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## 1

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must present a delineated enforcement mechanism for the Plan. To clarify they must state in in their speech - There is no normal means since terms are negotiated contextually among member states.

WTO "Whose WTO is it anyway?" <https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org1_e.htm> //Elmer

**When WTO rules impose disciplines** on countries’ policies, **that is the outcome of negotiations among WTO members.** The rules are **enforced** **by** the **members themselves** **under agreed procedures that they negotiated**, **including the possibility of trade sanctions**. But those sanctions are imposed by member countries, and authorized by the membership as a whole. This is quite different from other agencies whose bureaucracies can, for example, influence a country’s policy by threatening to withhold credit.

#### Violation: “through the states” doesn’t cut it

#### Standards:

#### 1. Shiftiness- They can redefine the 1AC’s enforcement mechanism in the 1AR which allows them to recontextualize their enforcement mechanism to wriggle out of DA’s since all DA links are predicated on type of enforcement i.e. sanctions bad das, domestic politics das off of backlash, information research sharing da if they put monetary punishments, or trade das.

#### 2. Real World - Policy makers will always specify how the mandates of the plan should be endorsed. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, states can circumvent the Aff’s policy since there is no delineated way to enforce the affirmative which means there’s no way to actualize any of their solvency arguments.

#### ESpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary- it’s an active part of the WTO is central to any advocacy about international IP law since the only uniqueness of a reduction of IP protections is how effective its enforcement is.

#### Paradigm:

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

#### Fairness – Debate is a competitive activity governed by rules. You can’t evaluate who did better debating if the round is structurally skewed, so fairness is a gateway to substantive debate.

#### DTD – Time spent on theory cant be compensated for, the 1nc was already skewed, and its key to deterring abuse.

#### Prefer Competing interps -

#### 1. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

#### 2. it Causes a race to the bottom where debaters push the limit as to how reasonably abusive, they can be.

#### No RVI’s -

#### 1. Chills some debaters from reading theory against abusive postions.

#### 2. incentivizes theory baiting where you can just bait theory to win.

## 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not justify 1ar theory is dtd, no rvi, competing interps, no 2n theory paradigm issues , and it’s the highest layer

#### Violation: its all in the underview

#### Standard:

#### 1. Infinite Abuse - their norm justifies the affirmative auto winning every round since they can read infinite risk free 1AR shells with DTD and Competing interp. And since I don’t have 2n paradigm issues I can’t contest it. Even if I uplayer I can’t win since your shell is the highest layer. Answering the argument doesn’t solve because you can read infinite of these paradigm issues in the 1ac making it impossible. Norming is an independent voter since justifying the value of debate necessarily justifies the norms of the activity being good in order for debate to be valuable.

## 3

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends a consequentialist framework, they must explicitly delineate which theory of the good they defend in the form of a text in the 1ac.

#### Each nuance of the ethic entails different obligations and would exclude different offense – there are 7 different versions.

**Mastin,** [Luke Mastin, Consequentialism, The basics of philosophy <http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_consequentialism.html>]

Some **consequentialist theories include**: Utilitarianism, which holds that an action is right if it leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people ("happiness" here is defined as the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain). **Hedonism**, **which** is the philosophy **[holds] that pleasure** **is** the **most important** pursuit of mankind, **and** that **individuals** **should** strive to **maximise** **their own total** **pleasure** (net of any pain or suffering). **Epicureanism** is a more moderate approach (which still seeks to maximize happiness, but which **defines happiness** more **as a** **state of tranquillity** than pleasure). **Egoism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self.** Thus, Egoism may license actions which are good for an individual even if detrimental to the general welfare. **Asceticism**, in some ways, **the opposite of Egoism in that it describes a life characterized by abstinence from egoistic pleasures** especially **to achieve a spiritual goal. Altruism**, which **prescribes that an individual take actions that have the best consequences for everyone except for himself**, according to Auguste Comte's dictum, "Live for others". Thus, individuals have a moral obligation to help, serve or benefit others, if necessary at the sacrifice of self-interest. **Rule Consequentialism**, which is a theory (sometimes seen as an attempt to reconcile Consequentialism and Deontology), **[holds] that moral behaviour involves following certain rules**, but that those rules should be **chosen** based **on** the **consequences that** the selection of **those rules have**. Some theorists holds that a certain set of minimal rules are necessary to ensure appropriate actions, while some hold that the rules are not absolute and may be violated if strict adherence to the rule would lead to much more undesirable consequences. **Negative Consequentialism**, which **focuses on minimizing bad consequences rather than promoting good consequences**. This may actually require active intervention (to prevent harm from being done), or may only require passive avoidance of bad outcomes.

