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#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing intellectual property protections for a subset of medicines.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab.] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/ TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in (1b), some individual tiger in (2b), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in (3b)—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In (1b), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in (1a) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. (1a) does not entail that animals are striped, but (1b) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1a) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (1b) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail reducing protections for aids, because it doesn’t prove that we should derestrict other beneficial tech, 2] adverb test – member nations “ought to usually reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t substantially change resolutional meaning.

#### Precision is key – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Violation – they only defend emergency use medicines.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from COVID vaccines to HIV/AIDS to random biotech to insulin treatments and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) drop the arg doesn’t make sense on T since that drops the whole advocacy.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) chilling effect – rvis deter checking abuse against better theory debaters since we lose. Outweighs since terminal impact of theory is norming b) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

T ow 1AR theory – a) only 2 months to set topic norms but 1AR theory norms set whenever, b) my abuse is jusitifeid if I was super skewed.

## 2

#### Ethics must began a priori rather than with experiences.

#### 1] 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 extrinsic goodness requires unconditional human worth—that means we must treat others as ends in themselves.

Korsgaard ’83 (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) OS/Recut Lex AKu \*brackets for gendered language

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] he or she 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 them. 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.

#### Practical reason is inescapable - 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?” requires reason to do in the first place which concedes its authority.

**This the standard is consistency with treating humans as ends in themselves.**

#### 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] IP is a reflection of our will and a form of property.

Merges 11 [Merges, Robert P. "Will and Object in the World of IP." Justifying Intellectual Property, Cambridge, Harvard UP, 2011, pp. 76-78. ISBN: 0674049489,9780674049482. Found on Libgen.] //Lex VM

It is clear enough at this point that Kant thought reliable expectations about ongoing possession of objects enables something positive to take place. Stable possession permits the imprinting of some aspect of a person, what Kant called his will, onto objects so as to enable the person to more fully flourish. Though nuances abound, Kant’s basic idea regarding the will24 is simple enough: Will is that aspect of a person which decides to, and wants to, act on the world.25 It has three distinctive qualities: it is personal, autonomous, and active. It is highly individual, a function of each person’s preferences and desires; Lewis White Beck says that will is “bent upon the satisfaction of some arbitrary purpose.” It is this aspect or feature of ourselves that we imprint or stamp on the world through our choices and the resulting actions that carry out or manifest these choices. Right here, in this foundational element, we see a radically individualistic and autonomous view of humans. Although this is balanced by a universalizing, transpersonal sense of reason in other parts of his philosophy,26 a highly individual will is nonetheless central to Kant’s view of human thought and action, and thus an essential aspect of what he thought it means to be human.27 will and object in the world of ip. It is tempting to get caught up in the terminology and conceptual complexity of Kant’s ideas of persons, will, and objects. To prevent that happening, it seems wise at this point to talk about some specific examples. How exactly does Kantian autonomy work? What does it look like in the context of IP rights? After we have a better grasp of these ideas, and of how they relate to Kant’s rationale for property, we can turn to an equally important topic: the limits on individual autonomy that Kant built into his theory. Our earlier example of Michelangelo showed how stable possession is required for a creator to fully work his will on a found object— in that case, a block of marble. The same basic logic applies in all sorts of cases. Individual farmers and landowners generate and then bring to life a vision for the lands they work on;28 inventors transform off- the- shelf materials into prototypes, rough designs, and finished products; and artists work in media such as paint and canvas, paper and pen, textiles and wood, keyboard and iPad, and so on, to give life to a concept or mental image. Wherever personal skill and judgment are brought to bear on things that people inherit or find, we see evidence of the Kantian process of will imprinting itself on objects. It even happens when the objects at hand are themselves intangible. A composer working out a new instance of a traditional form— a fugue or symphony, blues song or tone poem— is working on found objects just as surely as the farmer or inventor. Even in our earlier example, some of the objects that Michelangelo works on in the course of carving his sculpture are intangible: received conventions about how to depict an emotion; traditional groupings of figures in a religious set piece, such as the Pieta; or accepted norms about how to depict athletic grace or youthful energy. He may take these pieces of the cultural tableau and refine them, or he may subtly resist or transform them. However he handles them, these conventions are just as much objects in his hands as the marble itself.29 As with found physical objects, extended possession of these objects- intransformation is required to fully apply the creator’s skill and judgment. And because of this, Kantian property rights come into play with intangible objects as well. Let me say a word about this complex, and perhaps controversial, possession of intangible objects. It has often been argued that this feature of IP, the control of copies of an intangible work, constitutes a form of “artificial scarcity,”30 that it runs counter to an ethically superior regime where information is shared freely— and is maybe even counter to the nature of information, which, some say, “wants to be free.”31 According to Kant, all property rights have this element of artifice, because they define a conceptual type of possession. Property is not just a matter of physical contact between person and object; it describes a relationship that is deeper and goes well beyond the basic acts of grasping and holding. I can hear one objection to this right away. Yes, Kant speaks of legal ownership as a special relation between a person and an object. But, the objection might run, in his writings he refers only to physical objects, for example, an apple (à la Locke). So maybe the ownership relation is limited to that sort of thing? No. I give no weight to the fact that Kant uses only examples of tangible, physical property in most of the sections of the Doctrine of Right (DOR).32 Kant describes an additional type of possession that makes it crystal clear that the idea is not in any way limited to physical things—the expectation of future performance under a contract. He posits that one could not properly be said to “possess” a right to performance under an executory contract (one that has been signed or agreed to, but not yet performed) unless “I can maintain that I would have possession . . . even if the time of the performance is yet to come.”33 With that legal relation established, however, “[t]he promise of the [promisor] accordingly belongs among my worldly goods . . . , and I can include it under what is mine.”34 The synonymous use of “possession,” “object,” “belonging,” and “mine” in the case of a tangible, physical thing such as an apple and an intangible thing such as a promise of future contractual performance is too clear to require much comment. “Object” is very abstract for Kant, and can of course therefore include IPRs.35

