### Framework

#### Ethics must begin a priori:

#### [1] Is/Ought Gap – experience only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises to make a moral theory.

#### [2] Empiricism fails – an evil demon could deceive us, dreaming, simulation, and inability to know others’ experience make empiricism an unreliable basis for universal ethics. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same.

#### [3] Action theory – only evaluating action through reason solves since reason is key to evaluate intent, otherwise we could infinitely divide actions. For example: If I was brewing tea, I could break up that one big action into multiple small actions. Only our intention, to brew tea unifies these actions if we were never able to unify action, we could never classify certain actions as moral or immoral since those actions would be infinitely divisible

#### [4] Constitutive Authority – practical reason is the only unescapable authority because to ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary.

#### Next, moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends. The only constraint is noncontradiction--beating back my framework results in the principle of explosion – if we accept on contradiction to be true, we accept all statements to be true since you could switch the first half of a disjunctive statement and render any second half true.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. Prefer:

#### [A] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify a standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### [B] Practical identities – we set ends based on practical identities like student or debater. However, human identity – or agency – is the source of practical identity, since it’s necessary to choose which roles to take on. Impacts: A] Justifies valuing humanity as an end – we find our lives worth living under our practical identities and activities, but that means we must value agency as the source of that value. B] Hijacks the role of the judge – judge is a practical identity, which requires first valuing human identity.

#### [C] Universal subjectivity demands recognition of the plight of the oppressed.

Farr 02, Arnold (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32. // Lex CH  
Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions. It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims.That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings. Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves. Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a *complete* engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that produces the best material consequences based on the fiated implications of the plan –

#### [1] No performative or methodological offense – It’s extratopical which is a voter for limits, spiking out of ground making any discussion worse.

#### [2] Strat Skew – the resolution is the only stasis point and adding other factors to the round decks predictable limits which guts pre round prep.

#### [3] Inclusion – Novices and Lay debaters all use the material consequences in the plan – proven by every lay tournament outside the circuit – by increasing the burden to your model you exclude them from the space.

#### [5] Existential risk comes first under any framework

**Ord 20** Toby Ord [Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities], “The Precipice” Hachette Books, 2020 // Lex CH [Recut by Lex AKo]

But **an existential catastrophe is not** just **a catastrophe that destroys a particularly large number of lives. It destroys our potential**. My mentor, Derek Parfit, asked us to imagine a devastating nuclear war killing 99 percent of the world’s people.19 **A war that would leave behind a dark age lasting centuries, before the survivors could eventually rebuild civilization to its former heights; humbled, scarred—but undefeated. Now compare this with a war killing a full 100 percent of the world’s people. This second war would be worse, of course, but how much worse? Either war would be the worst catastrophe in history. Either would kill billions.** **The second war would involve tens of millions of additional deaths, and so would be worse for this reason**. But there is another, far more significant difference between the two wars. **Both wars kill billions of humans; but the second war kills humanity**. **Both wars destroy our present; but the second war destroys our future. It is this qualitative difference in what is lost with that last percent that makes existential catastrophes unique, and that makes reducing the risk of existential catastrophe uniquely important. 20 In expectation, almost all humans who will ever live have yet to be born.** Absent catastrophe, **most generations are future generations.** As the writer Jonathan Schell put it: The procession of generations that extends onwards from our present leads far, far beyond the line of our sight, and, compared with these stretches of human time, which exceed the whole history of the earth up to now, our brief civilized moment is almost infinitesimal. Yet we threaten, in the name of our transient aims and fallible convictions, to foreclose it all. **If our species does destroy itself, it will be a death in the cradle—a case of infant mortality**. 21 And because, in expectation, **almost all of humanity’s life lies in the future, almost everything of value lies in the future as well**: almost all the flourishing; almost all the beauty; our greatest achievements; our most just societies; our most profound discoveries. 22 We can continue our progress on prosperity, health, justice, freedom and moral thought. **We can create a world of wellbeing and flourishing that challenges our capacity to imagine. And if we protect that world from catastrophe, it could last millions of centuries**. This is our potential—what we could achieve if we pass the Precipice and **continue striving for a better world**. **It is this view of the future—the immense value of humanity’s potential —that most persuades me to focus my energies on reducing existential risk. When I think of the millions of future generations yet to come, the importance of protecting humanity’s future is clear to me**. **To risk destroying this future**, for the sake of some advantage limited only to the present, **seems** to me profoundly parochial and **dangerously short-sighted**. Such neglect privileges a tiny sliver of our

