## 1

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must present a delineated enforcement mechanism for the Plan. 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: they don’t

#### 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:

#### 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

#### Climate patents and innovation high now and solving warming but patent waivers set a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 21, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The biotech industry is making remarkable advancestowards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensationand no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass**,** reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietaryknow-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary internationalcollaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to investat the current and required levels**.**

#### Extinction.

Yangyang Xu and Ramanathan 17, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9/26/17, “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 114, No. 39, p. 10315-10323

We are proposing the following extension to the DAI risk categorization: warming greater than 1.5 °C as “dangerous”; warming greater than 3 °C as “catastrophic?”; and warming in excess of 5 °C as “unknown??,” with the understanding that changes of this magnitude, not experienced in the last 20+ million years, pose existential threats to a majority of the population. The question mark denotes the subjective nature of our deduction and the fact that catastrophe can strike at even lower warming levels. The justifications for the proposed extension to risk categorization are given below. From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and species extinction. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of tipping points. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as abrupt and irreversible climate changes, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49). Warming of such magnitudes also has catastrophic human health effects. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented, such as providing air conditioning to the entire population or a massive relocation of most of the population to safer climates. Climate risks can vary markedly depending on the socioeconomic status and culture of the population, and so we must take up the question of “dangerous to whom?” (54). Our discussion in this study is focused more on people and not on the ecosystem, and even with this limited scope, there are multitudes of categories of people. We will focus on the poorest 3 billion people living mostly in tropical rural areas, who are still relying on 18th-century technologies for meeting basic needs such as cooking and heating. Their contribution to CO2 pollution is roughly 5% compared with the 50% contribution by the wealthiest 1 billion (55). This bottom 3 billion population comprises mostly subsistent farmers, whose livelihood will be severely impacted, if not destroyed, with a one- to five-year megadrought, heat waves, or heavy floods; for those among the bottom 3 billion of the world’s population who are living in coastal areas, a 1- to 2-m rise in sea level (likely with a warming in excess of 3 °C) poses existential threat if they do not relocate or migrate. It has been estimated that several hundred million people would be subject to famine with warming in excess of 4 °C (54). However, there has essentially been no discussion on warming beyond 5 °C. Climate change-induced species extinction is one major concern with warming of such large magnitudes (>5 °C). The current rate of loss of species is ∼1,000-fold the historical rate, due largely to habitat destruction. At this rate, about 25% of species are in danger of extinction in the coming decades (56). Global warming of 6 °C or more (accompanied by increase in ocean acidity due to increased CO2) can act as a major force multiplier and expose as much as 90% of species to the dangers of extinction (57). The bodily harms combined with climate change-forced species destruction, biodiversity loss, and threats to water and food security, as summarized recently (58), motivated us to categorize warming beyond 5 °C as unknown??, implying the possibility of existential threats. Fig. 2 displays these three risk categorizations (vertical dashed lines).

## 3

#### CP Text: the United States should

#### anonymously invest $25 billion into 25 production lines dedicated solely to COVID-19 vaccines to boost global vaccine production managed by the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority.

#### distribute 8 billion doses of COVID vaccines using an equitable distribution framework prioritizing developing countries in the Global South.

#### The CP solves the entirety of the case and does it faster.

Stankiewicz 21 Mike Stankiewicz 5-6-2021"Opinion: For just $25 billion, the U.S. could jump-start a project to quickly vaccinate the entire world against COVID" <https://www.marketwatch.com/story/for-just-25-billion-the-u-s-could-jump-start-a-project-to-quickly-vaccinate-the-entire-world-against-covid-11614898552> (a press officer in Public Citizen's communication's department, where he focuses on legislative policy and health-orientated advocacy)//Elmer

Despite wealthy countries such as the U.S. ramping up COVID-19 vaccination efforts, **it** still **may** **take years to vaccinate the world**, especially poorer countries, and the economic and humanitarian impacts could be devastating. But **an injection of** **just $25 billion** **into global vaccine production efforts by the U.S.** government **could save millions of lives** and help prevent economic disaster. The most up-to-date numbers paint incredibly different futures between wealthy and low-income countries. At the current rate of vaccination, analysts predict that developing countries, including almost all of Southeast Asia, may not reach meaningful vaccine coverage until 2023. Comparatively, President Joe Biden has promised that the U.S. will have enough vaccine doses to inoculate every adult within the next three months. Increased fatalities And as wealthy countries such as the U.S. are starting to see lower death, transmission and hospitalization rates, low-income countries are experiencing increased hardship and fatalities. Countries such as Hungry are being forced to tighten restrictions as infection rates increase, and deaths in Africa have spiked by 40% in the past month, according to the World Health Organization (WHO). No country can be left behind in this global pandemic, and the U.S. is in a unique position to make sure every country gets the ample amount of vaccines they need. **Public Citizen research has found that just a $25 billion investment in COVID-19 vaccine production by the U.S. government would produce enough vaccine for developing countries, potentially shaving years from the global pandemic**. Public Citizen estimates that **8 billion doses of** National Institutes of Health-**Moderna MRNA**, +1.98% vaccine can be **produced** **for** just over **$3 per dose**. To bolster production and supply the necessary 8 billion doses, it would take **$1.9 billion to fund** the necessary **25 production lines**. Another **$19 billion** would pay **for materials and labor**, and **$3 billion** would **compensate** **Moderna** **for making technology available to manufacturers** in other countries. An additional $500 million would cover costs to staff and run **a rapid-response federal program that provides technical assistance and facilitates technology transfer to manufacturers and works with the WHO’s technology hub.** In total, vaccinating the world would cost less than 1.4% the total of Biden’s $1.9 trillion COVID relief plan. But such a program also needs to be properly managed to be successful. To help facilitate these efforts, the Biden administration should also **designate** the government’s Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (**BARDA**) **to lead** the world-wide **vaccine manufacturing effort**. BARDA has the **necessary experience to coordinate** **an initiative of this scale** with the WHO, building on its partnership to build pandemic flu manufacturing capacity in developing countries after the bird-flu scare of 2006. Widespread vaccines would help U.S. economy These efforts would dramatically increase access to vaccines in developing countries and speed up global vaccination by years, saving countless lives. But allowing the current vaccine supply crisis to continue is not just inhumane, it is also not in our own economic interest to do so.

## 4

#### 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.