## 3

#### Counterplan text: Member nations of the WTO should reduce intellectual property protections for emergency use listing medicines during public health emergencies of international concern with the exception of the people’s republic of china.

No 1AR theory – Double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. Intervention o/w since it takes the round out of debater’s hands

#### 1AR theory is drop the argument – they can initiate theory in the aff and the 1ar which means they have 2 speeches to devastate the 1n with no risk auto-loss issues, b) it allows us to go back to substance since they don’t just outright win for a small strategy skew key to substance ed – ow 2 months to debate the topic.

## 4

#### Despite resistance, the CCP regime is stable now – but challenges to legitimacy cause lashout

Ball, MA in IR, 20

(Joshua, University of St. Andrews, https://globalsecurityreview.com/degree-chinas-internal-stability-depend-economic-growth/, April 10) BW

For decades, Western academics, policymakers, and analysts assumed that China’s embrace of capitalist economic policies would set the stage for democratic reform. Almost three decades later, however, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) remains firmly in power under the increasingly autocratic leadership of General Secretary Xi Jinping. While the CCP-controlled government faces a range of threats from groups within its borders, the idea of a downturn in the Chinese economy remains a very legitimate threat. The Chinese government has radically modernized its economic policies over the past three decades, completely reversing their initial Marxist or Maoist aversion to providing monetary compensation for labor. These reforms are responsible for the significant growth of the Chinese middle class, which has the potential to be the most influential group in China when looked at in regards to socio-economic status. As a result, the considerably large middle class has come to perceive the CCP as being responsible for their rising levels of prosperity. China has undoubtedly experienced the effects of the 2008-2009 global economic crisis; it indeed fared much better than the majority of the world. However, China still faces many hurdles to overcome. Rising Debt and Escalating Unemployment for Chinese College Graduates It is becoming increasingly difficult in China for college graduates to find jobs, the volume of China’s exports is dropping, and tens of millions of workers are out of work. The possibility of a financial crisis in China could challenge Beijing’s ability to hold up its side of the deal with the population. Since the inception of Jiang Zemin’s ‘Three Represents,’ meant to attract private entrepreneurs to party membership, the middle and upper classes have seen the party as being responsible for their economic well-being. The government provides an environment for a healthy, regulated economy, to encourage the creation of private wealth and property, and in return has its rule legitimized by its people. Arguably, while it is individuals are responsible for the creation of personal wealth, the party made it possible. If the government or party cannot guarantee jobs to the people, there remains the little reason for the people to tolerate the strict control that the party maintains over the state. If the CCP-controlled government cannot sustain economic growth, it could be perceived by members of the growing middle class as violating the social contract that has existed between China’s citizens and the country’s ruling party elite. The CCP could face a challenge to its legitimacy if and when the time comes that it is unable to guarantee a healthy economy, prompting potential discontent from the middle class. Beijing has a track record of effectively suppressing unrest The Chinese government has become particularly adept at maintaining or regaining control over its people via means of physical repression, censorship, and through the creation of an environment where fear of speaking out is a legitimate means of control. Indeed, the likelihood of an economic downturn eliminating the CCP’s influence is minimal. Rising social discontent isn’t likely to be enough to force the party itself from power, but it might be sufficient to tempt some members of the elite to take advantage of the situation to their political benefit, thus leading to internal instability within the party and damaging its credibility. While the CCP has an extraordinary ability to suppress dissent, many argue that it can only contain such dissent for so long. However, due to the rapid proliferation of advanced technologies including surveillance, censorship, and controlled access to information, the Chinese authorities are empowered as never before, to monitor, identify, and censor those whose activities are a perceived threat to the party. Nevertheless, a sustained economic downturn poses a threat to the CCP’s legitimacy. Continued civil unrest on the part of groups desiring independence from CCP rule as a result of religious suppression and ethnic inequality illustrate not-insignificant threats to the party’s ability to maintain total control over the Chinese state. Regardless, the most significant threat to the power monopoly held by the CCP is a pronounced economic downturn.

#### The plan erodes CCP legitimacy. Xi, CCP leadership and the people have prioritized protecting IP Rights – the plan is a major reversal.

Changyu 21 [Changyu, Shen, March April 2021“Developing a Uniquely Chinese System of Intellectual Property.” *Developing a Uniquely Chinese System of Intellectual Property*, en.qstheory.cn/2021-04/30/c\_617534.htm.]//Lex AKu