## Offense

#### 1] IP rights prevent certain people from receiving the fruits of their mental labor.

Lindsey and Teles 17 [Ricketts, M. (2018). The Captured Economy: How the Powerful Enrich Themselves, Slow Down Growth, and Increase Inequality by Brink Lindsey and Steven M. Teles. Oxford University Press (2017), 221 pp. ISBN: 978-0190627768 (hb, £16.99). Economic Affairs, 38(2), 297–300. doi:10.1111/ecaf.12299]//Lex AKu recut Lex VM

In our opinion, the biggest problem with the moral case for patents and copyright laws is that those laws as currently constituted regularly violate the principle on which they are supposedly grounded—namely, entitlement to the fruits of one’s mental labor. The exclusive rights granted to copyright and patent holders aren’t just an additional premium layer of protection on top of the basic rights that all enjoy. Rather, copyright and patent laws extend premium rights to some in a way that frequently restricts the basic rights of others. Perversely, copyright and patent laws are regularly used to stop people from producing or selling their own original works. This was not always the case with copyright. Originally, US law prohibited only simple copying of full works as originally published. Thus, translations and even abridgments were not considered infringing. Gradually, the concept of infringement expanded to cover so-called derivative works—for example, a play based on a book, or a book that contains characters created by another author. This expansion was checked, to a limited and uncertain extent, by the concurrent rise of the doctrine of “fair use.” According to this doctrine, some derivative works—parodies, for example, and books that include brief quoted passages from other works—are not considered infringing. For everything else, including adaptations of an artistic work to a new format, new works using existing literary characters or settings, remixes or mashups of musical works, and so forth, the restrictions and penalties of copyright apply. In all these cases, artists can expend mental effort to create something new and original, but they are not allowed to publish or sell it.33 They are thus deprived of their basic rights to the fruits of their own mental labor. In the case of patent law, independent invention has never been a defense against claims of infringement. As a result, inventors who come in second in a patent race have no right at all to make use of and profit from their ideas. This is by no means an unusual occurrence, for nearly simultaneous and completely independent discovery of new technologies occurs with astonishing frequency.34 Indeed, patent infringement lawsuits only rarely involve intentional copying of someone else’s invention; in the clear majority of lawsuits, the alleged infringers developed their products on their own and weren’t even aware of the patent in question. In summary, the moral case for patents and copyright is supposedly based on the entitlement to enjoy the fruits of one’s mental labor. Yet under current law, the most basic and universal form that this entitlement can take, one whose general propriety is completely uncontroversial, is regularly traduced. We therefore find unconvincing the claim that copyright and patent holders are rightful property owners who are only receiving their just due. Yes, we can imagine intellectual property laws in which the moral claims for exclusive rights are much stronger. If copyright were limited to its original concern of preventing sales of full reproductions, and if patents were awarded to all independent co-inventors (or at least independent invention were a complete defense in any infringement action), then intellectual property rights would indeed provide additional protections for artists and inventors without impinging on the basic rights of other artists and inventors. But that is not the intellectual property law we have today, and to get there would require major statutory changes. The copyright and patent laws we have today therefore look more like intellectual monopoly than intellectual property. They do not simply give people their rightful due; on the contrary, they regularly deprive people of their rightful due. If there is a case to be made for the special privileges granted under these laws, it must be based on utilitarian grounds. As we have already seen, that case is surprisingly weak, and utterly incapable of justifying the radical expansion in IP protection that has occurred in recent years. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate to strip IP protection of its sheep’s clothing and to see it for the wolf it is, a major source of economic stagnation and a tool for unjust enrichment.

