### 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 No Date "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.

Fairness, education, competing interps, no rvis, dtd

### 2

Text: A nation appointed international panel of scientists including National Academies and corresponding organizations should [reduce IP protections for Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats.

#### ] and manage similar conflicts of interest between intellectual property.

#### International panel of science diplomats can rule over IP---that’s key to science diplomacy.

Hajjar and Greenbaum 18 [David; Dean Emeritus and University Distinguished Professor, and Professor of Biochemistry and Pathology at Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State, and a recent Senior Fellow in Science Policy at the Brookings Institute; Steven; Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Hunter College of the City University of New York and a Fellow of the American Physical Society. He was a Jefferson Science Fellow of the National Academies at the U.S. Department of State; “Leveraging Diplomacy for Managing Scientific Challenges,” American Diplomacy; September 18; <https://americandiplomacy.web.unc.edu/2018/09/leveraging-diplomacy-for-managing-scientific-challenges-an-opportunity-to-navigate-the-future-of-science/>] Justin

At the global level, science diplomacy is defined as cooperation among countries in order to solve complex problems through scientific research and education (1). For example, science diplomacy plays an important role in resolving global issues related to the ecosystem (such as clean water, food safety, energy conservation, and preservation of the environment). It also addresses problems related to the healthcare industry. For example, scientists have served at the international level to forge the Middle Eastern Cancer Consortium a decade ago to facilitate better healthcare and improve cancer research in the region. Whether one considers science for diplomacy or diplomacy for science, international science collaborations benefit from allowing science diplomats (broadly defined as science envoys, science attaches, embassy fellows) to help establish positive international relationships between the U.S., Europe, Latin America, Africa or Asia, particularly when proprietary disputes arise (2, 3). These various types of science diplomats already exist; some, like embassy fellows and science envoys, have one-year appointments so their role may be limited, while attaches usually have two or three year appointments that may allow them to be more successful in long, protracted negotiations. In any event, we believe that scientists can play more of a role in advancing international scientific cooperation. A key point addressed here is how to balance security concerns against the need for free exchange of information needed for innovation and growth.

Both the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health are already engaged in supporting American science and strengthening collaborations abroad. Such efforts take advantage of international expertise, facilities, and equipment. Here, we provide a rationale for the use of diplomacy to address scientific challenges. This approach allows some scientists working as diplomats to help manage complex and potentially conflicting situations that arise between scientific communities and their governments. Such issues include managing disputes such as licensing agreements for intellectual property (IP) and providing protection of IP.

International collaborations can not only support but also accelerate the advancement of science. However, collaborations may carry risk if IP is misappropriated for other purposes. International collaborations should have a basis in strategy and specific goals (for example, drug discovery) in order to justify the use of government and/or corporate funds.

About a decade ago, a group of academics from the University of Manchester in the United Kingdom assembled the “Manchester Manifesto,” subtitled “Who Owns Science” (6). This document addressed the lack of alignment between commercial interests, intellectual rights, and credit to the researcher. In our (and commonly held) view, the groups representing these disparate values could benefit from diplomatic mediation. More recently, it has become increasing apparent that managing China as a science and technology superpower represents another challenge for the U.S. Resolution of issues such as ownership of IP, rights to reagents, or use of skilled laboratory personnel from international collaborations may require the efforts of science diplomats. There are few international offices or “guardians” to protect junior and senior scientists in corporate or academic sectors from misuse of reagents or piracy.

China’s failure to respect IP rights, and the resulting piracy, has drawn much attention. The media have also focused on the failure of watchdog government agencies to detect and manage these unwanted activities. Industrial espionage compromises U.S. interests. Moreover, Chinese and Russian hackers have cyberattacked U.S. technology companies, financial institutions, media groups, and defense contractors. In 2018, industrial spying was even reported in a major medical school in New York City where scientists were alleged to have illegally shared research findings with Chinese companies.

The U.S. has a long history of hiring research personnel from other countries to staff its laboratories and industrial R&D centers. These scientists and engineers have made critical contributions to our nation’s well-being and security. These young Chinese and South Asian graduates of U.S. programs a generation ago now staff our research enterprise. However, recent trends in U.S. graduate school applications in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) reflect a downturn in foreign applicants, particularly from China. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the number of American-born students seeking STEM degrees is not sufficient to satisfy future demands of our high-tech workforce. While our own educational reforms must be augmented, we cannot ignore the need to continue to recruit overseas talent.

We believe that foreign scientists can continue to make critical discoveries in the U. S. provided that their talent is nurtured, developed, and harnessed for the common good. At the same time, American companies cannot hire foreign scientists if they take the ideas they generate in U.S. laboratories back to their home countries without proper credit or permission. If the advancement of science is to succeed, greater diplomatic cooperation is needed to solve and manage proprietary issues for the benefit of all (5, 6).

So, how does one strike the proper balance between security and growth? Science is a universal social enterprise; international conferences lead to friendships and productive collaborations between nations. Given that the U.S. and Chinese governments recognize the need for international communication and collaboration then surely there should be a mechanism for adjudicating anticipated conflicts. One approach would be for government, industrial, and academic stakeholders to form an international panel of scientists and engineers to manage any conflicts of interest between the need to protect proprietary information crucial to a company’s competitive edge, and the need for students and young faculty members to publish their findings. Smaller scale efforts along these lines have recently given rise to unique global partnerships, such as fellowship support by major pharmaceutical companies, which aim to address these conflicts to the benefit of both parties. An added feature of such arrangements is that they often provide corporate financing for research (9). Can this corporate-academic partnership model be adapted to multinational joint R&D efforts while protecting IP? This question falls squarely within the purview of international science diplomacy, whereby science diplomats can establish rules of conduct governing joint global technology development with proper IP protection.