#### Violation: They don’t and maximizing expected well-being doesn’t cut it.

**Crisp**, Roger, "Well-Being", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Fall **2017** Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/well-being/>.

Well-being is most commonly used in philosophy to describe what is non-instrumentally or ultimately good *for* a person. **The question of what well-being consists in is of independent interest**, but it is of great importance in moral philosophy, especially **in the case of utilitarianism**, according to which the only moral requirement is that well-being be maximized. Significant challenges to the very notion have been mounted, in particular by G.E. Moore and T.M. Scanlon. **It has become standard to distinguish theories of well-being as either hedonist theories, desire theories, or objective list theories**. According to the view known as welfarism, well-being is the only value. Also important in ethics is the question of how a person’s moral character and actions relate to their well-being.

#### Standards:

#### 1. Shiftiness – They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of consequentialism as coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1ar which gives them access to multiple contingent standards.

#### 2. Strat – I lose 6 minutes of time during the AC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy, I can go for during the 1N absent which proves CX doesn’t check since it would occur after the skew.

#### 3. Resolvability – Makes the round irresolvable since we can’t weigh different mechanisms for the good – Benatar would probably link harder under a hedonistic conception of util – weighing ground is key since it ensures we can compare arguments that clash to access the ballot.

## 4

#### CP Text: The member nations of the World Trade Organization except for the People’s Republic of China ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent protection.

#### China is geared up to become biotech lead.

CAS 21 [(CAS, a division of the American Chemical Society, partners with R&D organizations globally to provide actionable scientific insights that help them plan, innovate, protect their innovations, and predict how new markets and opportunities will evolve. Leverage our unparalleled content, specialized technology, and unmatched human expertise to customize solutions that will give your organization an information advantage.), “3 reasons biotech is booming in China: How can you capitalize on the growth?”, <https://www.cas.org/resources/blog/3-reasons-biotech-booming-china-how-can-you-capitalize-growth>, July 20, 2021] TDI