#### 2] IP Rights hand partial control of others property to IP Creators.

Kinsella 13 [Kinsella S. (2013) The Case Against Intellectual Property. In: Luetge C. (eds) Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1494-6\_99]//Lex AKu recut Lex VM \*\*\*Brackets for Gendered Language\*\*\*

Let us recall that IP rights give to pattern-creators partial rights of control – ownership – over the material property of everyone else. The pattern-creator has partial ownership of others’ property, by virtue of his [their] IP right, because he [they] can prohibit them from performing certain actions with their own property. Author X, for example, can prohibit a third party, Y, from inscribing a certain pattern of words on Y’s own blank pages with Y’s own ink. That is, by merely authoring an original expression of ideas, by merely thinking of and recording some original pattern of information, or by finding a new way to use his own property (recipe), the IP creator instantly, magically becomes a partial owner of others’ property. He [They] has some say over how third parties can use their property. He is granted, in effect, a type of “negative servitude” in others’ already owned property” (See [32]). IP rights change the status quo by redistributing property from individuals of one class (material-property owners) to individuals of another (authors and inventors). Prima facie, therefore, IP law trespasses against or “takes” the property of material-property owners, by transferring partial ownership to authors and inventors. It is this invasion and redistribution of property that must be justified in order for IP rights to be valid. We see, then, that utilitarian defenses do not do the trick. Further problems with natural-rights defenses are explored below.

#### The new head of the WTO is on track to push for reform and an increased role but is hindered now due to lack of vaccine agreement.

Baschuk 4-27. [(Bryce Baschuk is a Bloomberg Reporter) ["WTO Chief Pursues a ‘Hectic’ Agenda to Fix World Trade’s Referee," Bloomberg, April 27, 2021. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-04-27/wto-chief-pursues-a-hectic-agenda-to-fix-world-trade-s-referee](file:///Users/adenbarton/Downloads/%22WTO%20Chief%20Pursues%20a%20‘Hectic’%20Agenda%20to%20Fix%20World%20Trade’s%20Referee,%22%20Bloomberg,%20April%2027,%202021.%20https:/www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-04-27/wto-chief-pursues-a-hectic-agenda-to-fix-world-trade-s-referee)] TDI

The head of the World Trade Organization **raised an alarm about the credibility of the multilateral trading system**, urging leaders to act fast to bolster the global economy with steps like fairer vaccine distribution and cooperate to resolve longer-term problems like overfishing. During her first two months, WTO Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala has met with trade ministers around the globe to communicate a message that **the WTO is important, it needs to be reformed and it needs to deliver results.** So far, she says the reception from world leaders has been positive, but quickly translating that goodwill into substantive outcomes during a global pandemic is just as daunting as she anticipated. “The word I would use to describe it is absolutely hectic,” Okonjo-Iweala said in a phone interview on Tuesday when asked about her first few months in the job. “The challenges we thought were there are there and getting an agreement is not as easy because of longstanding ways of negotiating business positions.” Read More: Arcane WTO Pact Moves to Center of Vaccine Debate: Supply Lines Countries need to move past the notion that one country’s gain in international commerce is another’s loss, she said. “We need to break out of the zero-sum deadlock,” Okonjo-Iweala said. “We need to remind the countries and members that the WTO is here to deliver for people. **We can’t take 20 years to negotiate something**.” Okonjo-Iweala said **her top priority is to use trade to alleviate the pandemic** and said her recent meeting with trade ministers and vaccine manufacturers provided a positive step in the right direction. ‘More Pragmatism’ “That meeting yielded quite a lot,” she said. “I see more pragmatism on both sides.” An important component of the WTO’s trade and health agenda is a proposal from India and South Africa that seeks to temporarily waive enforcement of the WTO’s rules governing intellectual property for vaccines and other essential medical products. Read More: U.S. Trade Chief Meets Pfizer, AstraZeneca About Vaccine Supply As of this week there are fresh signals that the Biden administration, which currently opposes a waiver to the WTO agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, wants vaccine manufacturers like Pfizer Inc. and AstraZeneca Plc to help ramp up U.S. pandemic assistance to the rest of the world. “There is movement,” Okonjo-Iweala said. “Are we there yet? No, but there is a little bit of change in the air among members. I think hopefully we will be able to come to some sort of a framework for the WTO ministers to bless.” “We don’t have time,” she added. “People are dying.” Okonjo-Iweala said this month’s vaccine meeting also revealed areas where the developing world can increase its capacity to produce more doses rather than waiting for rich countries to send them their excess supplies. She said various emerging markets such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Senegal, Indonesia and Egypt already have some capacity to begin producing vaccines for people living in developing economies.