Despite the highly publicized and legitimate piracy allegations against China, at least some data indicates that the Chinese legal system is responding positively to worldwide pressure to honor foreign IP. A 2016 study by Love, Helmers, and Eberhardt, for example, found that between 2006 and 2011, foreign companies brought over 10 percent of patent infringement cases in China, and won over 70 percent of those cases (10). Today, “win rates” average around 80 percent, and “injunction rates,” around 98 percent (10). As Chinese scientists and engineers increasingly enter the top tier of the innovation space, their growing awareness of their own need for IP protection could be a powerful motivating force for the protection of all IP. As stated earlier, science diplomats could catalyze this progress even further by direct negotiations with those parties involved in the conflicts. An obvious flaw in this optimistic outlook is that scientists in the U.S. wield more influence with their government than scientists in China wield with theirs. And to the extent that the Chinese government could be encouraging IP theft, this must be addressed first by those international companies/firms who want to do business with the Chinese. Chinese investments, as well as tech incubators and targeted acquisitions, can enable access to U.S. technologies for commercial development. Although this conveys a level of risk to the developers, it may provide valuable opportunities for U.S. companies as well. In many respects, the extensive engagement and collaboration in innovation between the U.S. and China, often characterized by open exchanges of ideas, talent, and technologies, can be mutually beneficial in enriching and accelerating innovation in both countries.

In summary, we believe that science diplomats could help address the increasingly complex issues that arise between accelerating scientific and engineering advances, and the need to protect national security and corporate IP. We also propose that this might be accomplished by asking the National Academies to **recommend** academic, corporate, and government scientific leaders to serve on an international scientific advisory board, and for the corresponding organizations in other countries to do the same. Access to the free flow of information promotes new knowledge and innovation. A return to a more restrictive intellectual environment is not only harmful to progress, but also nearly impossible to manage in the current internet age. A good place to start would be to engage the newly appointed head of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (the Science Advisor to the President of the United States), and working groups within established organizations. These organizations include the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) or the National Academies of Science, Engineering and Medicine, and corresponding international organizations. What incentive is there for a busy and successful scientist to serve in such capacity? It is the same altruism that motivates us to accept assignments as journal editors, manuscript reviewers, or funding agency panelists for the advancement of science toward the greater good.

#### Solves every existential threat.

Haynes 18—research associate in the Neurobiology Department at Harvard Medical School (Trevor, “Science Diplomacy: Collaboration in a rapidly changing world,” <http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/science-diplomacy-collaboration-rapidly-changing-world/>, dml) // Re-Cut Justin

Today’s world is extremely interconnected. Most of us take this fact for granted, but its implications cannot be overstated. The rate at which information, resources, and people are able to move from one part of the world to another continues to accelerate at an alarming rate. Undoubtedly, this development has done society immense good. In the last century, global life expectancy has doubled, the percentage of people living in extreme poverty has dropped by about 60%, and world literacy rates have increased by a similar margin. But while these statistics paint a promising picture of human civilization, human progress rests on a fragile foundation of international cooperation; the challenges presented by an interconnected world are immense. War, natural disasters, and economic collapse now exert their effects globally, creating economic and ecological disasters and mass human migrations on an unprecedented scale. And with the US pulling out of major multilateral agreements on trade, climate change mitigation, and denuclearization, you might wonder if our ability to collaborate across borders productively is really up to the task.

Global challenges require global solutions, and global solutions require collaboration between countries both big and small, rich and poor, authoritative and democratic. There are few human enterprises capable of providing continuity across these differences, and as technological solutions are becoming available to some of our most pressing issues, two in particular will be necessary to getting the job done: science and diplomacy. While science has long been utilized as a means to reach political ends—think of British explorer James Cook’s mapping of unexplored continents or the United States’ Manhattan Project—a more formal integration of scientists into the diplomatic process is being undertaken. This effort, which has led to scientists and academics playing a direct role in foreign policy development and international relations, has given birth of a new branch of diplomacy: science diplomacy.

What is science diplomacy?

As both the term and concept of science diplomacy have only recently gained traction in scientific and diplomatic circles, it’s been given a variety of definitions. But common to them all is the focus on applying scientific expertise to an international effort. The focus of these efforts is to solve international problems collaboratively while balancing economic prosperity, environmental protection, and societal wellbeing. The challenge of reaching this balance in the face of a booming global population cannot be understated, but this new branch of diplomacy is already at work and is producing results. International agreements such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the Iran Nuclear Deal are two famous examples, and science diplomacy is also establishing international collaboration in many other important arenas. While these lesser known efforts may not dominate the headlines, they are quietly tackling the global issues of today and preparing us for those of tomorrow.

Natural disasters don’t respect national boundaries (and neither does the aftermath)

In 2013, the number of refugees displaced by natural disasters—hurricanes, droughts, earthquakes—outnumbered those displaced by war. Current projections estimate as many as 1 billion people may be displaced by natural disasters by the year 2050. That would mean 1 in 9 people on the planet displaced and looking for a home. Compare this to the estimated 12 million refugees displaced by the war in Syria, and a frightening picture begins to form. As natural disasters continue to increase in both their frequency and intensity, solutions for mitigating the risk of total catastrophe will be underpinned by science, technology, and the ability of the international community to collaborate. Many organizations are starting to tackle these problems through the use of science diplomacy. The center for Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) is composed of ten national committees—a network of government sponsored research institutions across the world in countries ranging the political and economic scale. These working groups have committed to improving disaster-risk-reduction science and technology while providing guidance to policy makers charged with implementing disaster prevention and mitigation strategies.