It is vital to grasp the strategic aspect of IP protection**.** President Xi pointed out that to build a modern socialist country in all respects, China must incorporate it into its national strategies and consider the requirements posed by the new development stage, comprehensively strengthen IP protection, construct a modern economic system, encourage innovation throughout society, and develop a new development dynamic. President Xi's instructions have provided insight into the goals and tasks of IP protection in the new era. China needs to further enhance its sense of responsibility, of mission, and of urgency regarding IP protection in the new era, understand the role of IP in building a modern economic system, and strengthen IP protection to encourage internal innovation and greater openness to the outside world. We need to promote a market system predicated on high standards, develop a more open economy, and support the construction of a new development dynamic with the domestic economy and international engagement providing mutual reinforcement, and the former as the mainstay. **It is vital to recognize the historical significance of IP protection.** President Xi has indicated that China is making the transition from a major importer of IP to a major creator of IP, and IP work is changing from being about pursuing quantity to improving quality. In his speech, President Xi has affirmed the achievements that have been made in IP work, emphasized the historical significance of this work, and encouraged further efforts in this regard. China must use its historical achievements in the development of IP to increase the enthusiasm of officials and ordinary workers toward entrepreneurship. It must understand the new circumstances, features, and tasks of developing IP rights, and continue to boost a uniquely Chinese system of IP. In particular, China needs to highlight the theme of the times, which is high-quality development; put in place even higher standards for the creation, use, protection, and management of IP rights as well as IP services; redouble its efforts in international cooperation on IP protection; and seek progress in IP protection amidst stability and high-quality development of IP from a higher starting point. **It is vital to understand the fundamental stance of IP protection.** The people's stance is the fundamental political stance of the CPC. President Xi has pointed out the need to uphold the principles of acting in our own best interests, prioritizing the people's interests, and providing fair and reasonable protection. China must not only stringently protect IP rights but also prevent the excessive expansion of individual and corporate rights, to both protect public interests and encourage innovation. In his speech, President Xi reflected this people-centered development concept and clearly expressed these values. The fundamental criterion for assessing the effectiveness of IP protection efforts should be whether people's legitimate IP rights and interests are protected, whether innovation is stimulated, and whether economic and social development is promoted. To adhere to the principle of acting in its own best interests, China must absorb and learn from others' achievements in IP system development around the world and then build its own system suited to its national conditions and development requirements. To provide fair and reasonable IP protection, China must balance the interests of rights holders with those of the general public. We must protect the legitimate rights and interests of rights holders but also promote the dissemination and utilization of knowledge, to ensure the benefits of innovation enrich the lives of ordinary people. **It is vital to comprehend the strategies involved in international IP cooperation and competition.** President Xi said in his speech that we must promote the concept of a global community with a shared future, adhere to the principles of openness, inclusiveness, and balance, participate meaningfully in global IP governance under the WIPO, promote improvements to rules and standards covering IP and related international trade and investment, and develop a more just and rational global IP governance system. China needs to deepen IP cooperation with countries along the Belt and Road and encourage knowledge sharing. President Xi also clarified the strategic necessity of international IP cooperation and competition and said that China needs to focus on its national reform and opening up while strengthening international IP cooperation. He particularly noted the need to engage with the WIPO, the Belt and Road countries, BRICS, as well as the US, Europe, Japan, and South Korea to promote improvements to international governance of IP rights. China also needs to balance domestic and overseas IP protection to both safeguard the legal IP rights of foreign-funded enterprises in China in accordance with the law and ensure foreign governments strengthen their protection of Chinese IP rights.

#### Threats to legitimacy cause the CCP to escalate tensions and lash out – uniquely threatens Taiwan.

Blumenthal and Urda 9/28 [09-28-20, Dan Blumenthal, Jakob Urda, The National Interest, “China’s aggressive tactics aim to bolster the Communist Party’s legitimacy”, https://www.aei.org/articles/chinas-aggressive-tactics-aim-to-bolster-the-communist-partys-legitimacy/, Jakob Urda is a Masters Student at Georgetown University and research specialist at a technology consultancy. He has previously worked at the Chicago Project on Security and Threats and studied in the Institute for the Study of War’s War Studies Program. Dan Blumenthal is the director of Asian Studies at the American Enterprise Institute and the author of the forthcoming book The China Nightmare: the Grand Ambitions of a Decaying State (AEI Press, November 17, 2020] //Lex AKu