#### Patent waiver is necessary to revitalize WTO’s credibility as an international dispute mechanism – creates momentum for further reform.

Meyer 6-18-21. [(David Meyer is the Editor of CEO Daily and a senior writer on Fortune’s European team. Author of the digital rights primer, Control Shift: How Technology Affects You and Your Rights. “The WTO’s survival hinges on the COVID-19 vaccine patent debate, waiver advocates warn,” Fortune, June 18, 2021. <https://fortune.com/2021/06/18/wto-covid-vaccines-patents-waiver-south-africa-trips/>] TDI

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."

#### Post Covid WTO legitimacy and credibility necessary to prevent a downward spiral of protectionism.

Solís 20 [(Mireya Solís is director of the Center for East Asia Policy Studies, Philip Knight Chair in Japan Studies, and a senior fellow in the Foreign Policy program at Brookings. “The post COVID-19 world: Economic nationalism triumphant?” July 10, 2020. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/07/10/the-post-covid-19-world-economic-nationalism-triumphant/>] TDI

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 drops 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 harm ~~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 weakened 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. Graph detailing the number of countries that imposed export restrictions on various categories of medical supplies and devices in response to the coronavirus pandemic. 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.

#### Trade solves great power competition – regionalism causes militarized crises.

Lake 18 [(David Lake is a Professor of Social Sciences and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. "Economic Openness and Great Power Competition: Lessons for China and the United States,” April 30, 2018. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3171196/>] TDI