IRDR is governed by a committee comprising experienced scientists and natural disaster experts. Its members come from all over the world—the US, China, Uganda, Norway, Mexico, Venezuela, and more. The diversity of this organization starts at the top and is crucial to developing comprehensive risk-reduction strategies. Data and insights from countries with varying areas of expertise are being shared and built upon, facilitating more accurate natural disaster forecasting and better strategies for mitigating their destructive power. And by including representatives from countries of varying political and economic power in its leadership, IRDR ensures that its work will consider the needs of the global community at large, rather than just nations with considerable wealth and political standing.

The results of this type of international collaboration speak for themselves. Although humanity is grappling with more natural disasters than ever before, deaths related to these incidents continue to trend downward. Operating outside of the typical political framework that dominates foreign relations, IRDR provides a model for effective collaboration across the geopolitical spectrum in the face of a major global issue.

Explore or Exploit? Managing international spaces

Over the last few decades the polar ice cap that covers much of the Arctic Ocean has been shrinking. So much so, that during the warm season vast areas of previously solid ice have become open waters, creating opportunities for new trade routes and exposing the Arctic’s enormous reserves of oil and natural gas. Depending on your values, this will sound either like an opportunity for huge economic development of the region or the inevitable exploitation of one of the last untouched natural territories on the planet. And if you live there, like the half a million indigenous people who currently do, how this territory is managed will determine where you can live, how (and if) you can make a living, and what the health of the ecosystems that have supported Arctic life for millennia will look like.

Luckily, such a scenario was predicted decades ago. In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, then leader of the then Soviet Union, delivered a speech outlining his aspirations for the arctic to be explored rather than exploited—to radically reduce military presence, create a collaborative multinational research effort, cooperate on matters of environmental security, and open up the Northern Sea Route for trade. This speech laid the foundation for the Arctic Council (Figure 1), which is one of the most successful examples of science diplomacy at work. Composed of the eight Arctic nations, including geopolitical rivals US and Russia, and numerous groups of indigenous peoples, the Arctic Council was established to maintain Gorbachev’s vision for the region while giving the indigenous peoples a seat at the negotiating table. The council’s activities are conducted by six scientific and technology-based working groups who conduct research in the area and provide knowledge and recommendations to the council members. As a result of this research, and allowing scientists to take part in the negotiations, the Arctic council has enacted several legally binding agreements regarding the sustainable development and environmental protection of the Arctic Ocean. These agreements have facilitated cooperation on a number of important issues including search and rescue operations, prevention and containment of maritime oil pollution, and, most recently, enhanced data sharing and scientific research collaborations. Against a backdrop of rapidly deteriorating diplomatic relations, the US and Russia have co-chaired task forces that laid the foundation for these agreements, proving to the world that meaningful results can be achieved through the avenue of science diplomacy, regardless of geopolitics.

Science diplomacy going forward

The technical expertise that characterizes science diplomacy will continue to be in demand across many realms of foreign policy. For example, synthetic biology and gene-editing technology continue to factor into matters regarding agriculture and trade. Also, digital currencies, such as bitcoin, have changed the way economists and businesses are approaching markets. Finally, machine learning and artificial intelligence are being used by governments as a means for population control, giving rise to a new type of governance—digital authoritarianism.

While this expertise will be necessary for managing such issues, building international coalitions can’t be done through a purely scientific and technical lens. Convincing others to cooperate means providing them with a convincing argument to do so, and in terms they understand and find compelling. To achieve this, scientists must be trained to communicate their expertise in a way that moves stakeholders in policy discussions to act. This means appealing to motivations they have been largely taught to put to the side—whether they be political, economic, or emotional in nature—without obscuring the data and insights they have to offer.

For our leaders, policy makers, and diplomats to effectively understand issues underpinned by science and technology, experts in these fields must continue to be integrated into the mechanisms of governance. With scientists in the US running for elections in numbers like never before, we can expect this trend to continue. And in the face of a rising wave of nationalism across the world, it is crucial that we do everything we can to foster collaboration. The future of human civilization depends on it.

### 3

#### Genocidal settlement is a structure, not an event meaning ontological logic of elimination is an everyday manifestation that defines settler identity.

**Rifkin 14**, Mark. Settler common sense: Queerness and everyday colonialism in the American renaissance. U of Minnesota Press, 2014. (Associate Professor of English & WGS at UNC-Greensboro)//Elmer

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associa- tions they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler- colonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func- tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sover- eignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and main- tain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writ- ing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collec- tivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and manage- ment: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix).

#### That results in land exploitation and ecocide – specifically manifests in knowledge institutions making forefronting Settler Colonialism a prior question.