Yet for the CCP, external aggression is a necessary tool to combat internal weakness. The CCP is obsessed with its fragilities, such as the threat of losing popular support and legitimacy and demands for more justice and freedoms. When Chinese people criticize their government, China must act more aggressively abroad. Beijing uses external aggression to fan Chinese nationalism and cast the CCP as the protector of the people and champion of a new era of Chinese glory. Coronavirus was a true moment of weakness for the CCP, as it exposed fissures in China’s overcentralized authoritarian political system to light. A now-infamous example of Chinese paranoia over potentially out-of-control domestic crises was the case of Dr. Li Wenliang. On February 7, Li, a doctor who warned of the coronavirus but was quickly censored by the Wuhan police, died from the virus himself. Li’s death quickly became the top trending topic on Chinese social media with hashtags such as “We want freedom of speech.” The CCP censored all mentions of Li or any coronavirus failings, fearing more organized protests. Simultaneously, the coronavirus battered China’s economic growth, which underpins the CCP’s claim to legitimacy, with an unprecedented 6.8 percent Q1 contraction. Far from the unified front which Beijing seeks to project, the coronavirus revealed the CCP’s dysfunction. For example, Dali, a midsize city, intercepted and distributed a shipment of surgical masks headed to the hard-hit municipality of Chongqing. Similarly, the City of Qingdao instructed customs officials to hold on to a shipment of masks and medical products headed to Shenyang. At the same time, Hong Kong dealt the CCP a major political embarrassment when it halted traffic coming in from the mainland. These reports demonstrate the government’s inability to enforce basic order among competing cities and provinces. In response to the tumult caused by the coronavirus crisis, the CCP mobilized popular support by reigniting conflicts with its neighbors. On April 2, during the peak of the coronavirus, a Chinese maritime security vessel sank a Vietnamese fishing boat near the Parcel islands. Just two weeks later on April 16, China escalated a month’s long standoff with Malaysia by deploying the coast guard to a disputed oil shelf. China also stepped up its military activities targeting Taiwan—who’s coronavirus response was strong and effective—with as many as three incursions in a single week in June. These episodes were widely condemned by the international community, but greeted with nationalist revelry at home. The need to project strength and unity domestically explains the timing of China’s border dispute with India. In May, violent brawls broke out between Chinese and Indian soldiers near Sikkim. On June 15, the Indian government reported that twenty Indian soldiers were killed by Chinese soldiers in the Galwan River Valley, a disputed border region controlled by India but claimed by China. The CCP has made full use of the crisis to rally nationalism. China’s foreign ministry issued statements blaming India for the clashes and state-propaganda popularized the slogan “China is not afraid.” The Global Times, a propaganda outlet, cast the clashes as an Indian invasion, saying “India has illegally constructed defense facilities across the border into Chinese territory in the Galwan Valley region.” Importantly, Chinese state-owned news outlets were also running news about India’s poor coronavirus response at the time, in contrast to its own “successes.” The recent border clashes mirror China’s 2017 standoff with India at Doklam, a strategic point near Bhutan. During the conflict, Foreign Minister Wang Yi made statements that cast