### 1

#### Ethics must be derived apriroi:

#### 1] Uncertainty – experiences are locked within our own subjectivity and are inaccessible to others, however a priori principles are created in the noumenal world and are universally applied to all agents. Outweighs since founding ethics in the phenomenal world allows people to justify atrocities by saying they don’t experience the same.

#### 2] Is/Ought Gap – experience in the phenomenal world 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 within the noumenal world to make a moral theory.

#### The existence of conditional goodness requires the unconditional human worth—that means we must treat others as ends in themselves.

Korsgaard 83 (Christine M., [American philosopher and Arthur Kingsley Porter Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University whose main scholarly interests are in moral philosophy and its history “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr. 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) TDI

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness. Kant considers what this might be**:** it cannot be an object of inclination, for those have only a conditional worth, "for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity" or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action." By this I understand him to mean that we must regard ourselves as capable of conferring value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize t hem. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### Next, any moral rule faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” asks for a reason for reasons, which concedes its authority.

#### Thus, 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.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Other frameworks collapse—they contain conditional obligations which derive their authority from the categorical imperative.

Korsgaard 98 [CHRISTINE M. KORSGAARD, greatest philosopher alive, 1998, “Introduction”, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals] AG // Recut Lex AKu

This is the sort of thing that makes even practiced readers of Kant gnash their teeth. A rough translation might go like this: the categorical imperative is a law, to which our maxims must conform. But the reason they must do so cannot be that there is some further condition they must meet, or some other law to which they must conform. For instance, suppose someone proposed that one must keep one's promises because it is the will of God that one should do so - the law would then "contain the condition" that our maxims should conform to the will of God. This would yield only a conditional requirement to keep one's promises — if you would obey the will of God, then you must keep your promises - whereas the categorical imperative must give us an unconditional requirement. Since there can be no such condition, all that remains is that the categorical imperative should tell us that our maxims themselves must be laws - that is, that they must be universal, that being the characteristic of laws. There is a simpler way to make this point. What could make it true that we must keep our promises because it is the will of God? That would be true only if it were true that we must indeed obey the will of God, that is, if "obey the will of God" were itself a categorical imperative. Conditional requirements give rise to a regress; if there are unconditional requirements, we must at some point arrive at principles on which we are required to act, not because we are commanded to do so by some yet higher law, but because they are laws in themselves. The categorical imperative, in the most general sense, tells us to act on those principles, principles which are themselves laws. Kant continues:

#### 2] 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.

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

#### Now Negate:

#### 1] Patents protect private companies.

Na 19 [Blake Na, "Protecting Intellectual Property Rights in the Pharmaceutical Industry", Chicago-Kent | Journal of Intellectual Property, 4-19-2019, https://studentorgs.kentlaw.iit.edu/ckjip/protecting-intellectual-property-rights-in-the-pharmaceutical-industry/, accessed: 8-24-2021.] //Lex VM