I develop two central arguments. First, historically, great power competition has been driven primarily by exclusion or fears of exclusion from each power’s international economic zone, including its domestic market. Great powers in the past have often used their international influence to build zones in which subordinate polities – whether these be colonies or simply states within a sphere of influence – are integrated into their economies. These economic zones, in turn, are typically biased in favor of the great power’s firms and investors, with the effect of excluding (in whole or part) the economic agents of other great powers. These other great powers, in response, are then compelled to develop or expand their own exclusive economic zones. The “race” for economic privilege can quickly divide the world up into economic blocs. Like the security dilemma, great powers need not actually exclude one another from their zones; the fear of exclusion alone is enough to ignite the process of division. The race for privilege then draws great powers into over-expanding into unprofitable regions and, more important, militarized competition. Economic and military competition are thus linked, with the former usually driving the latter. The most significant military crises have, historically, been over where to draw the boundaries between economic zones and subsequent challenges to those boundaries. Economic closure and fear of closure have been consistent sources of great power conflict in the past – and possibly will be in the future. The major exception to this trend was the peaceful transfer of dominance in Latin America from Britain to the United States in the late nineteenth century. This suggests that economic closure and great power competition is not inevitable, but a choice of the great powers themselves. Second, this international competition is driven, in turn, by domestic, rent-seeking groups and their economic interests. In all countries, scarce factors of production, import competing sectors, and domestically-oriented firms have concentrated and intense preferences for market restricting policies, including tariffs and the formation of exclusive economic zones. Consumers and free trade-oriented groups have diffuse preferences for market enhancing policies, and thus tend to lose at the ballot box and in the making of national policy. This inequality in preference intensity does not mean protectionists always win; after 1934, the United States insulated itself by shifting authority to the executive and negotiating reductions through broad, multi-product international agreements.8 Yet, as the recent return to economic nationalism of the Trump administration suggests, protectionism often wins out. Rent-seeking is a central tendency, not an inevitable success. Contemporary great power relations are at a critical juncture. As China’s influence expands, the role of special economic interests in China is especially worrisome. In pursuit of stability, political support, or private gains, the government will always be tempted to create economic zones that favor its nationals. In this way, China will be no different than the majority of great powers before it. But, given the expansive role of the state in the Chinese economy, especially its backing of outward foreign investments by its state-owned enterprises (SOEs), and the close ties between business elites and its authoritarian political leaders, however, it will be even harder for China to resist biasing any future economic zone to benefit its own firms. Although China has gained greatly from economic openness, its domestic political system will be prone to rent-seeking demands by important constituents in areas of future influence. Critically, the United States is also moving toward economic closure with the election of President Trump on a platform of economic nationalism. Demands for protection against Chinese goods have been growing over time.9 The “China shock” that followed Beijing’s joining the World Trade Organization was a huge disruption to the international division of labor, U.S. comparative advantage, and especially U.S. industry.10 The Trans-Pacific Partnership, though now defunct, was “marketed” by President Barak Obama as a means of “containing” China, both economically and militarily, but was opposed by virtually all of the candidates in the 2016 presidential election for its trade-enhancing potential. President Trump has already signaled a much more hostile and protectionist stance toward China – as well as calling for the repeal of NAFTA and even questioning the utility of the European Union. Not only has he imposed tariffs on washing machines, solar panels, steel and aluminum, dangerously declaring the latter two issues of national security, he is making exceptions on these tariffs for friends and allies. 11 Implicitly targeting China, these protectionist moves by the administration risk creating preferential trading blocs not seen since the 1930s. He has also now proposed punitive tariffs on over $60 billions of imports from China into the United States.12 Acknowledging his inconsistencies on many policy issues, Trump’s economic nationalism has remained the core of his political agenda. The threat to the liberal international economy is not only that China might seek an economic bloc in the future, but that the United States itself is turning more exclusionary. For each great power to fear that the other might seek to exclude it from its economic zone is not unreasonable. If so, great power competition could break out in the twenty-first century not because of bipolarity or any inevitable tendency toward conflict, but because neither great power can control its own protectionist forces nor signal to the other that it would not exclude it from its economic zone. The British-U.S. case, again, suggests that exclusion and competition are not inevitable, but the current danger of economic closure is real and increasing. This article is synthetic in its theory and merely suggestive in its use of historical evidence. The theory aims to integrate current work on political economy and national security, not to develop a completely original take on this relationship. In turn, rather than testing the theory in any rigorous sense or delving into particular cases to show the theoretical mechanisms at work, so to speak, it surveys selected historical episodes to illustrate central tendencies. It is the recurring pattern across multiple cases that suggests why we should worry today. The remainder of this essay is divided in three primary sections. Section I briefly outlines the analytics of economic openness and great power competition. Section II focuses on historical instances of great power competition, highlighting the role of economic openness as a central cleavage in international politics. Section III examines contemporary policies in and between China and the United States. The conclusion suggests ways that the potential for conflict may be mitigated. The Open Economy Politics of Great Power Competition All states have a tendency towards protectionism at home and exclusive economic zones abroad. A tendency, though, is not an inevitability. The pursuit of protection and economic zones by domestic interests is conditioned by the political coalition in power at any given time and institutions that aggregate and bias the articulation of social groups. 13 The tendency is also influenced, however, by the actions of other countries. Protectionism can sour great power relations, but it is the desire for exclusive economic zones that drives great power competition and, given the possibility of coercion, influences grand strategy. Thus, the theory sketched here integrates insights from international political economy (see below), the literature on domestic politics and grand strategy,14 and systemic theories of international

#### Nuclear war causes extinction – mass starvation and ice age.

**Starr 15** (Steven Starr 15. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html>) TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

#### The plan solves both scenarios and WTO IP rules are a barrier to scaled-up vaccine production.

Pandey 21 [(Ashutosh Pandey) “Rich countries block India, South Africa's bid to ban COVID vaccine patents,” DW, April 2, 2021. <https://www.dw.com/en/rich-countries-block-india-south-africas-bid-to-ban-covid-vaccine-patents/a-56460175>