the conflict as an Indian attack upon China, and state media circulated images from the 1962 Sino-Indian War, to remind the China populace that Beijing had defeated Delhi before. The India clashes coincided with another threat to CCP legitimacy: a fight to remove pro-democracy advocates from the Hong Kong Legislative Council. China ended up harshly cracking down on the supposedly autonomous city as well. Understanding China’s weaknesses is essential for policymakers attempting to make sense of its aggression. This dynamic is not only a Xi Jinping phenomenon: China’s modern history shows that domestic crises are often followed by belligerence. A study that pre-dated Xi’s rule, with a dataset of over three thousand interactions between the United States and China, found that the CCP was twice as likely to initiate disputes when the Shanghai Stock Exchange (SSE) experienced a substantial drop. The SSE is a barometer of elite sentiment in China because the government pledges to protect elite investments and uses SSE listings to reward party insiders. Insight into the CCP’s domestic political objectives helps determine the magnitude of the conflict and appropriate response. The editor of the Global Times wrote that a belligerent foreign policy was “necessary to satisfy the Chinese people.” Policymakers can use history to deduce what levels of aggression are “necessary” for the CCP’s goals. In India, it is unlikely that clashes will escalate into invasion because the current skirmishes satisfy the CCP’s purpose of bolstering legitimacy. However, Taiwan may be in particular danger from China’s reactionary aggression. This is because the ways in which conflict with Taiwan would bolster the CCP’s legitimacy align more closely with more violent coercion—reunification is a core element of the CCP’s platform and Taiwan’s clear success fighting the coronavirus is a major blow to Beijing’s legitimacy. Because Taiwan’s “threat” to the CCP stems from its mere existence, it is particularly vulnerable to reactionary aggression. Xi is a self-proclaimed follower of Mao. So, the 1958 Taiwan Strait Crisis is a powerful example; Mao needed to generate support for the great leap forward and deflect criticism from poor economic growth. To stir the nation, Mao seized islands controlled by Taiwan and threatened an invasion of the country until restrained by American nuclear brinksmanship. Over the last three months, China has faced another crisis in the form of historic floods. The Yangtze river basin has been inundated, affecting sixty-three million Chinese and inflicting over twenty-five billion dollars in direct damages. Many Chinese have raised concerns that the government’s massive infrastructure projects have worsened the crisis by draining wetlands and promoting development in flood-prone areas. Poor transparency has stirred more backlash as the CCP has been accused of hiding the extent of damages and censoring criticism. One political commentator in Beijing even predicted that the “Chinese public will question Beijing from this year’s continuous natural and man-made disasters, and even question China’s governance model and its effectiveness.” Instead of hoping that the crisis created by the current floods will give China’s neighbors breathing space, the United States should brace itself for the possibility of renewed aggression. The CCP must prove its worthiness to the tens of millions of displaced people across China, making it prone to lashing out. Taiwan may be an appealing target; it has been spared from flooding and has been visible in assisting neighboring countries like Japan with post-flood reconstruction. Already, China has begun live-fire sea-crossing drills near Taiwan.