Patent Rights A pharmaceutical company may apply for a patent from the PTO at any time in the development lifetime of a drug.[12] A drug is patentable if it is non-obvious, new, and useful.[13] The drug must be non-obvious when comparing the drug with another previously invented drug, i.e., it does not bring the same type of information as the other drugs. The drug must also not exist, and it must have a purpose. Intellectual property rights, especially patent rights, are the foundation of the pharmaceutical industry. The industry heavily depends on the future profits which innovation (and as a result, exclusivity) enable. Drug patents grant the originator company to market exclusivity for a fixed term of 20 years from the patent’s original filing date. By giving this 20-year patent term in which the government cannot regulate the price, market exclusivity allows pharmaceutical companies to have a monopoly over the market. To maximize their profit, pharmaceutical companies work on extending the exclusivity of a drug. For example, AbbVie extended the manufacturing exclusivity of Humira by delaying generic companies from manufacturing generic entrants until 2023. The market exclusivity can be lengthened anywhere between 180 days to 7 years. Thus, due to efforts to derive profits from patents, pharmaceutical companies’ patents contribute to roughly 70-80 percent of their overall revenues. Patents in the pharmaceutical industry are normally referred to as their product portfolio and are the most effective method for protecting innovation and creating significant returns on investments. Accordingly, as mentioned above, patents help in recouping costs related to research, development, and marketing of a drug. Patents not only help pharmaceutical companies recoup investments, they can also act as a shield against infringement claims. Strong patent protection can safeguard drugs from potential infringers. Without consent from the patentee, other competing companies cannot use, make, or distribute the invention. However, because a drug can be easily imitated by competitors, bringing an infringement suit can also protect a patentee’s rights. Recently, DUSA Pharmaceuticals, Inc.—an arm of the Indian pharmaceutical company Su Pharma and ranked among the top 50 global Pharma Companies—was recently granted injunctive relief from a U.S. court against Biofrontera Inc. in a patent infringement case[14]. The court’s order prohibited Biofrontera from making use of information, including sales data, marketing data, technical information, and unpublished clinical data, of DUSA Pharmaceuticals[15]. Although bringing an infringement suit is a valuable remedial measure for patentees, pharmaceutical companies often face difficulty with the high costs and uncertainty of litigation

#### That negates – A] Promise breaking – states promised legally binding IP protections to companies who might not have otherwise developed medicines – the aff is a unilateral violation of that contract. B] That’s a form of restricting the free economic choices of individuals.

#### 2] Reducing protections of IP leads to theft and the free riding of ideas.

Van Dyke 18 [Raymond Van Dyke, Technology and Intellectual Property Attorney and Patent Practitioner, 7-17-2018, accessed on 8-8-2021, IPWatchdog, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting", https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/] //D.Ying recut Lex VM

As we shall see, applying Kantian logic entails first acknowledging some basic principles; that the people have a right to express themselves, that that expression (the fruits of their labor) has value and is theirs (unless consent is given otherwise), and that government is obligated to protect people and their property. Thus, an inventor or creator has a right in their own creation, which cannot be taken from them without their consent. So, employing this canon, a proposed Categorical Imperative (CI) is the following Statement: creators should be protected against the unlawful taking of their creation by others. Applying this Statement to everyone, i.e., does the Statement hold water if everyone does this, leads to a yes determination. Whether a child, a book or a prototype, creations of all sorts should be protected, and this CI stands. This result also dovetails with the purpose of government: to protect the people and their possessions by providing laws to that effect, whether for the protection of tangible or intangible things. However, a contrary proposal can be postulated: everyone should be able to use the creations of another without charge. Can this Statement rise to the level of a CI? This proposal, upon analysis would also lead to chaos. Hollywood, for example, unable to protect their films, television shows or any content, would either be out of business or have robust encryption and other trade secret protections, which would seriously undermine content distribution and consumer enjoyment. Likewise, inventors, unable to license or sell their innovations or make any money to cover R&D, would not bother to invent or also resort to strong trade secret. Why even create? This approach thus undermines and greatly hinders the distribution of ideas in a free society, which is contrary to the paradigm of the U.S. patent and copyright systems, which promotes dissemination. By allowing freeriding, innovation and creativity would be thwarted (or at least not encouraged) and trade secret protection would become the mainstay for society with the heightened distrust. Also, allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement would be akin to a Communist environment where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible, apart from legitimate exigencies. On the positive front, there is a Categorical Imperative that creators should be encouraged to create, which is imminently reasonable and supportable. Likewise, the statement set forth in the Constitution that Congress should pass laws “To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries” is supportive, as a Categorical Imperative, for the many reasons elucidated two centuries ago by Madison and others, and endorsed by George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and later by Abraham Lincoln. A Categorical Imperative, universality, however, may be a stretch outside of the United States since other cultures may not treasure the progress of science and the useful arts and freedoms that we Americans do. Nonetheless, it is certainly a supportable proposition in the United States, and even a Categorical Imperative that we must do it!

