance of rights and obligations among members. During the current COVID-19 crisis, for example, some countries have imposed questionable export controls on medical supplies and food products in order to mitigate shortages. But despite these challenges, the WTO has not been a “failure.” Rather, it has built upon the successes of its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which entered into force in 1948. The rules-based multilateral trading system that began with GATT has contributed immensely to global economic growth over the last seven decades, by reducing average tariffs and steadily eliminating non-tariff barriers. As a result, living standards have improved in most countries. Moreover, rules-based global trade has helped to underpin peace and security, because trading partners are more likely to resolve differences through negotiations than through armed conflict. Nonetheless, WTO members today recognize the need to reboot the organization for the 21st century. Developed countries believe that they have shouldered the burden of trade liberalization for far too long, and that developing countries should shoulder more obligations if they are in a position to do so. Least-developed and low-income developing countries, meanwhile, say that WTO rules are hampering their efforts to grow and modernize their economies. Over the last two decades, international trade has become a bogeyman for critics who blame it for the economic woes some countries face. But trade is not a zero-sum game: Rights and obligations can be balanced, as the evolution of global and regional trading rules since 1948 has shown. The question facing the WTO and its members now, therefore, is how to make progress and reach mutually beneficial agreements. All members should participate in this endeavor, because that is the only way the organization can regain its credibility and carry out its rule-making function. New negotiations must therefore take account of members’ varying levels of economic development, and aim—as ever—to reach fair and equitable agreements. Other crucial priorities for the WTO include enhanced transparency, in the form of timely notifications of countries’ trade measures, and an effective dispute-settlement system that commands the confidence of all members. A moribund WTO does not serve any country’s interest. An effective, rules-based international trade system is a public good, and failure to revive it will undermine governments’ efforts to pull the global economy out of the recession caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The WTO has an irreplaceable role to play in transforming countries’ economic prospects and the lives of people around the world. Although the current crisis has brought the organization’s deteriorating health into sharp focus, its further decline is not inevitable. In a world economy already imperiled by COVID-19, we must now apply the antidote—members’ political will, determination, and flexibility—needed to revive it.

#### Intellectual property rights cannot be discriminated on the basis of field, or place of invention

WTO <https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04c_e.htm>, Article 27.1, Section 5 on patents, World trade Organization, WTO, Part II — Standards concerning the availability, scope and use of Intellectual Property Rights

Subject to the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3, patents shall be available for any inventions, whether products or processes, in all fields of technology, provided that they are new, involve an inventive step and are capable of industrial application. [(5)](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_04c_e.htm#fnt-5) Subject to paragraph 4 of Article 65, paragraph 8 of Article 70 and paragraph 3 of this Article, patents shall be available and patent rights enjoyable without discrimination as to the place of invention, the field of technology and whether products are imported or locally produced.

#### The WTO’s appellate body no longer exists to mediate disputes, without immediate buy in by states, and no mechanism to make disobedient states obey, the system collapses

Horton, 08/3, Lessons from Trump’s assault on the World Trade Organization, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/08/lessons-trumps-assault-world-trade-organization, Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, Communications Manager; Project Lead, Common Futures Conversations

The WTO is unique amongst international institutions because it has a powerful enforcement mechanism – the dispute settlement system. However, the fundamental vulnerability is that if powerful states like the US and others won’t participate in the system and be bound by its rules, they quickly risk becoming irrelevant. And that’s the situation we’re in right now with the appellate body crisis, where, without a functioning mechanism to ensure that WTO rules are enforced, the entire system of global trade rules risk collapsing. Ironically, the United States has been the leader of the liberal trading order for the past 70 years, but since Trump, it has become its leading saboteur.