**Paperson 17** la paperson or K. Wayne Yang, June 2017, “A Third University is Possible” (an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego)//Elmer

Land is the prime concern of settler colonialism, contexts in which the colonizer comes to a “new” place not only to seize and exploit but to stay, making that “new” place his permanent home. Settler colonialism thus complicates the center–periphery model that was classically used to describe colonialism, wherein an imperial center, the “metropole,” dominates distant colonies, the “periphery.” Typically, one thinks of European colonization of Africa, India, the Caribbean, the Pacific Islands, in terms of external colonialism, also called exploitation colonialism, where land and human beings are recast as natural resources for primitive accumulation: coltan, petroleum, diamonds, water, salt, seeds, genetic material, chattel. Theories named as “settler colonial studies” had a resurgence beginning around 2006.[2] However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire.[3] The critical literatures of the colonized have long positioned the violence of settlement as a prime feature in colonial life as well as in global arrangements of power. We can see this in Franz Fanon’s foundational critiques of colonialism. Whereas Fanon’s work is often generalized for its diagnoses of anti/colonial violence and the racialized psychoses of colonization upon colonized and colonizer, Fanon is also talking about settlement as the particular feature of French colonization in Algeria. For Fanon, the violence of French colonization in Algeria arises from settlement as a spatial immediacy of empire: the geospatial collapse of metropole and colony into the same time and place. On the “selfsame land” are spatialized white immunity and racialized violation, non-Native desires for freedom, Black life, and Indigenous relations.[4] Settler colonialism is too often thought of as “what happened” to Indigenous people. This kind of thinking confines the experiences of Indigenous people, their critiques of settler colonialism, their decolonial imaginations, to an unwarranted historicizing parochialism, as if settler colonialism were a past event that “happened to” Native peoples and not generalizable to non-Natives. Actually, settler colonialism is something that “happened for” settlers. Indeed, it is happening for them/us right now. Wa Thiong’o’s question of how instead of why directs us to think of land tenancy laws, debt, and the privatization of land as settler colonial technologies that enable the “eventful” history of plunder and disappearance. Property law is a settler colonial technology. The weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it, are also technologies. Like all technologies, they evolve and spread. Recasting land as property means severing Indigenous peoples from land. This separation, what Hortense Spillers describes as “the loss of Indigenous name/land**”** for Africans-turned-chattel, recasts Black Indigenous people as black bodies for biopolitical disposal: who will be moved where, who will be murdered how, who will be machinery for what, and who will be made property for whom.[5] In the alienation of land from life, alienable rights are produced: the right to own (property), the right to law (protection through legitimated violence), the right to govern (supremacist sovereignty), the right to have rights (humanity). In a word, what is produced is whiteness. Moreover, it is not just human beings who are refigured in the schism. Land and nonhumans become alienable properties, a move that first alienates land from its own sovereign life. Thus we can speak of the various technologies required to create and maintain these separations, these alienations: Black from Indigenous, human from nonhuman, land from life.[6] “How?” is a question you ask if you are concerned with the mechanisms, not just the motives, of colonization. Instead of settler colonialism as an ideology, or as a history, you might consider settler colonialism as a set of technologies —a frame that could help you to forecast colonial next operations and to plot decolonial directions. This chapter proceeds with the following insights. (1) The settler–native– slave triad does not describe identities. The triad—an analytic mainstay of settler colonial studies—digs a pitfall of identity that not only chills collaborations but also implies that the racial will be the solution. (2) Technologies are trafficked. Technologies generate patterns of social relations to land. Technologies mutate, and so do these relationships. Colonial technologies travel. In tracing technologies’ past and future trajectories, we can connect how settler colonial and antiblack technologies circulate in transnational arenas. (3) Land—not just people—is the biopolitical target.[7] The examples are many: fracking, biopiracy, damming of rivers and flooding of valleys, the carcasses of pigs that die from the feed additive ractopamine and are allowable for harvest by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The subjugation of land and nonhuman life to deathlike states in order to support “human” life is a “biopolitics” well beyond the Foucauldian conception of biopolitical as governmentality or the neoliberal disciplining of modern, bourgeois, “human” subject. (4) (Y)our task is to theorize in the break, that is, to refuse the master narrative that technology is loyal to the master, that (y)our theory has a Eurocentric origin. Black studies, Indigenous studies, and Othered studies have already made their breaks with Foucault (over biopolitics), with Deleuze and Guatarri (over assemblages and machines), and with Marx (over life and primitive accumulation). (5) Even when they are dangerous, understanding technologies provides us some pathways for decolonizing work. We can identify projects of collaboration on decolonial technologies. Colonizing mechanisms are evolving into new forms, and they might be subverted toward decolonizing operations. The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado- Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people.[8] This creates a host of post+colonial problems that have come to define modernity. Because the humanity of the settler is predicated on his ability to “write the world,” to make history upon and over the natural world, the colonized is instructed to make her claim to humanity by similarly acting on the world or, more precisely, acting in his. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko.[9] Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.”[10] Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”[11]

#### Expansion of medical access is a form of settler colonial biomedical onslaught – humanitarian promotions of health proliferate genocidal assimilation.

**Klausen 13,** Jimmy Casas. "Reservations on hospitality: contact and vulnerability in Kant and indigenous action." Hospitality and World Politics. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2013. 197-221. (Associate Professor in the Instituto de Relações Internacionais at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro)//Elmer