#### 3] IP is property in the same way our health and labor are too.

D’Amato 14 [David S. D’Amato, David S. D’Amato is an attorney, a regular opinion contributor at The Hill, and an expert policy advisor to the Future of Freedom Foundation and the Heartland Institute. His writing has appeared in Forbes, Newsweek, The American Spectator, the Washington Examiner, Investor’s Business Daily, The Daily Caller, RealClearPolicy, Townhall, CounterPunch, and many others, as well as at nonpartisan, nonpartisan policy organizations such as the American Institute for Economic Research, the Centre for Policy Studies, the Institute for Economic Affairs, the Foundation for Economic Education, and the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, among others. He earned a JD from New England School of Law and an LLM in Global Law and Technology from Suffolk University Law School. He lives and writes in Chicago. "Libertarian Views of Intellectual Property: Rothbard, Tucker, Spooner, and Rand", Libertarianism.org, 5-28-2014, https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/libertarian-views-intellectual-property-rothbard-tucker-spooner-rand, accessed: 8-25-2021.] //Lex VM

Since Spooner finds the foundation of property in each individual’s natural right to provide for her own subsistence and happiness, it is perhaps unsurprising that he regards “the right of property in intellectual wealth” as necessary and legitimate. After all, ideas are no less important to the ends served by property than are labor and natural resources, which would remain idle and useless without the application of intellect and ingenuity. Confronting the argument that a thing must have “corporeal substance” to be the subject of a property right, Spooner protests that tangible, physical substances “are not the only things that have value”—that denying a property right in ideas is akin to arguing that an individual does not own her labor, also intangible. If labor is properly the subject of property, belonging to the individual and deserving of payment, then so too are ideas, which he compares to the “new forms and new beauties” that human labor gives to physical objects. Engaging ideas from tort law, Spooner goes on to observe that health, strength, and the physical senses too are incorporeal, susceptible to loss “without the loss of any corporeal substance,” but are nevertheless “valuable possessions, and subjects of property.” A tortfeasor who impairs or harms these non‐​physical qualities must make his victim whole, paying damages as compensation. For Spooner, then, it is clear that property rights can (indeed, must) extend their reach beyond physical objects, that the acquisition of property itself depends fundamentally upon something that cannot be seen or touched, human effort.

#### 4] Neg contention choice – otherwise they can concede all of our work on framework and just read 4 minutes of turns which moots the four minutes of framework debate that the 1NC did giving them a massive advantage and limits phil debate.

#### 5] There is a distinction between action and omission –No act/omission distinction is infinitely regressive because it means that you are culpable for everything since you are technically aware of anything. That negates – omitting is a morally permissible action to avoid culpability, you can choose to omit from any ethical action which means the squo is ok and theres no moral obligation to do the aff.

## Case

### UV

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc and exacerbates the fact that they get infinite pre-round prep since I should be able to compensate by choosing – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical. Even if they win comparrative worlds our offense still functions bc its disproves the desirability of the aff.

#### You get 1AR theory BUT it isn’t automatically dtd beause abuse is contextual—you shouldn’t give me the death penalty for j-walking. Neg gets an RVI on 1AR theory if the 1NC didn’t read a shell: [a] Otherwise the 1AR will always uplayer to give themselves an out that I can’t access offense on—the RVI is key to deter frivolous theory [b] Otherwise they can spread out the 2NR and collapse to whatever I undercover—there’s no 3NR so the 2AR can always shift to avoid my arguments.

### Framework OV

#### 1---Kant hijacks: The way to maximize wellbeing is by following the categorical imperative since it avoids pain through things like murder and exploitation.