#### Attempts at Taiwan cause US draw in, even during decline

Bernstein 20 Richard Bernstein,, 8-17-2020, "The Scary War Game Over Taiwan That the U.S. Loses Again and Again," No Publication, https://www.realclearinvestigations.com/articles/2020/08/17/the\_scary\_war\_game\_over\_taiwan\_that\_the\_us\_loses\_again\_and\_again\_124836.html mvp

But as the U.S. seeks a closer alliance with Taiwan – illustrated by the visit of Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar there last week, the highest-level official U.S. delegation to the island in 40 years – the possibility of war between the two superpowers may be more than theoretical: A bill now before both houses of Congress, the Taiwan Defense Act, would end the long-held American policy of “strategic ambiguity” – which aims to keep China guessing as to the U.S. response to any attempt to take Taiwan by force – and require the U.S. “to delay, degrade, and ultimately defeat” an attempt by China “to use military force to seize control of Taiwan.”

#### US-China war goes nuclear

Talmadge 18, Caitlin [**PoliSci PhD from MIT**, Government BA from Harvard, Prof of Security Studies at Georgetown’s Walsh School of Foreign Service.] “Beijing’s Nuclear Option.” Foreign Affairs. October 15, 2018. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option TG

As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States. Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic pressure on Taiwan and built military installations on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil.

A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but the prospect of a military confrontation—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think.

Members of China’s strategic com­munity tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict. Asked about the issue in 2015, Dennis Blair, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Indo-Pacific, estimated the likelihood of a U.S.-Chinese nuclear crisis as “somewhere between nil and zero.”

This assurance is misguided. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States’ signature approach to war has been simple: punch deep into enemy territory in order to rapidly knock out the opponent’s key military assets at minimal cost. But the Pentagon developed this formula in wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Serbia, none of which was a nuclear power.

China, by contrast, not only has nuclear weapons; it has also intermingled them with its conventional military forces, making it difficult to attack one without attacking the other. This means that a major U.S. military campaign targeting China’s conventional forces would likely also threaten its nuclear arsenal. Faced with such a threat, Chinese leaders could decide to use their nuclear weapons while they were still able to.

As U.S. and Chinese leaders navigate a relationship fraught with mutual suspicion, they must come to grips with the fact that a conventional war could skid into a nuclear confrontation. Although this risk is not high in absolute terms, its consequences for the region and the world would be devastating. As long as the United States and China continue to pursue their current grand strategies, the risk is likely to endure. This means that leaders on both sides should dispense with the illusion that they can easily fight a limited war. They should focus instead on managing or resolving the political, economic, and military tensions that might lead to a conflict in the first place.

## Case

### Fwk

### Overview

#### 1] C/A Korsgaard 83 – pleasure is a conditional value and collapses

**2] Ability to set and pursue ends is a pre-requisite – util necessitates states setting and pursing the end of maximizing pleasure which collapses to our framework.**

#### 3] Induction fails-induction relies on another induction since we are literally unable to predict the future which is circular. Only deduction solves which mandates intentionality.