On the other hand and by contrast, the governmental reach of public health initiatives that would effect the improvement of isolated indigenous populations’ health accords with Kantian philanthropy – with all the risks of violated freedom and smothered life that entails. Public health advocates would repair the disadvantaged morbidity profile of isolated indigenous groups through a policy of initiating contact supported by the provision of modern biomedical health care services to ameliorate the epidemiological effects of contact. State-initiated contact without attendant health care has proved disastrous. Into the 1970s, FUNAI attempted to make friendly contact with isolated Indians. By relying on hired expert indigenous trackers, government contact expeditions located isolated groups and – demonstrating their interest in seeking commerce – enticed the latter with gifts of machetes and blankets. One FUNAI expedition to contact the Matis in 1978 resulted in high morbidity from pneumonia and other infectious diseases and killed one of every two Matis. 60 To correct such devastating policies, anthropologists Magdalena Hurtado, Kim Hill, Hillard Kaplan and Jane Lancaster have elaborated the following argument: Many anthropologists and indigenous-rights activists believe that uncontacted Indians should be left alone. These people are well-meaning, but they are wrong because they base their position on three incorrect assumptions. First, they assume that the Indians have chosen to remain isolated . . . . Those who oppose contact also assume that the Indians will inevitably be decimated by virgin-soil epidemics . . . . Finally, opponents of contact assume that isolated native groups will survive if not contacted. 61 However, even correcting for the fatal infelicities of past policy-driven, state-initiated contacts such as FUNAI’s, the preponderantly disadvantaged morbidity profile of such virgin-soil populations cannot be reduced by greater hospitality in the form of redoubled and more expert interventionary contacts. Although public health efforts like those advocated by Hurtado et al. might reduce mortality, highly disease-vulnerable persons will still sicken and will do so through means that would pretend to foster life by actively disregarding how the people subject to these external machinations might determine their own needs and value their own health. Isolated indigenes’ biological lives would be simultaneously fostered and risked, while their free personhood would count as nothing morally–culturally. In short, there are serious political costs to be weighed in such an intervention. Because of – and not in spite of – their philanthropy, public health interventions of the type that Hurtado et al. advocate extend the reach of governmentality much more intrusively than land rights policies. Besides deciding on behalf of peoples in regard to the interpretation of their acts of self-quarantine, the advocated public health policies surgically insert apparatuses of biomedicine directly into the contacted peoples’ living being. Such policies thereby displace indigenous norms of health and native cultural strategies of living on with the norms and overall strategy embedded in the culture of scientific and clinical biomedicine. Though the pretence is that such acts demonstrate the hospitality of the wider national or global society, such health policy interventions cannot simply make a presentation for possible society; rather, qua philanthropy they initiate contact, which, because of the high degree of vulnerability of those contacted, must needs lead to the proliferation of contacts. It is not a hospitable policy of fostering life that Hurtado et al. support, not merely possible commerce but an obsessive philanthropy of biomedical life support and literally unavoidable onslaught of commerce, possibly forevermore. Most startlingly, such public health interventions presume as universal a standard of life that could certainly vary while retaining meaning and value. The anthropologist Tess Lea describes this universalising interventionary compulsion in withering words: When you are a helping bureau-professional, the compulsion to do something to fix the problems of target populations – those deemed as suffering from unequal and preventable conditions – exceeds all other impulses . . . . ‘They’ need our greater commitment. The idea that life might be lived differently with value and meaning or that ‘need’ might be conceived differently from the way in which we calculate it through our interventionary lens, becomes impossible to imagine. 62 Hurtado et al. assume that health professionals and policy makers must hospitably confer biomedically acquired immunity on heretofore isolated and now contacted virgin soil populations. Fostering indigenous lives by imposing an alien conception of immunity, they would inhospitably destroy alternate strategies of living on. Seeing through their interventionary lens, Hurtado et al. themselves become arbiters of successful and unsuccessful forms of life: they presume that self-quarantine cannot itself serve as an effective cultural strategy to immunise living bodies. Thus, ironically perhaps, these anthropologists choose biology above culture by seeing each from a standpoint authorised by the culture of biomedicine. From their interventionary lens and against Canguilhem’s admonition above, self-quarantine appears to be a failed strategy for living on because the immunity it would confer is imperfect or incomplete. Likewise, condoning self-isolation is imperfect or incomplete hospitality as against their more perfect interventionary hospitality in the name of life. Authorising themselves to make these judgements, they enact an altogether different collapse of morality into nature than the Kantian collapse I reconstruct above. Whereas Kant’s collapse of minimalism into abstentionism and moral duty into nature’s constraints opens hospitality and therefore strategies for living on, this other collapse binds moralising conceptions of ‘health’ to the biomedically conceived body. Yet if, according to Canguilhem, for humans especially, ‘health is precisely a certain latitude, a certain play in the norms of life and behavior’, 63 then it seems that the ‘health’ that supposedly hospitable, though strictly philanthropic, ‘life’-fostering interventionary contact would impose on the exuberance of self-quarantining indigenous peoples is a sickness unto that other perpetual peace Kant mentions: death.

#### Biomedicine itself is invested in colonial exploitation through testing done on indigenous communities to biopiracy and stealing indigenous knowledge.

**Lift Mode 17** 3-10-2017 "Pharmaceutical Colonialism” <https://medium.com/@liftmode/pharmaceutical-colonialism-3-ways-that-western-medicine-takes-from-indigenous-communities-3a9339b4f24f> (We at Liftmode.com are a team of professionals from a variety of backgrounds, dedicated to the mission of providing the highest quality and highest purity nutritional health supplements on the market. We look specifically for the latest and most promising research in the fields of cognition enhancement, neuroscience and alternative health supplements, and develop commercial strategies to bring these technologies to the marketplace.)//Elmer