The World Trade Organization (WTO) talks on a proposal by India and South Africa to temporarily suspend intellectual property (IP) rules related to COVID-19 vaccines and treatments hit a roadblock on Thursday after wealthy countries balked at the idea, Germany's dpa news agency reported. The two developing countries say the IP waiver will allow drugmakers in poor countries to start production of effective vaccines sooner. India and South Africa had approached the global trade body in October, calling on it to waive parts of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement). The suspension of rights such as patents, industrial designs, copyright and protection of undisclosed information would ensure "**timely access to affordable medical products including vaccines and medicines or to scaling-up of research, development, manufacturing and supply of medical products essential to combat COVID**-19," they said. The proposal was vehemently opposed by wealthy nations like the US and Britain as well as the European Union, who said that a ban would stifle innovation at pharmaceutical companies by robbing them of the incentive to make huge investments in research and development. This would be especially counterproductive during the current pandemic which needs the drugmakers to remain on their toes to deal with a mutating virus, they argue. The WTO talks are taking place as some wealthy countries face criticism for **cornering billions** of COVID shots — many times the size of their populations — while **leaving poor countries** struggling for supplies. **Experts say the global scramble for vaccines, or vaccine nationalism, risks prolonging the pandemic.** "We have to recognize that this virus knows no boundaries, it travels around the globe and the response to it should also be global. It should be based on international solidarity," said Ellen 't Hoen, the director of Medicines Law & Policy — a nonprofit campaigning for greater access to medicines. "Many of the large-scale vaccine manufacturers are based in developing countries. All the production capacity that **exists should be exploited**…and that does require the sharing of Not enough production capacity Supporters of the waiver, which include dozens of developing and least-developed countries and NGOs, said the WTO's IP rules were acting as a **barrier to urgent scale-up of production of vaccines** and other much needed medical equipment in poor countries.

### 1AC – Advocacy

#### Thus, the advocacy – Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### The plan solves

[Thomas **Hanna**, 9-21-20**20**, "Democratizing knowledge: Transforming intellectual property and research and development," Democracy Collaborative, [https://democracycollaborative.org/learn/publication/democratizing-knowledge-transforming-intellectual-property-and-research-and //](https://democracycollaborative.org/learn/publication/democratizing-knowledge-transforming-intellectual-property-and-research-and%20//) JB]

* Link turns cap Ks and setcol, read unhighlighted part
* R&D – research and development
* Specs patents

**As countries grapple with** the devastating **challenges of COVID-19** and **we**, hopefully, **move closer towards** the **development of a vaccine, the injustices and insufficiencies of the current approach to IP and R&D are becoming increasingly apparent. It is imperative that we quickly move away from the current system that prioritizes corporate profits sourced from monopoly rights to one that values and centers public health, social equality, and ecological sustainability**.

**The design**, implementation, and governance **of our IP and R&D systems are critically important**. However, the incredible rise of the intangible economy has dramatically altered these systems and our wider economic landscape. **Rather than stimulating and supporting the innovation needed to power the 21st-century digital economy**, the enclosure of **ownership of creations of the mind has been capitalized on to generate vast profits and considerably increase the power and control of a small group of large corporations and their owners. This** has **resulted in** a series of adverse **consequences, from** languishing **innovation to exacerbating racial, economic, gender, and geographic inequality**, to reducing competition, to abusive corporate practices related to workers’ rights, tax justice, and consumer protections. In sum, **it is becoming** increasingly **clear** to observers from **across the political spectrum that the current approach to IP and R&D is not fit for purpose.**

**Given** their inherently **political nature** and central role **in the economic system**, were **our IP and R&D systems to be transformed, they could be harnessed for the common good and to build an equitable, democratic, and environmentally sustainable future for all. Extending principles of democratic ownership is key to this transformation**. From the creation of a public knowledge commons, to substantially increasing public R&D funding, to embedding global solidarity and reparations, to challenging corporate power, to bolstering workers’ rights,