#### 4] Pain and pleasure aren’t a reliable starting point for ethics – everyone has a constantly changing and different account of what causes them pain or pleasure, i.e a masochist or a smoker which makes aggregating impossible since empirical circumstances are fluctuating.

5] Need an explanation of pain or pleasure

LBL

#### A2 Degrees of wrongness

#### 1] No reason weighing is necessary – if my theory provides a side constraint to actions then it proves my framework is prior and can guide action.

2] Util can’t explain – it would say a baby accidentally stepping on a gun and shooting someone is equally as bad as a grown man intentionally shooting someone.

**AT Phenomenal Inrospection**

1] fallacy of origin – just because pleasure is good doesn’t mean that it’s the starting point. The point of phil debate is too debate about these things.

2] Doesn’t prove we ought to value other people’s happiness just because I value my own.

3] Repugnant – allows white supremacists to introspect that racism is good based off their experience.

#### A2 Pummer – 1] Presumes we care about conseqeucnes and future generations – our fwk says morality is defined by intent rather than trying to preserve well-being of future generations, 2] Just because extinction precludes moral theorizing, doesnt meant that extinction is necessarily a good or a bad thing which proves its impact justified. We could be alive and theorize that life is a bad thing, 3] They need to win an explanation of pain and pleasure .

### AT: Epistemic Modesty

#### 1] WE win under EM – rights violation has infinite magnitude under kant but extinction doesn’t because eventually sun will blow up and pain causes will be very high but not infinite.

#### 2] No way to weigh between competing claims to epistemic modesty, IE if I concede a framework indight how do we weigh what percent kant is true vs what percent util is true.

#### 3] Kills Phil education since it means big impacts like extinction will always be prioritized and freedom violations are never debated about, outweighs since phil is unique to LD.

### Adv

#### No disease extinction

Owen Cotton-Barratt 17, et al, PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, 2/3/2017, Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are very unlikely to cause human extinction. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, less than 4% (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is very numerous, globally dispersed, and capable of a rational response to problems, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic. One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

### 1NC – Infrastructure Deficit

#### LICs statistically cannot mass produce vaccines.

Newey et al 21 [Sarah Newey*;* Anne Gulland*;* Jennifer Rigby, (GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY CORRESPONDENTS at the telegraph) *and* Samaan Lateef (Reporting IN INDIA) 6/1/21, Vaccinating the world: the obstacles hindering global rollout – and how to overcome them, Telegraph, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/vaccinating-the-world/>] Justin

Supply is one thing but actually getting shots into arms is a huge undertaking for any country. According to a review of low and middle income countries’ readiness to implement vaccine campaigns conducted by the World Bank, 95 per cent have developed national plans and 82 per cent have worked out which groups should be vaccinated first. However, crucial gaps remain. Only 59 per cent have plans to train vaccinators and less than half (48 per cent) have implemented communications strategies to encourage people to take up vaccines. While low and middle income countries are used to delivering childhood vaccines, so have cold chain systems in place, a mass vaccine campaign for adults is a very different beast, says Mamta Murthi, vice president for human development at the World Bank. “This is a very different population – adults may be at work, at home, they may be unwilling to travel or not be able to come to vaccine centres,” she says.

### 1NC – Raw Material Turn

#### List of supply shortages – there is no way the aff solves, but they decrease available vaccines.

[Laurie Garrett 21, (Columnist at Foreign Policy and former senior fellow for global health at the Council on Foreign Relations). 5/7/21, Stopping Drug Patents Has Stopped Pandemics Before, Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/05/07/stopping-drug-patents-pandemics-coronavirus-hiv-aids/>] Justin

The vaccines aren’t easy to make. Manufacturing errors in a Maryland Emergent BioSolutions factory caused an 86 percent plummet in Johnson & Johnson vaccine supplies in early April. Complex steps in the process of isolating, purifying, preserving, storing, and delivering COVID-19 immunizations are each error-prone and require long lists of specialized chemicals and machinery.