Does modern medicine take from rural communities? At first, this seems outrageous. However, on closer inspection, we find three main methods of poaching: stealing indigenous knowledge, ‘biopiracy’, and the sale of pharmaceuticals at exorbitant prices. Another example includes using developing countries and rural populations as test subjects in unethical clinical trials — for example on AIDS patients in South Africa.[1] This article examines three methods that Western medicine takes from rural communities. We also examine the emerging new forms of medicine and how many people are beginning to appreciate the medical knowledge of different cultures around the world. Traditional knowledge and culture is threatened by the expansive natural of the pharmaceutical industry 1. Pharmaceutical colonialism: Stealing Indigenous Knowledge First and foremost, what has been taken from indigenous communities for the last roughly 600 years is traditional knowledge about medicinal plants. It is interesting that the major advancements in Western medicine coincide very closely to escalating global colonialism by Western countries. It’s difficult to estimate the exact percentage of modern drugs that were originally based on traditional plant sources, because of the complex evolution of Western laboratory-made medicine. However, this percentage is known to be very high. In fact, a 2006 paper by Dr. A Gurib-Fakim states: “Natural products and their derivatives represent more than 50% of all the drugs in clinical use in the world. Higher plants contribute no less than 25% of the total.”[2] The extent to which traditional knowledge permeates through Western medicine is too broad to explain fully in a small article like this. We’d need to write an entire book to cover the full content! So, we will just take a look at one example below. How the West takes Indigenous knowledge: Anti-Malaria Drugs Mosquitoes are, by far, the world’s most dangerous animals, spreading a number of diseases including Dengue fever, Zika virus, and malaria. According to the World Health Organization, nearly half of the world’s population is at risk of malaria. In 2015, over 210 million people became infected with malaria, and a staggering 429 000 people died from the blood parasite.[3] To combat the infectious disease, scientists have developed two major classes of anti-malarial drugs. These are both based on indigenous knowledge of plant medicine: Mosquitos kill more people than any other animal every year 1. Quinine Quinine is extracted from the bark of the cinchona tree, native to South America. Contrary to propaganda by the Spanish inquisitors, which is still used in modern medicine today, Westerners did not ‘discover’ the cinchona tree. Indigenous Peruvian cultures had been using the bark of the cinchona tree for hundreds, possibly thousands, of years before the arrival of the colonial forces from the North. They crushed it up and mixed it with water to ‘relieve shivering’ — a major sign of the feverish symptoms of malaria.[4] Unlike traditional Chinese knowledge, which has survived until modern times, the ancient knowledge of South America cultures was almost completely destroyed by colonial forces. This makes tracing the historical use of the cinchona tree more difficult.[5] After the inquisition of most traditional cultures in South America, the cinchona bark was brought back to Western Europe and was hailed as one of the most exciting discoveries of modern medicine. The success of cinchona bark in Europe created a massive industry, initially run by the Spanish, but which was later overtaken by French and English industrialists.[6] It’s important to know that the ‘traditional’ use of cinchona bark in 18th century Europe was in exactly the same method as its original use in indigenous societies: crushing up the barking and mixing it with water. The chemical compound quinine was first extracted from cinchona bark in 1820 by two Frenchmen: Pierre Joseph Pelletier and Joseph Caventou. This allowed purified quinine to replace traditional cinchona extracts.[7] Interestingly, Western scientists have since discovered that cinchona bark actually contains several active components, which function in a synergistic relationship to kill the malaria parasite.[8] In modern times, a number of quinine-based drugs have been developed, with varying success. The issue becomes complex here because, while these drugs were developed by Western scientists using modern technological laboratories, if it hadn’t been for the original indigenous knowledge, these compounds could not have been developed at all. The quinine derivatives include Chloroquine, Pyrimethamine, and Mefloquine. Chloroquine was used as a spray along with DDT in the WHO’s malaria eradication plan (the efficacy and usefulness of this are still under debate: numerous countries that were sprayed with these chemicals soon developed strains of malaria that were resistant to the drugs).[9] 60411828 - workers are fogging for dengue control. mosquito borne diseases of zika virus. Quinine-based drugs were used in sprays to combat malaria around the world 2. Artemisinin Artemisinin is an active compound found in traditional Chinese medicine called Qinghao Su (sweet wormwood). This traditional Chinese medicine has been used to treat fevers for over a thousand years. It is currently still extracted from plant sources, the majority of which are grown in China, Vietnam and East Africa. Once the full-grown plants are harvested, the chemical is extracted, leaving the pure artemisinin at a highly variable market price of between $120 — $1200 per kilogram.[10] It’s interesting that the artemisinin-based drug combinations (ACTs) are the most expensive anti-malarial treatments available. This is despite the fact that it is one of the few malarial medications that are still mostly plant-based. However, Western pharmaceutical companies are now developing synthetic forms of artemisinin. The new forms of artemsinin are genetically engineered and have intellectual property rights attached, potentially bringing in big revenues for the companies involved. The proponents of the synthetic form of artemisinin claim that the synthetic form will be able to be sold for cheaper than the natural form. However, the average import price of natural artemsisin to India over the last ten years was around $370 per kilo — a fair amount cheaper than the price that the pharmaceutical companies are pushing for.[11] Artemisinin farming sustains the livelihoods of an estimated 100’000 farmers. With synthetic derivatives being developed this puts the livelihoods of the farmers and their families at risk of poverty (estimated to be around 3–5 times the number of people as the farmers themselves).[12] The ironic and disturbing thing about the whole situation is that the artemisinin farmers themselves are the ones who are most at risk of contracting malaria. In effect, they stand to not only have their incomes stripped by Western pharmaceutical companies but also to become physically dependent on the products of those very companies. [13] 16118463 - portrait of a burmese woman with thanaka powdered face working in farm Farmers livelihoods are threatened by the use of synthetic chemicals 2. ‘Biopiracy’ — stealing natural resources and plants The idea that modern medicine might be a form of colonialism seems at first to be quite outrageous! However, on closer inspection, it’s quite clear that a few nations continue to play the role of ‘missionary’, helping to save people in the ‘developing world’.[14] In some cases, though, the role of the ‘missionary’ becomes a little less clear. The second way that Western medicine takes from indigenous communities is something called ‘Biopiracy’. This is similar to the method we described above, however, in this case, what is taken is not knowledge but the actual plants and resources themselves. In biopiracy actions, plants and natural resources are stolen entirely from indigenous communities and are then used to develop drugs and medicines in the West. The indigenous communities benefit nothing from the theft of their resources. Medicines developed from stolen materials are often sold back to the very people from whom the original plant-sources were stolen — at exorbitant prices. Examples of medications that face biopiracy charges include: A drug for diabetes developed in the UK from a Libyan plant, Artemisia judaica A medicine for immunosuppression developed by GlaxoSmithKline which is derived from a chemical found in termite hills in Gambia An HIV treatment taken from bacteria found in central Uganda Antibiotic drugs developed from amoebas found in Mauritius and Venezuela Anti-diarrhea vaccines developed from Egyptian bacteria [15] According to Beth Burrows, president of Washington-based Edmond’s Institute: “Times have changed. It is no longer acceptable for the great white explorer to trawl across Africa or South America taking what they want for their own commercial benefit. It is no more than a new form of colonial pillaging. As there are internationally recognized rights for oil, so there should be for indigenous plants and knowledge.”[16] In an ideal world, knowledge and resources would be shared equitably. Both the indigenous cultures and the modern world would benefit from the sharing of knowledge and medicinal plants, which could leave the world a much better place. However, this is not the case in today’s world. More and more, we see evidence of pharmaceutical companies using rural communities as customers and guinea-pigs for medicine that was originally sourced from local knowledge.[17] Traditional medicine is pushed off the market and indigenous knowledge is ‘dumbed down’ through development programs. This forces the majority of the world to have to work through cartel-like pharmaceutical corporations who extract unbelievably large sums of money from people, which we’ll look at below.[18] 21736635 - shanty house in bangkok water canals along the river bank, thailand Those who benefit the least from pharmaceutical colonialism are the ones who need healthcare the most