3 reasons biotech is booming in China: How can you capitalize on the growth? This year marks the 40th anniversary of China's Reform and Opening Up policy, which was established in 1978. China’s embrace of economic reform and free-market principles has propelled unprecedented business and industry growth since that time, firmly securing its position as the world's second largest economy. In light of the rise of China's economy, a number of global biotech companies—such as Denmark's Novo Nordisk—began to build an early presence there. Building on this foundation, within the past few years biotech has started to grow at an explosive rate in China. In fact, China's biotech industry is anticipated to exceed four percent of GDP by 2020. Why is biotech betting big on China? Here, we explore three factors driving the country's recent biotech boom and what it means for those looking to capitalize on this growth National innovation strategy attracting top talent Ten years ago, a biotech specialist from China may have needed to look for international career opportunities. But today, thriving government programs and a surge of entrepreneurial investments have created more incentive than ever for top talent to establish careers in China. The Chinese government has made it a priority to transform the country from a manufacturing to an innovation-driven economy by developing five-year national strategic plans that set economic and growth goals. The most recent plan, which put special focus on the biotech industry, outlines the development of 10 to 20 biomedicine life-science parks with an output surpassing $1.5 billion by 2020. This is in addition to the 100 life-science parks already established throughout the country, as well as $100 billion of government investments dedicated to innovation. The government's Thousand Talents Plan—which encourages Chinese scientists, academics and entrepreneurs living abroad to return to China—has recruited 7,000 experts since 2008, with 1,400 of them recruited specifically by the life sciences committee for biotech. The government has also heavily invested to enhance the intellectual property environment in China. The State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO), China's patent office, has received additional resources to address the growing volume of patent applications and has implemented an expedited examination process. In 2007, SIPO had 2,672 examiners dedicated to examining patents; by 2017, that number had grown to more than 11,500 (SIPO Annual Reports, 2007 and 2017). SIPO also offers attractive benefits to high-demand patent applications, such as covering filing fees and providing tax incentives and monetary rewards. Beyond the government, Chinese venture capital and private equity funds raised $45 billion for life sciences in two and a half years, which contributed to the development of China's flourishing biotech start-up culture. As a result of all of these factors driving innovation, patent applications have soared—more than 50,000 biotech patents were submitted in 2017, up from less than 20,000 in 2010. Some fields leading this growth are natural products, biologics and bioinformatics. Chinese biotech patent applications Growth in Chinese biotech patent application volume since 2000 Demand for new treatments creating an attractive market According to the United Nations, China's population is ageing more rapidly than that of any other country. This fact, along with changing lifestyles and environmental concerns, is driving increasing rates of critical and chronic illness. For example, 36 percent of the world's lung cancer diagnoses come from China, yet the five-year lung cancer survival rate is currently 17 percent lower than the global average. This market landscape creates surging demand for pioneering medical treatments, and investors are turning to Chinese scientists to develop solutions that could not only be sold in China, but enhance treatment worldwide. Major pharmaceutical companies in the west are taking note as well and considering ways to bolster their presence in China as domestic investors gain market share, with many global leaders opening research centers in China and others coordinating research cooperation pacts with Chinese institutions. Globalized approach to regulations easing market entry In March 2018, the China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) announced it will merge with other administrative bodies to form a national market supervision administration. As part of the restructuring, a new entity is being created that will focus primarily on medical technologies. This is expected to bring increased efficiency and consistency to regulation of pharmaceuticals and medical devices in China. Further, in April 2018, the government launched initiatives to support generic drug research and development as a means to foster innovation and provide more accessible treatment options to Chinese patients. They include providing research grants, as well as expediting the review and approval process of generic drugs based on name-brand drugs with compulsory licenses. These efforts are the latest in a series of reforms aimed at streamlining China's regulatory process to align with international standards. Last August, for example, the CFDA announced it had joined ICH, a global federation of medicines regulators that seeks to harmonize health technology regulations. It also announced it would allow data from clinical trials conducted outside of China to be admitted as part of regulatory filings, a move that fast-tracks new treatments from the lab to the clinic. Overall, these efforts to streamline China's regulatory processes and align them more closely with those outside of China eases entry into the Chinese market for domestic as well as foreign investors and also make it easier for Chinese firms to market their innovations internationally. These developments, along with the impressive growth rate, clearly demonstrate that China is quickly establishing itself as the eastern hub for biotechnology innovation. Organizations looking for growth opportunities in biotech should certainly have China on their radar. However, a successful strategy for growth within any industry sector in China requires a deep understanding of the market and intellectual property landscape, as well as governmental and cultural factors.

#### **US biotech stocks down now.**

Gatlin 21 [(Allison, Author at Investor's Business Daily “Biotech Stocks Hit A Snag — Why Experts Say The Heyday Isn't Over“, Investor's Business Daily, ), 4-9-2021, https://www.investors.com/news/technology/biotech-stocks-why-they-have-skidded-why-experts-are-not-worried/)] TDI

Regulatory and drug-pricing worries have knocked biotech stocks off their Covid pedestal. After seeing massive gains in 2020 amid the Covid-19 vaccine heyday and hitting a high point in early February, biotech stocks have collectively pulled back 21%. Investors are uneasy after the Federal Trade Commission formed a working group to more deeply scrutinize pharmaceutical mergers. Meanwhile, the Food and Drug Administration has delayed a number of drug approvals, and Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., introduced sweeping drug-pricing legislation. All of this comes amid a backdrop of rising interest rates.

#### CP solves innovation in every other country BUT reversing Chinese lead is key. They can’t get out of this otherwise the aff has zero solvency.

#### Chinese tech leadership leads to nuclear war.

Kroenig 18 (Matthew, Deputy Director for Strategy, Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service, Georgetown University) “Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?” *BAS*, Nov 12, 2018, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war>

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation. This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

## 5

#### Despite growing rivalry, US-China economic interdependence strong now. Exchange of tech know-how, collaboration science research, and massive US-China STEM pipeline improving relations – but it can easily collapse.