#### A major country operating outside WTO consensus wrecks global trade norms

Bacchus 20 [James Bacchus, member of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, the Distinguished University Professor of Global Affairs and director of the Center for Global Economic and Environmental Opportunity at the University of Central Florida, 12-16-2020, "An Unnecessary Proposal: A WTO Waiver of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Vaccines," Cato Institute, [https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines]/Kankee](https://www.cato.org/free-trade-bulletin/unnecessary-proposal-wto-waiver-intellectual-property-rights-covid-19-vaccines%5d/Kankee)

In a sign of their increasing frustration with global efforts to ensure that all people everywhere will have access to COVID-19 vaccines, several developing countries have asked other members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to join them in a sweeping waiver of the intellectual property (IP) rights relating to those vaccines. Their waiver request raises anew the recurring debate within the WTO over the right balance between the protection of IP rights and access in poorer countries to urgently needed medicines. But the last thing the WTO needs is another debate over perceived trade obstacles to public health. Unless WTO members reach a consensus, the multilateral trading system may be further complicated by a delay like that in resolving the two‐​decades‐​old dispute between developed and developing countries over the compulsory licensing and generic distribution of HIV/AIDS drugs. A new and contentious “North‐​South” political struggle definitely would not be in the interest of the developed countries, the developing countries, the pharmaceutical companies, or the WTO. Certainly it would not be in the interest of the victims and potential victims of COVID-19. Background In early October 2020, India and South Africa asked the members of the WTO to waive protections in WTO rules for patents, copyrights, industrial designs, and undisclosed information (trade secrets) in relation to the “prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19 … until widespread vaccination is in place globally, and the majority of the world’s population has developed immunity.”1 India and South Africa want to give all WTO members freedom to refuse to grant or enforce patents and other IP rights relating to COVID-19 vaccines, drugs, diagnostics, and other technologies for the duration of the pandemic. In requesting the waiver, India and South Africa have argued that “an effective response to the COVID-19 pandemic requires rapid access to affordable medical products including diagnostic kits, medical masks, other personal protective equipment and ventilators, as well as vaccines and medicines for the prevention and treatment of patients in dire need.” They have said that “as new diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines for COVID-19 are developed, there are significant concerns, how these will be made available promptly, in sufficient quantities and at affordable prices to meet global demand.”2 Later in October, the members of the WTO failed to muster the required consensus to move forward with the proposed waiver. The European Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and other developed countries opposed the waiver request.3 One WTO delegate, from the United Kingdom, described it as “an extreme measure to address an unproven problem.”4 A spokesperson for the European Union explained, “There is no evidence that intellectual property rights are a genuine barrier for accessibility of COVID‐​19‐​related medicines and technologies.”5 In the absence of a consensus, WTO members have decided to postpone further discussion of the proposed waiver until early 2021. Balancing IP Rights and Access to Medicines Not New to WTO This waiver controversy comes nearly two decades after the end of the long battle in the multilateral trading system over access to HIV/AIDS drugs. At the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis at the turn of the century, numerous countries, including especially those from sub‐​Saharan Africa, could not afford the high‐​priced HIV/AIDS drugs patented by pharmaceutical companies in developed countries. Having spent billions of dollars on developing the drugs, the patent holders resisted lowering their prices. The credibility of the companies, the countries that supported them, and the WTO itself were all damaged by an extended controversy over whether patent rights should take precedence over providing affordable medicines for people afflicted by a lethal disease. Article 8 of the WTO Agreement on the Trade‐​Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (the TRIPS Agreement) provides that WTO members “may, in formulating or amending their laws and regulations, adopt measures necessary to protect public health … provided that such measures are consistent with the provisions of this Agreement.” In similar vein, Article 7 of the TRIPS Agreement provides that the “protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights” shall be “in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare.”6 It can be maintained that these two WTO IP rules are significantly capacious to include any reasonable health measures that a WTO member may take during a health emergency, such as a pandemic. Yet there was doubt among the members during the HIV/AIDS crisis about the precise reach of these provisions. As Jennifer Hillman of the Council on Foreign Relations observed, ordinarily the “inherent tension between the protection of intellectual property and the need to make and distribute affordable medicines” is “resolved through licensing, which allows a patent holder to permit others to make or trade the protected product—usually at a price and with some supervision from the patent holder to ensure control.”7 But, in public health emergencies, it may be impossible to obtain a license. In such cases, “compulsory licenses” can be issued to local manufacturers, authorizing them to make patented products or use patented processes even though they do not have the permission of the patent holders.8