The world is in the grips now of pipette tips shortages—used to suck out chemicals and viral samples from test tubes in key steps of vaccine making. Syringes are in short supply, prompting vaccinators to toss vaccine supplies for lack of means to administer them. The sterile containers used to hold vaccines are running out. From the earliest days of the 2020 pandemic, the sorts of protective gear and machinery vaccine researchers and makers require have been in short supply, exacerbated by trade tensions between the United States and China. Swabs used for COVID-19 testing and all aspects of equipment cleaning in sterile conditions are held up in a grotesque family dispute in Maine. There aren’t enough centrifuge tubes made worldwide to spin down cell samples. Moderna and Pfizer are constantly scrambling to find the ingredients used to make the microscopic fatty balls, called liposomes, that house the mRNA molecules and carry them safely into the bloodstream. Even the nucleic acids used to construct mRNA and a long list of special enzymes used to purify those samples are in horribly short supply, largely because their use overlaps with the manufacture of COVID-19 tests. Because such delicate chemicals and proteins must be handled at deep-freeze temperatures and transported swiftly for immediate use, the entire supply chain is vulnerable to the simplest of catastrophes: weather at an airport, a car crash that blocks truck traffic, power outages, or competition for cargo space.

Although waiving TRIPS requirements on COVID-19 vaccines is a spectacular, historic gesture, would-be generic makers worldwide will soon discover their efforts are stymied not by patents but for want of Avanti Polar Lipids’ liposome ingredients, Flexsafe RM special bags to hold liquid vaccines in bulk, phosphate-buffered saline solution, Distearoylphosphatidylcholine for liposome-making, 5’ cap for mRNA made by TriLink BioTechnologies, RNA polymerases—the list goes on, and on, and on. As the number of would-be vaccine makers grows, so will demand for thousands of such items, putting pressure on companies that are, in many cases, mom-and-pop operations. Worse, pressure on supplies critical for COVID-19 vaccine making is already resulting in a production loss of vital medicines for other diseases.

#### Raw materials take years to scaleup.

Newey et al 21 [Sarah Newey*;* Anne Gulland*;* Jennifer Rigby, (GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY CORRESPONDENTS at the telegraph) *and* Samaan Lateef (Reporting IN INDIA) 6/1/21, Vaccinating the world: the obstacles hindering global rollout – and how to overcome them, Telegraph, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/vaccinating-the-world/>] Justin

But perhaps the strongest argument against waivers is this: in October Moderna, one of the producers of new mRNA vaccines, actually offered an IP waiver. No-one has yet taken it up. Instead, “the biggest obstacle is raw materials,” says Dr Richard Torbett, chief executive of the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry. “All of the companies are saying we could produce more if we only had more glass vials, or filters, or bio bags.” Again, this is a daunting challenge – the Pfizer vaccine, for example, has 260 ingredients that come from 60 companies in 19 different countries. Many of these products are highly specialised and it will take many months, perhaps years, to ramp production of them up. “We’re very likely to see continued shortages that set back some of the vaccine producers for several months,” says Rasmus Bech Hansen, chief executive of Airfinity, adding that it is becoming harder for manufacturers with new jabs to secure the needed supplies – CureVac is already facing this problem, for example. The third challenge is perhaps harder to tackle. Vaccines are biological products and the manufacturing process does not always go smoothly. According to Airfinity, 1.73bn doses have been distributed worldwide, far short of the 4.5bn initially projected by big pharma. An overambitious manufacturing target is largely to blame for the gap. [AstraZeneca’s row with Europe](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2021/05/09/eu-says-wont-renew-astrazeneca-contract-pivots-towards-pfizers/), for instance, was triggered by a lower yield at factories than hoped. Meanwhile Russia has produced only around 42m doses – compared to 400m from AstraZeneca and Pfizer – amid difficulties producing the second dose of Sputnik V, which uses different adenoviruses in the first and second shot.