#### Vote negative to endorse a cartography of refusal

**Day 15** Iyko, Associate Professor of English. Chair, Critical Social Thought. “Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and Settler Colonial Critique.” Source: Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 2015), pp. 102-121 //Elmer

And so the potential relations that Wilderson sets up through a critique of sovereignty are at best irrelevant or at worse false in Sexton’s absolute claim that slavery stands alone as the “threshold of the political world.”45 I suggest that this wavering relation/nonrelation of antiblackness and Indigeneity exhibited in Wilderson’s and Sexton’s work reveal the problem in any totalizing approach to the heterogeneous constitution of racial difference in settler colonies. Beyond this inconsistency, the liberal multiculturalist agenda that Wilderson and Sexton project into Indigenous sovereignty willfully evacuates any Indigenous refusal of a colonial politics of recognition. Among other broad strokes, Sexton states, “as a rule, Native Studies reproduces the dominant liberal political narrative of emancipation and enfranchisement.”46 This provides a basis for Wilderson’s assertion that Indigenous sovereignty engages in a liberal politics of state legitimation through recognition because “treaties are forms of articulation” that buttress “the interlocutory life of America as a coherent (albeit genocidal) idea.”47 But such a depoliticized liberal project is frankly incompatible with Indigenous activism and scholarship that emerges from Native studies in North America. The main argument in Glen Sean Coulthard’s book Red Skin, White Masks is to categorically reject “the liberal recognition-based approach to Indigenous selfdetermination.”48 This is not a politics of legitimizing Indigenous nations through state recognition but rather one of refusal, a refusal to be recognized and thus interpellated by the settler colonial nation-state. Drawing on Fanon, Coulthard describes the “necessity on the part of the oppressed to ‘turn away’ from their other-oriented master-dependency, and to instead struggle for freedom on their own terms and in accordance with their own values.”49 It is also difficult to reconcile the depoliticized narrative of “resurgence and recovery” that Wilderson and Sexton attribute to Indigenous sovereignty in the face of Idle No More, the anticapitalist Indigenous sovereignty movement in Canada whose national railway and highway blockades have seriously destabilized the expropriation of natural resources for the global market. These are examples that Coulthard describes as “direct action” rather tjhan negotiation—in other words, antagonism, not conflict resolution: The [blockades] are a crucial act of negation insofar as they seek to impede or block the flow of resources currently being transported to international markets from oil and gas fields, refineries, lumber mills, mining operations, and hydroelectric facilities located on the dispossessed lands of Indigenous nations. These modes of direct action . . . seek to have a negative impact on the economic infrastructure that is core to the colonial accumulation of capital in settler-political economies like Canada’s.50 These tactics are part of what Audra Simpson calls a “cartography of refusal” that “negates the authority of the other’s gaze.”51 It is impossible to frame the blockade movement, which has become the greatest threat to Canada’s resource agenda,52 as a struggle for “enfranchisement.” Idle No More is not in “conflict” with the Canadian nation-state; it is in a struggle against the very premise of settler colonial capitalism that requires the elimination of Indigenous peoples. As Coulthard states unambiguously, “For Indigenous nations to live, capitalism must die.”