#### Collapse of the WTO triggers an inevitable global war

Raymond J. Waldmann, Corporate Counsel & Secretary for AuBeta Networks Inc and former vice president of international relations and as director of government affairs for The Boeing Company & assistant U.S. Secretary of Commerce for international economic policy (1981-83) and chair of the Seattle Host Committees for the 1999 WTO Ministerial Meeting, “WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION IMPORTANT TO CITIZENS OF CITY AND STATE, Seattle-Post Intelligencer, 5/11/99,

The answer is simple: Because trade matters to the U.S. economy, to Washington state and to Seattle and because the WTO matters to trade. The Geneva-based WTO is the only global body dedicated to developing international trade rules. From the U.S. perspective, the WTO is our voice and vote for dealing with trade issues. The WTO provides the rules-based system of international trade on which we rely. Members negotiate agreements ensuring that:-- Countries may not raise their tariffs or other border taxes whenever they feel like it, and thereby exclude American products from their markets; -- Countries may not impose unjustified technical barriers such as inspection requirements on U.S. wheat, apples and other agricultural products just to protect their home markets, nor may they favor products from specific countries; -- Countries may not allow or encourage piracy of intellectual property, thereby protecting our software and computers, books and films, CDs and tapes;-- Countries are restricted from violating the rules on subsidies and export assistance, and flooding the world with government-subsidized products whose prices we could not match.Trade is not a panacea for the political, economic and social problems of the world. But it is a force for peace and cross-cultural contact. Countries are less likely to go to war against their trading partners than they are against strangers. The WTO furthers the process of protecting against commercial skirmishes and potential trade wars by forging agreement among nations on trade protocols. Without the WTO, trade would be too dangerous a proposition for countries to leave to their trade ministries, and eventually trade disputes could become national security issues. A non-WTO world would more closely resemble the international economy before World War II, where countries used trade as tools of foreign policy, and international commerce was a pawn of aggressor states. As Franklin D. Roosevelt's former secretary of state Cordell Hull said, "When goods do not cross borders, armies do."

#### WTO cred solves wars that go nuclear.

Hamann 09 [Georgia; 2009; J.D. Candidate, Vanderbilt University Law School; “Replacing Slingshots with Swords: Implications of the Antigua-Gambling 22.6 Panel Report for Developing Countries and the World Trading System,” VANDERBILT JOURNAL OF TRANSNATIONAL LAW, http://www.jogoremoto.pt/docs/extra/duqJ53.pdf] Justin

Both Antigua and the U.S. claimed the resolution of the arbitration as a victory.99 In reality, the decision reached a midpoint between the respective countries’ positions, establishing a victory for the evolution of the international trading system itself. Voluntary compliance with WTO rules and procedures is of the utmost importance to the international trading system.100 Given the increasingly globalized market, the coming years will see an increase in the importance of the WTO as a cohesive force and arbiter of disputes that likely will become more frequent and injurious.101 The work of the WTO cannot be overstated in a nuclear-armed world, as the body continues to promote respect and even amity among nations with opposing philosophical goals or modes of governance.102 Demagogues in the Unites States may decry the rise of China as a geopolitical threat,103 and extremists in Russia may play dangerous games of brinksmanship with other great powers, but trade keeps politicians’ fingers off “the button.”104 The WTO offers an astounding rate of compliance for an organization with no standing army and no real power to enforce its decisions, suggesting that governments recognize the value of maintaining the international construct of the WTO.105 In order to promote voluntary compliance, the WTO must maintain a high level of credibility.106 Nations must perceive the WTO as the most reasonable option for dispute resolution or fear that the WTO wields enough influence to enforce sanctions.107 The arbitrators charged with performing the substantive work of the WTO by negotiating, compromising, and issuing judgments are keenly aware of the responsibility they have to uphold the organization’s credibility.108
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#### No bioweapon threat – too risky & behavior uncertainty