Hass 21[Ryan Hass (Senior Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center for East Asia Policy Studies, John L. Thornton China Center The Michael H. Armacost Chair Chen-Fu and Cecilia Yen Koo Chair in Taiwan Studies Nonresident Fellow, Paul Tsai China Center, Yale Law School), 8-12-2021, "The “new normal” in US-China relations: Hardening competition and deep interdependence," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2021/08/12/the-new-normal-in-us-china-relations-hardening-competition-and-deep-interdependence/> // belle]

The intensification of U.S.-China competition has captured significant attention in recent years. American attitudes toward China have become more negative during this period, as anger has built over disruptions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, Beijing’s trampling of Hong Kong’s autonomy, human rights violations in Xinjiang, and job losses to China. Amidst this focus on great power competition, two broader trends in the U.S.-China relationship have commanded relatively less attention. The first has been the widening gap in America’s and China’s overall national power relative to every other country in the world. The second has been the continuing thick interdependence between the United States and China, even amidst their growing rivalry. Even on economic issues, where rhetoric and actions around decoupling command the most attention, trade and investment data continue to point stubbornly in the direction of deep interdependence. These trends will impact how competition is conducted between the U.S. and China in the coming years. SEPARATING FROM THE PACK As America’s unipolarity in the international system has waned, there has been renewed focus on the role of major powers in the international system, including the European Union, Russia, India, and Japan. Each of these powers has a major population and substantial economic weight or military heft, but as my Brookings colleague Bruce Jones has observed, none have all. Only the United States and China possess all these attributes. The U.S. and China are likely to continue amassing disproportionate weight in the international system going forward. Their growing role in the global economy is fueled largely by both countries’ technology sectors. These two countries have unique traits. These include world-class research expertise, deep capital pools, data abundance, and highly competitive innovation ecosystems. Both are benefitting disproportionately from a clustering effect around technology hubs. For example, of the roughly 4,500 artificial intelligence-involved companies in the world, about half operate in the U.S. and one-third operate in China. According to a widely cited study by PricewaterhouseCoopers, the U.S. and China are set to capture 70% of the $15.7 trillion windfall that AI is expected to add to the global economy by 2030. The United States and China have been reinvesting their economic gains to varying degrees into research and development for new and emerging technologies that will continue to propel them forward. While it is not foregone that the U.S. and China will remain at the frontier of innovation indefinitely, it also is not clear which other countries might displace them or on what timeline. Overall, China’s economy likely will cool in the coming years relative to its blistering pace of growth in recent decades, but it is not likely to collapse. DEEP INTERDEPENDENCE At the same time, bilateral competition between the United States and China also is intensifying. Even so, rising bilateral friction has not – at least not yet – undone the deep interdependencies that have built up between the two powers over decades. In the economic realm, trade and investment ties remain significant, even as both countries continue to take steps to limit vulnerabilities from the other. For example, Chinese regulators have been asserting greater control over when and where Chinese companies raise capital; Beijing’s recent probe of ride-hailing app Didi Chuxing provides but the latest example. China’s top leaders have been emphasizing the need for greater technology “self-sufficiency” and have been pouring billions of dollars of state capital into this drive. Meanwhile, U.S. officials have been seeking to limit American investments from going to Chinese companies linked to the military or surveillance sectors. The Security and Exchange Commission’s scrutiny of initial public offerings for Chinese companies and its focus on ensuring Chinese companies meet American accounting standards could result in some currently listed Chinese companies being removed from U.S. exchanges. Both countries have sought to disentangle supply chains around sensitive technologies with national security, and in the American case, human rights dimensions. U.S. officials have sought to raise awareness of the risks for American firms of doing business in Hong Kong and Xinjiang. Even so, U.S.-China trade and investment ties remain robust. In 2020, China was America’s largest goods trading partner, third largest export market, and largest source of imports. Exports to China supported an estimated 1.2 million jobs in the United States in 2019. Most U.S. companies operating in China report being committed to the China market for the long term. U.S. investment firms have been increasing their positions in China, following a global trend. BlackRock, J.P. Morgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley have all increased their exposure in China, matching similar efforts by UBS, Nomura Holdings, Credit Suisse, and AXA. The Rhodium Group estimates that U.S. investors held $1.1 trillion in equities issued by Chinese companies, and that there was as much as $3.3 trillion in U.S.-China two-way equity and bond holdings at the end of 2020. One leg of the U.S.-China economic relationship that has atrophied in recent years has been China’s flow of investment into the United States. This has largely been a product of tightened capital controls in China, growing Chinese government scrutiny of its companies’ offshore investments, and enhanced U.S. screening of Chinese investments for national security concerns. Another area of U.S.-China interdependence has been knowledge production. As U.S.-China technology expert Matt Sheehan has observed, “With the rise of Chinese talent and capital, the exchange of technological know-how between the United States and China now takes place among private businesses and between individuals.” Leading technology companies in both countries have been building research centers in the other. Alibaba, Baidu, and Tencent have all opened research centers in the United States, just as Apple, Microsoft, Tesla, and other major American technology companies rely upon engineering talent in China. In science collaboration, The Nature Index ranks the joint research between the two countries as the world’s most academically fertile. U.S.-China scientific collaboration grew by more than 10% each year on average between 2015 and 2019. Even following the global spread of COVID-19, American and Chinese experts collaborated more during the past year than over the previous five years combined. This has led to over 100 co-authored articles in leading scientific journals and frequent joint appearances in science-focused workshops and webinars. China also is the largest source of international students in the United States. In the 2019-20 year, there were over 370,000 Chinese students in the U.S., representing 34% of international students in colleges and universities. Up until now, many of the top Chinese students have stayed in the United States following graduation and contributed to America’s scientific, technological, and economic development. It remains to be seen whether this trend will continue.