### Underview

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater, competing interp– 1AR are too short to make up for the time trade-off – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time. PP affirm- we assume statements are true if I tell you my name is Aanya you believe me otherwise we wouldn’t be able to justify morally neutral actions

## 1AR

#### Cede the political: pessimistic calls for “no progress” that theorize a subject position outside of the political realm only re-entrench the impossible fantasy of escaping the drive, as subjecthood can never be the drive—that justifies the perm and turns the K. Mollow

(The Disability Drive by Anna Mollow A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English in the Graduate Division of the University of California, Berkeley Committee in charge: Professor Kent Puckett, Chair Professor Celeste G. Langan Professor Melinda Y. Chen Spring 2015//Lex AGh \*\*note: this card may seem to only be talking about queer theory, but it uses it as an example; its claims about pessimistic literature are universal. //Aanya

But what does it mean to side with the drive? Such siding can only be a fantasy, for if our psyches cannot escape the drive, neither can they avoid being shaped by the egos that the drive continually threatens. As we have seen, it is this threat to the ego that makes the drive disabling: the disability drive pulls us in directions that go against what our reasoning, desiring, and egocentered selves think that they want. Indeed, our necessary, structural dependence upon our egos is a precondition for the drive‟s disabling effects; if we did not need our egos, then the drive‟s erosions of our socially identifiable selves would not injure us. Yet in a strange way, queer antisocial theory seems sometimes to imagine itself as exempt from the drive‟s injuriousness. Queer antisocial theory positions itself as a discourse that embraces the death drive (Edelman) and celebrates the threat that sexuality poses to subjectivity (Bersani). However, Bersani‟s and Edelman‟s respective claims to be on the side of the drive and sexuality may actually serve as defenses against these forces. By figuring their theories as outside the political (Edelman), or beyond the redemptive (Bersani), queer antisocial theory constructs itself as a discourse that can overcome the disablement that the drive produces by fantasmatically identifying with the drive. Indeed, a fantasmatic identification with the drive might be described as a crucial structural component of queer antisocial theory. Because the figure of the “queer” is not a subject, Edelman seems at moments to imagine, it cannot be disabled by the drive‟s negations of subjectivity. Edelman does acknowledge that “being” the death drive would be impossible; however, when he writes that queerness is “never a matter of being or becoming but, rather, of embodying” the death drive, the distinction between “being” and “embodying” is tenuous (25). As Edelman clearly recognizes, it would be a contradiction in terms to claim that any subject could ontologically “be” the drive. But in positing “queerness” as a near synonym for the drive, Edelman comes close to theorizing queerness as coextensive with the drive. An emblem for the drive, queerness as it is construed in No Future haunts but is never haunted; it ruptures, but is never ruptured by, the drive. It cannot be so ruptured, according to Edelman, because “queerness can never define an identity; it can only ever disturb one” (17).

#### Recognizing the material suffering contingent upon disability is necessary within any model of discourse—that implicates alt solvency. Mollow

(The Disability Drive by Anna Mollow A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English in the Graduate Division of the University of California, Berkeley Committee in charge: Professor Kent Puckett, Chair Professor Celeste G. Langan Professor Melinda Y. Chen Spring 2015//Aanya