#### 2---Induction Fails - we predict future events based on past trends, but that’s circular since the idea that past trends will repeat themselves itself relies on past trends continuing

### Overview

#### They don’t solve---Vaccines specifically are different from medicines.

Immunize BC 20 (Immunize British Colombia is a collaborative project of the BC Ministry of Health, the BC Centre for Disease Control (an agency of the BC Provincial Health Services Authority), the regional health authorities (First Nations Health Authority, Fraser Health, Interior Health, Island Health, Northern Health and Vancouver Coastal Health), the BC Pharmacy Association and the Public Health Association of BC. Our mission is to improve the health of British Columbians by continuing to reduce the number of vaccine-preventable diseases, along with the illness, disability and death that they cause, What are vaccines?, Date last reviewed: Thursday, Mar 19, 2020, accessed on 6-30-21, <https://immunizebc.ca/what-are-vaccines)//ww> pbj

Vaccines are products that protect people against many diseases that can be very dangerous and even deadly. Different than most medicines that treat or cure diseases, vaccines prevent you from getting sick with the disease in the first place.

### AT: WTO Cred

#### 1] This impact is an absolute joke – need to win conflict coming.

#### 2] Biden and trump terminally thump WTO cred.

**Krueger 21** (Anne O. Krueger 5-24 [(Anne O. Krueger, a former World Bank chief economist and former first deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund, is Senior Research Professor of International Economics at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies and Senior Fellow at the Center for International Development at Stanford University.) “Biden's Trumpy Start on Trade” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/bidens-trade-policy-is-a-lot-like-trumps-by-anne-o-krueger-2021-05>] TDI

WASHINGTON, DC – Former President Donald Trump did enormous damage to the United States’ reputation and future prospects, both domestically and internationally. Yet while President Joe Biden has set about reversing the previous administration’s legacy in many domains, he has yet to focus his attention on US trade policy. That needs to change. Trump’s trade policies were not only a disaster for US and world trade; they also have made it more difficult for the US to achieve a broader range of economic and foreign-policy goals. Reversing those policies thus should be a top priority for the new administration. After all, America’s friends and allies (particularly the European Union, the United Kingdom, Canada, Mexico, Japan, and South Korea) remain deeply shaken by Trump’s protectionist impulses. In addition to slapping tariffs on a broad range of goods, his administration forced a renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the US-Korea Free Trade Agreement, and withdrew the US from the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) to which the US had agreed. It declared a “trade war” with China, despite that country’s membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO), and with no regard for US trading partners’ own dealings with China. Taken together, these policies have done serious damage to America’s standing in the world. Leading the world toward an open multilateral trading system under the 1947 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, which became the WTO in 1995) was one of America’s crowning achievements after World War II. The system works precisely because members willingly commit themselves to open, rules-based trade policies. Among other things, this ensures that foreign traders have the same rights as domestic nationals when disputes between them arise, and that the principle of nondiscrimination among trading partners prevails, except in the case of preferential trading arrangements. Trade flourished under the GATT, with the US leading negotiations for multilateral tariff reductions and the removal of other trade barriers (including quantitative restrictions). In later years, developing countries witnessed the success of open markets and decided to start dismantling their own highly protectionist regimes. For most, this resulted in a remarkable acceleration of growth in output and trade. For more than a half-century, world trade grew roughly twice as fast as world GDP. This growth was far from smooth, of course. Significant slowdowns followed the oil shocks of the 1970s, the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s, and the Great Recession a decade later. Growth in world output and trade has resumed since the 2008 global financial crisis, but not as rapidly as in the years preceding it. And China, following an overhaul of its trade policies in the 1990s and its accession to the WTO in 2001, emerged as the world’s largest trading power. In addition to reducing domestic poverty and improving living standards for its own population, China’s dramatic economic ascent was bound to raise issues with other countries. **But thanks to the WTO and its dispute-settlement mechanism, there was a multilateral forum where these issues could be addressed – that is, until Trump came along.** Although **Biden** has reasserted America’s commitment to internationalism and multilateralism, he **has moved slowly to repair the damage that Trump did to critical institutions like the WTO.** Nor has Biden reversed Trump’s withdrawal from the TPP. Now called the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership, US membership in this 11-country pact would be a boon for US exporters. Currently, US companies are at a distinct disadvantage relative to their competitors in CPTPP countries, because their exports to those economies are subject to duties that do not apply to exports from members of the bloc. Biden also has not ended the trade war with China, even though that effort has utterly failed to achieve its stated objectives. While the US bilateral trade deficit with China has fallen somewhat, the deficits with Vietnam, Malaysia, and others have risen commensurately as their exports have replaced those from China. Although the Biden administration has finally agreed to a new director-general for the WTO, it has done little to reduce Trump’s tariffs, and has even announced that it will strengthen “buy American” provisions in government procurement contracts. Biden says he wants to protect American jobs, yet the Trump administration’s tariffs on imported iron and steel, which have cost a net total of around 75,000 jobs (leaving out the additional losses caused by other countries’ retaliatory tariffs), remain in place. If Biden really wants to help American workers, he should recognize that exports create good jobs, and that the export sector’s contribution to US GDP has doubled as a result of open multilateral trade. As for America’s current-account deficit, that can be addressed only by curtailing US expenditures relative to income, not through protectionism. And because the WTO procurement agreement has led other countries to open up government bidding processes for American exporters, it is doubtful that weakening it will benefit American workers; indeed, doing so may even cost jobs. China is here to stay. Though there are certainly trade issues that need to be addressed, that is best done multilaterally. The US and China have both lost as a result of the trade war. A US offer to remove the tariffs if the Chinese reciprocate and join multilateral discussions on outstanding issues could benefit both countries and the rest of the world. Strong economies make for successful countries. Efforts to protect domestic industries are a sign of weakness, not strength. If the Biden administration wants to achieve its stated goals, it will remove Trump’s protectionist measures, work multilaterally, strengthen US infrastructure, invest in workforce skills and education, and expand America’s research capabilities. **It should be obvious by now that continuing the last administration’s trade policies is a recipe for failure.**