#### Plan hurts US-China relations – means China goes back on it’s promise to regulate IP violations and draws in U.S. crackdown.

Shape 21 [Steven M. Shape; registered patent attorney and electrical engineer who has represented preeminent technology companies in complex, high-stakes Intellectual Property litigation; 2-19-2021, "IP Law Looms Large Over U.S.-China Relations," No Publication, [https://www.mondaq.com/trademark/1038030/ip-law-looms-large-over-us-china-relations //](https://www.mondaq.com/trademark/1038030/ip-law-looms-large-over-us-china-relations%20//) belle]

The U.S. and China were indisputably the two largest parties in the global trade war that consumed much of the last several years. Particularly between early 2018 and late 2019, it seemed as if one could hardly go a week, if that, without hearing something about tariffs, exports, imports, steel, soybeans, then-President Donald Trump, President Xi Jinping and the like. Accusations regarding violations of Intellectual Property law were among the biggest flashpoints, and ultimately, China announced new regulations concerning IP protection in November 2019 as a conciliatory move. Nearly 14 months later, newly inaugurated President Joe Biden has yet to fully clarify his administration's stance toward China. However, it is inevitable that IP rights and their preservation will factor into negotiations between the two economic giants. A look back at the proposed reforms (and their effects) Reports from CNN at the time claimed that China's prospective IP law reforms focused on making the penalties for IP infringement more strict. It would also put the government's increasingly modernized tech infrastructure to use in the discovery and prosecution of such crimes. Beyond that, the proposal carried few specifics. Although it is unclear whether Beijing's gambit worked as the deciding factor for Washington, it certainly did not fail. The two nations agreed in principle on "Phase One" of a new trade agreement December 12, 2019, per The Washington Post, and formalized the deal about a month later. The U.S. pledged not to impose further tariffs and roll back existing import taxes in return for China's IP reforms and agreement to buy American goods. In the 14 months that followed, so much changed. COVID-19's devastating impact on human life and the global economy made it difficult to gauge the positive effects of the tariff relief or IP reform. A report by the South China Morning Post found that China did not meet its import goal for 2020, with some analysts concluding the Phase One target was unrealistic. On the IP front, a Hong Kong news provider noted that Beijing had drafted some specific guidance to protect pharmaceutical patents, trade secrets and copyrights, but it was unclear how well they were being implemented. Additionally, a January 2021 report by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) found that Chinese policies which offered subsidies for certain trademark and patent applications helped motivate a glut of fraudulent and bad-faith filings in the last few years. The bigger picture of China's IP law A casual observer or someone just learning of this issue might assume that until recently, China had little or no IP laws on the books. Of course, that is not true. However, there are many factors at play complicating the matter of Chinese IP protection policies. As noted in Harvard Business Review, China is quite strict in certain aspects of IP protection: Beijing allows (and encourages) all businesses to impose non-compete agreements to help protect trade secrets and other IP assets. In addition, according to the National Law Review, two new measures were passed in 2020 specifically to combat bad-faith trademark applications, in addition to the other new guidelines being imposed by the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) in accordance with the Phase One agreement. All that said, it would be inaccurate to describe Chinese IP law as thoroughly protective for either domestic or foreign innovators. Along with the aforementioned trademark and patent subsidies, considerable controversy stems from "forced technology transfer" policies. According to the University of Oxford's Business Law Blog, foreign companies looking to do business in China must turn over their technology to local firms or be denied the right to operate within China. This effectively means turning over the blueprints (literal or otherwise) to such technology - which is all but equivalent to surrendering the IP. It creates considerable opportunities for infringement, fraud and corruption. Also, in disputes with foreign firms, some local IP courts still markedly favor domestic organizations. Chinese government representatives often resent such accusations of bias or corruption. In their view, the deals represent friendly agreements between businesses, and courts' decisions are not politically motivated. While Oxford noted that FTT guidelines are not as pervasive now as they were a few years ago, they have yet to disappear altogether. The Biden approach: Not dissimilar, but multilateral If the new U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Janet Yellen, is to be believed, the Biden administration will not tolerate any signs of lapses in China's IP protections. "We need to take on China's abusive, unfair and illegal practices," Yellen said to the Senate Finance Committee at her confirmation hearings. As reported by Bloomberg, she added, "[China has] been stealing intellectual property and engaging practices that give it an unfair technological advantage, including forced technology transfers. And these . are practices that we're prepared to use the full array of tools to address." Biden had expressed similar sentiments during a December interview with The New York Times. However, he also said that they would work with ally nations to "develop a coherent strategy" for addressing cases of IP infringement and other issues - a stance Yellen echoed before the Senate - instead of taking China on in a unilateral and bellicose manner. This more nuanced approach could yield greater cooperation from Beijing and help repair U.S.-China trade relations, but we will likely not know one way or the other for some time. As we saw with the trade war, conflicts between the U.S. and China can quickly escalate and have ripple effects throughout the world. It would thus be wise for all organizations doing business in China to keep themselves abreast of the country's evolving IP regulations and work with a reliable IP services provider to help establish strong protection for their intangible assets.