Recognizing that the social model may place unnecessary constraints upon discourses about disability, some disability scholars have in recent years proposed alternative frames. For example, Sharon L. Snyder and David T. Mitchell refer to a “cultural model” of disability, in which disability is to be understood not only as social oppression but also as “a site of resistance and a source of cultural agency” (10). And Alison Kafer has offered a “political/relational model” as a “friendly departure from the more common social model of disability” (Feminist 6- 7). Noting that the social model “can marginalize those disabled people who are interested in medical interventions or cures,” Kafer emphasizes that experiences such as pain and fatigue should not be regarded as “irrelevant to the project of disability politics” (7). I welcome these interventions, and in this dissertation I seek to take them further: while the cultural model and the political/relational model allow that discussions of suffering may sometimes be relevant, the sexual model places suffering at its center. In centralizing suffering positions, I do not suggest that all disabled people suffer as a result of their impairments; nor do I propose that the terms “disability” and “suffering” are interchangeable. However, I do argue that suffering plays a crucial role in determining social reactions to disability. When people witness (or believe that they witness) another person‟s suffering, deeply troubling affective responses often ensue, and disabled people are frequently blamed or punished for producing these feelings. If disability studies limits itself to saying that disability is not suffering, then our field not only restigmatizes disabled people who do suffer but also misses the opportunity to address a more crucial question, a question that pertains to the social oppression of suffering and nonsuffering disabled people alike: what forces impel our culture to place such a strong stigma upon those disabled bodies, minds, and bodyminds that are imagined (whether accurately or not) to inhabit suffering positions? In framing the question this way, my intent is not to override or eliminate the social model. Despite my divergence from some of the social model‟s central claims, I retain what I see as the social model‟s most critical intervention: its assertion that the dominant social order has made disabled people‟s lives far more difficult than they need to be. Had there been no social model, there would be no Americans with Disabilities Act, and I would not have been able to write this dissertation: because my disability prevents me from writing, typing, or using a computer, I have relied upon assistants to transcribe and type every word of this thesis; without funding from the California Department of Rehabilitation, it would have been impossible for me to pay for these services. In addition, I understand the reasons that the social model‟s framers constructed a divide between impairment and disability. Because they wanted to drive home the point that societies needed to radically alter their treatment of disabled people, these activists thought that it was 31 important to deny that there was anything “wrong” with disabled people ourselves. Indeed, Oliver‟s critique of the medical model‟s tendency to “regard disabled people as „having something wrong with them‟ and hence [being] the source of the problem” is a fundamental claim of disability studies (“Social” 20). The social model says to focus on access, not suffering. But although this approach may be effective in many instances, it is untenable for people whose access needs are linked to suffering. Such is the case with my own disabilities: the reason that I am unable to write or type is that these activities cause pain. Therefore, in order to apply for the public services that provide me with access to a graduate education, it has been necessary for me to talk about suffering. Similarly, if I make the access request that people refrain from wearing perfume in my presence, my success in convincing them to grant this accommodation will depend upon my ability to convince them that chemical fragrances cause me to suffer. And as almost anyone with an undocumented disability will attest, such convincing can be extraordinarily difficult. Rachel Cohen-Rottenberg, expressing frustration with access barriers at the Society for Disability Studies annual conference, notes that for many neuroatypical people, holding the convention in a location replete with “noise, crowds, and visual overstimulation” is like having the conference near “the gates of hell.” If disability scholars cannot talk about suffering, then we certainly cannot talk about “the gates of hell.” But we need to be able to do so, because prohibitions against speaking of suffering are access barriers in and of themselves. It‟s not just that I need to convey the “hell” of the symptoms of environmental illness in order to get you to switch to fragrance-free laundry detergent; I also need to tell you about the suffering I experience so that I can be heard and recognized as part of the disability community. As Liz Crow points out, “pain, fatigue, depression and chronic illness are constant facts of life” for many people with disabilities; if we deny these realities, “our collective ability to conceive of, and achieve, a world which does not disable is diminished” (58).

Yes IP Oxfam International, 9/20, Campaigners warn that 9 out of 10 people in poor countries are set to miss out on COVID-19 vaccine next year, https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/campaigners-warn-9-out-10-people-poor-countries-are-set-miss-out-covid-19-vaccine,

Anna Marriott, Oxfam’s health policy Manager, said: “No one should be blocked from getting a life-saving vaccine because of the country they live in or the amount of money in their pocket. But unless something changes dramatically, billions of people around the world will not receive a safe and effective vaccine for COVID-19 for years to come.” Heidi Chow, from Global Justice Now, said: “All pharmaceutical corporations and research institutions working on a vaccine must share the science, technological know-how, and intellectual property behind their vaccine so enough safe and effective doses can be produced. Governments must also ensure the pharmaceutical industry puts people’s lives before profits.”