#### 3] No impact—

#### A] No Brink Scenario – no explanations of conflicts/tensions that are escalating now.

#### B] Trade wars don’t go to hot wars

**Dayen 17**, New Republic contributor (David “Trump Is Signaling a Trade War, but It’s Not as Disastrous as You May Think”, https://www.thenation.com/article/trump-is-signaling-a-trade-war-but-its-not-as-disastrous-as-you-may-think/)

Can Trump enact tariffs on his own? Though it would appear to contradict the Origination Clause of the Constitution, Congress has delegated that authority in enough pieces of legislation that Trump could probably raise import duties unilaterally. But what would be the practical effect? Hard-core free traders paint a picture of cataclysm. Tariffs will launch trade wars, increase prices, and destroy the economy. This is all hard-wired into the pro-globalization worldview. Thomas Friedman once famously admitted that he wrote a column supporting a free-trade agreement with Central America without knowing a thing about it: “I just knew two words: free trade,” he told an audience. Presumably the opposite is true for Friedman: He sees one word, “tariff,” and immediately screams in horror. Oddly, many of those same proponents of free trade favor a policy that looks very much like a tariff. The Republican corporate-tax revamp includes something called a border-adjustment tax, which would impose a 20 percent tax on imports while eliminating a tax on exports. Like with tariffs, the goal appears to be to encourage domestic production. In fact, the tax would be much higher than the 5-10 percent tariff being floated. (It also might be illegal under the current global trade regime.) Supporters of border adjustment, particularly economists, argue that it will end up trade neutral, because the exchange rate will fluctuate in response to the tax. In other words, though the tax would make American-made goods more attractive, the value of the dollar would increase, leveling that out. Few of these economists seem to carry over the same analysis to the effects of a tariff. I don’t understand why. There’s no reason to doubt the fact that, if Trump imposed an across-the-board tariff, the dollar would strengthen, thus nullifying the desired effect. Indeed, before Trump has even taken office, the dollar has risen to a 14-year high, in anticipation of a more protectionist stance. Incidentally, for all the one-off announcements by Trump (however factually challenged) about hundreds of jobs he has allegedly rescued here or there, this one development—the rise in the dollar—has likely caused the loss of hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs, under standard economic theory. Looked at this way, higher tariffs wouldn’t cause a recession (as Paul Krugman has acknowledged), but would be somewhat pointless, with currency exchanges shifting to account for any changes. Trade wars might temporarily reduce efficiency, as domestic supply chains would have to be rebuilt, but they’re unlikely to radically alter the balance of trade on their own. There are other variables here. Importers and exporters who have lived in a world of floating exchange rates for decades may be fairly nimble in adjusting to them. On the downside, Krugman explains that raising tariffs could inhibit capital flows, meaning that investors will place less money into US markets. You can see how that might reduce economic growth. But Jeff Spross points out that America currently has a problem with too much foreign money flowing in; reducing the flow could arguably make the economy more stable. Trump could also seek to prevent unlawful currency manipulation (not necessarily from China, but from other Asian nations) that artificially disadvantages US manufacturing. The real unknown here is what Trump would do with all that tariff revenue. The border adjustment tax at 20 percent is assumed to bring in $1 trillion over the 10-year budget window. So a tariff of even one-quarter or one-half that size would draw significant funds. What’s the plan for it? Would it get plowed into job-creating investments? Tax cuts for the wealthy? That’s a significant variable as well. We do know that the same pundits who confidently predicted that globalization would be a win-win policy for America repeatedly got it wrong. Those on the losing side saw their jobs shipped out and factories closed down, and weren’t given the kind of assistance needed to offset the disruption. So it’s worth being a little skeptical of the warnings coming from the same corners now. I don’t have a ton of faith in the Trump team to necessarily make their trade agenda work (especially as corporate interests will seek to co-opt the redesigned policies in ways even friendlier to their bottom line). And I think there are smarter ways to balance our trade deficit than a tariff strategy which will just run up against currency exchange rates. But the hysteria accompanying these tariffs (which wasn’t at all present when President Obama imposed his own tariffs on Chinese tires and steel) seems far beyond what little we can assume about the actual results of such a strategy.