#### AI destabilizing but dialogues key to peaceful AI – anything else risks escalation to nuclear war.

Haotian 21 [Qi Haotian (assistant professor in the School of International Studies at Peking University, where he teaches courses on international security, military science, international public policy, and game theory. He is also secretary general of the Institute for Global Cooperation and Understanding at Peking University. His research interests include technological transitions and world politics, international security and conflict management, and methodology and philosophy of social science) April 2021, " US AND CHINESE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES," United States Institute of Peace, <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/pw_172-enhancing_us-china_strategic_stability_in_an_era_of_strategic_competition_us_and_chinese_perspectives.pdf> // belle]

The rapid decision-making features of AI can be yet another destabilizing factor. AI’s advantage in speed can be detrimental if it unnecessarily accelerates the escalation of conflicts from crisis to war, or even from conventional war to nuclear confrontation. Furthermore, improvements in ISR capabilities can narrow the window for diplomatic mediation and reduce the time available for crisis management. AI, however, can also have a stabilizing effect through the enhancement of crisis and battlefield simulations. AI-enabled war games now involve more complex multirole interactions with variables and parameters that can be adjusted to explore how dynamic interactions of various factors such as weapons and allies can influence the development of a complex strategic environment. This employment of evolutionary learning can help stabilize strategic relations and mutual deterrence by demonstrating to decision-makers the consequences of certain behaviors and actions. CONCRETE STEPS TO TAKE IN THE NEAR TERM As the United States and China pursue the incorporation of AI into their military forces, they have a shared interest in avoiding both intended and unintended escalations caused by AI-enabled systems. The two countries should establish systematic confidence-building measures and develop a shared understanding of what a future AI-enabled military transformation might entail as well as its strategic impacts. While it may be difficult for the United States and China to agree on certain questions—such as how to tailor defense tools for AI systems that span multiple military domains—the two sides can still work together to find common ground and jointly explore applications for AI to strengthen strategic stability. Although dialogue exists between industry experts, academics, and think tanks in both countries, more direct exchanges among diplomats, military leaders, AI researchers, and multidisciplinary scholars is crucial for fostering mutual understanding and opening avenues for cooperation. Such dialogue can occur in parallel with existing multilateral efforts, such as the Group of Governmental Experts on lethal autonomous weapon systems, held through the United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. The two countries should hold dialogues examining how existing international law can constrain the use of AI for military purposes and the implications of private sector development of dual-use technology. They should also address the risks that the weaponization of technology poses to nuclear stability and develop practical measures for technological management. Moreover, the two sides should establish a systematic dialogue mechanism to exchange views on emerging concerns, such as fail-safe mechanisms and how to reduce the risk of crises and conflict escalation due to AI-driven cyberattacks, especially on strategic assets. In addition to the above near-term measures, there are also some long-term steps that, although not feasible at present, would be beneficial and should be taken when circumstances allow. For example, China and the United States should increase transparency and enhance mutual understanding by sharing their respective AI strategies, doctrines, and other related documents. The two should also set limitations on the deployment of AI weapon systems in sensitive areas and exercise restraint in employing AI in strategic command and control systems, particularly with respect to nuclear weapons. Furthermore, they should formulate bilateral or multilateral agreements that prohibit attacks on nuclear C4ISR systems. Finally, they should work to prevent the use of autonomous weapons against other countries’ strategic assets, including missile submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and second-strike countermeasure systems.