Morrow 17 (John, PhD in genetics, University of Washington, authored over 60 peer-reviewed publications reporting original research in genetics, immunology, developmental biology, evolution, cancer biology and animal science, “Bioweapons: An Existential Threat?”, Legend Web Works LLC, March 6, <http://www.newportbiotech.com/pages/blog/entry/48/>, [CORNELL DEBATE](note: //// indicates par.breaks)[AT WINTER 18])

Today, large scale production, storage, protection and field testing of weaponized bacteria or viruses are beyond the abilities of a small group or a terrorist cell. However, a number of countries in the world have demonstrated the ability – and the will – to unleash horrific attacks upon their perceived enemies. They undoubtedly are following the current advances in gene manipulation technology with great interest. For now though, such advances in gene manipulation, while making the process faster, simpler and more accessible, are still quite a challenge to carry out. //// CRISPR/Cas9 is the best of a new generation of tools for manipulating genes, and is being used to develop cures for diseases, improve agricultural products and engineer organisms that can carry out a variety of industrial processes. It is undergoing constant improvement, making it faster and easier to employ. //// Fortunately, there are many obstacles to the execution of a credible biological warfare program, perhaps the greatest is the uncertainty of the behavior of these agents once released into the environment. In the commercial realm of engineered agricultural products (herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers), all manner of living and inert substances undergo arduous evaluation (usually for years) before they can be released to the environment; yet these new inventions still have phenomenal failure rates. //// Given that engineered bacteria and viruses are lethal materials, their handling and use in battle would be extremely risky, and loading them with a burden of genetic modifications could affect their behavior outside of the laboratory in unpredictable ways. In order to be confident that the bioweapon would have its desired effect, it would be essential to have field data, which could require years of testing. Would a terrorist be content to keep deploying flawed product until hitting the motherlode?

#### No Russia war

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### No war from economic collapse – this card answers their internal warrants

**Walt 20** Stephen M. Walt,MAY 13, 2020, "Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?," Foreign Policy, [https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war //](https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war%20//) LEX JB

But war could still be much less likely. The M**assachusetts** I**nstitute of** T**echnology**’s **Barry** Posen has [already considered](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-04-23/do-pandemics-promote-peace) the likely impact of the current pandemic on the probability of war, and he believes **COVID-19 is more likely to promote peace instead**. He argues that **the** current **pandemic is affecting** all the **major powers adversely**, which means it isn’t creating tempting windows of opportunity for unaffected states while leaving others weaker and therefore vulnerable. Instead, it is making all governments more pessimistic about their short- to medium-term prospects. Because states often go to war out of sense of overconfidence (however misplaced it sometimes turns out to be), pandemic-induced pessimism should be conducive to peace. Moreover, by its very nature war requires states to assemble lots of people in close proximity**—at training camps, military bases, mobilization areas, ships at sea, etc.—and that’s** not something you want to do in the middle of a pandemic. For the moment at least, beleaguered governments of all types are focusing on convincing their citizens they are doing everything in their power to protect the public from the disease. Taken together, **these** considerations might **explain why** even an impulsive and headstrong warmaker like **Saudi Arabia’s Mohammed bin Salman has gotten more interested in**[**winding down his brutal and unsuccessful military campaign in Yemen**](https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/09/coronavirus-pandemic-peace-talks-yemen-houthi-saudi-arabia/). Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that [Trump occasionally hints at](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/11/05/trump-keeps-talking-about-keeping-middle-east-oil-that-would-be-illegal/)—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.