### AT: Distribution

#### 1] No Correlation and best studies show COVID decreases Conflict.

Salemi 20 Colette Salemi 10-15-2020 "Does COVID-19 raise the risk of violent conflict? Not everywhere" <https://archive.is/h591O#selection-309.0-312.0> (Colette Salemi is a PhD student in applied economics at the University of Minnesota. Her research focuses on conflict, forced displacement, environmental degradation and their intersections.)//Elmer

How we did our research We **used** the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data (**ACLED**), a **database** **that counts** the **number of conflict events daily around the world**. For 2019 and 2020, ACLED includes more than 100 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe — and tracks three categories of violent conflict: battles, violence against civilians and explosions/remote violence. We examine trends in the number of conflict events over time. To see whether the trend changes in response to covid-19, we look at what happened after the World Health Organization declared a global pandemic (March 11) or the country declared a lockdown. [Don’t miss any of TMC’s smart analysis! Sign up here for our newsletter.] The **relationship between pandemics and conflict is theoretically unclear.** In some countries, job losses from the covid-19 pandemic mean people have fewer income-generating options — that can make participation in violence seem a more viable alternative. But if **market disruptions** and reduced global demand are **driving down** the **value of natural resources** such as oil wells, then **we** may **see less conflict** over control of such resources. We then **conducted** case **studies** based **on** our knowledge of countries with high rates of violent conflict before **covid**-19. These include countries with active civil wars (such as Syria) as well as countries with violent militia groups (such as the Philippines). Conflict during the coronavirus pandemic varies greatly **Worldwide**, **we didn’t observe an increase in violent conflict**. **If anything, conflict has decreased**, as the figure below shows. **Violent conflict** between March and August 2020 **was 23 percent lower** than violent conflict during the same period in 2019. Comparing these time periods, battles are down 20 percent and remote violence and bombings are down 40 percent. But violence against civilians — the deliberate attack of unarmed noncombatants by armed groups — continued at similar rates globally.

#### 2] Be extremely skeptical of the brink or uniqueness for this – COVID has happened for nearly two years and we have yet to see a great power conflict. Pakistan is also struggling bc of COVID.