#### Extinction – nuke war fallout creates Ice Age and mass starvation.

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.

## 6

#### CP Text: States should individually domestically establish single-payer national health insurance.

#### Solves evergreening and drug prices while avoiding our innovation turns.

Narayanan 19 Srivats Narayanan 8-15-2019 "Medicare for All and Evergreening" <https://medium.com/@srivats.narayanan/medicare-for-all-and-evergreening-cb84c930e0ea> (UMKC School of Medicine)//Elmer

Drug companies rake in massive profits. The pharmaceutical industry has some of the largest profit margins among American industries. Unfortunately, pharmaceutical giants don’t always have patients’ best interests in mind — they make a big portion of their money by exploiting the patent process instead of making breakthrough drugs that would meaningfully improve patients’ lives. Pharmaceutical corporations aren’t as innovative as one might expect. Although the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has been consistently approving new (and expensive) drugs every year, most of these drugs aren’t impacting healthcare much. Many studies have revealed that a whopping 85–90% of new drugs since the mid-1990s “provide few or no clinical advantages.” This is because pharmaceutical firms are spending their time and money on a technique known as “evergreening.” Evergreening is when drug companies produce redundant drugs that are nothing but minor modifications of old drugs. By making slight alterations to their medicines, biotech companies continue to hold patents for drugs with minimal spending on research and development (R&D). Pharmaceutical companies then use those patents to prevent competitors from selling generic versions of their drugs. Without any competition, these corporations get away with ridiculously high drug pricing and can thus make big profits on their drugs. The companies simultaneously justify their absurd drug prices by pointing to the inflated R&D costs of producing new drugs. This excuse has been used time and again by the profit-hungry pharmaceutical industry, and it’s coming at the expense of patients who struggle to afford their medicines. A well-known example of evergreening pertains to the anticonvulsant medication gabapentin, which was first sold by Pfizer under the brand name Neurontin. When the drug became available as a generic medication over a decade ago, Pfizer created a very similar medicine, pregabalin (Lyrica), that didn’t have any significant benefits over the original drug. As a result, Pfizer has kept a control over the market for anticonvulsant drugs with negligible innovation. The drug industry’s reliance on evergreening is undoubtedly stifling innovation. This is where **Medicare for All**, **which would impose the government as the only health insurer**, **would be useful**. **In our current system**, **there are many insurers** **and they each have** **little market power** **and** consequently **little negotiating power** **to reduce** treatment **prices**. **Since the government would have** **consolidated control over healthcare financing** under Medicare for All, **its stronger bargaining power would force drug companies to charge lower prices for their products**. In addition, prescription drugs would be paid for by the government and not by patients under Medicare for All. **Medicare for All would prevent evergreening**. **National healthcare financing** **would align** **how much the government pays a drug company with how much patients benefit** from the company’s drugs. **If a new drug had more clinical benefits** than an older version, **the government would pay more** for it. If a new drug produced the same results as an older version, the government wouldn’t pay more for the new drug. So, Medicare for All would **encourage** pharmaceutical **companies to pursue truly innovative drugs because such drugs would be more profitable**. The policy would incentivize companies to invest in R&D for more useful drugs, instead of just producing redundant and expensive medications. A national healthcare plan would prioritize “patient and community needs” and match up pharmaceutical companies’ interests with actually improving public health. Evergreening has become the name of the game for the pharmaceutical industry. A major solution to the evergreening problem is Medicare for All. **A single-payer system** like Medicare for All **would sharply curtail evergreening**, since drug companies wouldn’t be able to profit from it. Medicare for All would **usher** in **a new era of medical innovation**.