### Adv 1

#### Warming doesn’t trigger extinction

* peer-reviewed journal shows IPCC exaggeration
* history proves resilience
* no extinction- warming under Paris goals
* rock breaking strategy could offset warming

IBD 18 [Investors Business Daily, Citing Study from Peer reviewed journal by Lewis and Curry, “Here's One Global Warming Study Nobody Wants You To See”, 4/25/18, https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/global-warming-computer-models-co2-emissions/]

Settled Science: A new study published in a peer-reviewed journal finds that climate models exaggerate the global warming from CO2 emissions by as much as 45%. If these findings hold true, it's huge news. No wonder the mainstream press is ignoring it.

In the study, authors Nic Lewis and Judith Curry looked at actual temperature records and compared them with climate change computer models. What they found is that the planet has shown itself to be far less sensitive to increases in CO2 than the climate models say. As a result, they say, the planet will warm less than the models predict, even if we continue pumping CO2 into the atmosphere.

As Lewis explains: "Our results imply that, for any future emissions scenario, future warming is likely to be substantially lower than the central computer model-simulated level projected by the (United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), and highly unlikely to exceed that level.

How much lower? Lewis and Curry say that their findings show temperature increases will be 30%-45% lower than the climate models say. If they are right, then there's little to worry about, even if we don't drastically reduce CO2 emissions.

The planet will warm from human activity, but not nearly enough to cause the sort of end-of-the-world calamities we keep hearing about. In fact, the resulting warming would be below the target set at the Paris agreement.

This would be tremendously good news.

The fact that the Lewis and Curry study appears in the peer-reviewed American Meteorological Society's Journal of Climate lends credibility to their findings. This is the same journal, after all, that recently published widely covered studies saying the Sahara has been growing and the climate boundary in central U.S. has shifted 140 miles to the east because of global warming.

The Lewis and Curry findings come after another study, published in the prestigious journal Nature, that found the long-held view that a doubling of CO2 would boost global temperatures as much as 4.5 degrees Celsius was wrong**.** The most temperatures would likely climb is 3.4 degrees.

It also follows a study published in Science, which found that rocks contain vast amounts of nitrogen that plants could use to grow and absorb more CO2, potentially offsetting at least some of the effects of CO2 emissions and reducing future temperature increases.

#### Warming isn’t existential---new studies.

Nordhaus 20. Ted Nordhaus, an American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, citing new climate change forecasts. [Ignore the Fake Climate Debate, 1-23-2020, https://www.wsj.com/articles/ignore-the-fake-climate-debate-11579795816]//BPS

Beyond the headlines and social media, where Greta Thunberg, Donald Trump and the online armies of climate “alarmists” and “deniers” do battle, there is a real climate debate bubbling along in scientific journals, conferences and, occasionally, even in the halls of Congress. It gets a lot less attention than the boisterous and fake debate that dominates our public discourse, but it is much more relevant to how the world might actually address the problem. In the real climate debate, no one denies the relationship between human emissions of greenhouse gases and a warming climate. Instead, the disagreement comes down to different views of climate risk in the face of multiple, cascading uncertainties. On one side of the debate are optimists, who believe that, with improving technology and greater affluence, our societies will prove quite adaptable to a changing climate. On the other side are pessimists, who are more concerned about the risks associated with rapid, large-scale and poorly understood transformations of the climate system. But most pessimists do not believe that runaway climate change or a hothouse earth are plausible scenarios, much less that human extinction is imminent. And most optimists recognize a need for policies to address climate change, even if they don’t support the radical measures that Ms. Thunberg and others have demanded. In the fake climate debate, both sides agree that economic growth and reduced emissions vary inversely; it’s a zero-sum game. In the real debate, the relationship is much more complicated. Long-term economic growth is associated with both rising per capita energy consumption and slower population growth. For this reason, as the world continues to get richer, higher per capita energy consumption is likely to be offset by a lower population. A richer world will also likely be more technologically advanced, which means that energy consumption should be less carbon-intensive than it would be in a poorer, less technologically advanced future. In fact, a number of the high-emissions scenarios produced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change involve futures in which the world is relatively poor and populous and less technologically advanced. Affluent, developed societies are also much better equipped to respond to climate extremes and natural disasters. That’s why natural disasters kill and displace many more people in poor societies than in rich ones. It’s not just seawalls and flood channels that make us resilient; it’s air conditioning and refrigeration, modern transportation and communications networks, early warning systems, first responders and public health bureaucracies. New research published in the journal Global Environmental Change finds that global economic growth over the last decade has reduced climate mortality by a factor of five, with the greatest benefits documented in the poorest nations. In low-lying Bangladesh, 300,000 people died in Cyclone Bhola in 1970, when 80% of the population lived in extreme poverty. In 2019, with less than 20% of the population living in extreme poverty, Cyclone Fani killed just five people. “Poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate. The fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development.” So while it is true that poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate, it is also true that the fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development, which requires infrastructure and industrialization. Those activities, in turn, require cement, steel, process heat and chemical inputs, all of which are impossible to produce today without fossil fuels. For this and other reasons, the world is unlikely to cut emissions fast enough to stabilize global temperatures at less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, the long-standing international target, much less 1.5 degrees, as many activists now demand. But recent forecasts also suggest that many of the worst-case climate scenarios produced in the last decade, which assumed unbounded economic growth and fossil-fuel development, are also very unlikely. There is still substantial uncertainty about how sensitive global temperatures will be to higher emissions over the long-term. But the best estimates now suggest that the world is on track for 3 degrees of warming by the end of this century, not 4 or 5 degrees as was once feared. That is due in part to slower economic growth in the wake of the global financial crisis, but also to decades of technology policy and energy-modernization efforts. “We have better and cleaner technologies available today because policy-makers in the U.S. and elsewhere set out to develop those technologies.” The energy intensity of the global economy continues to fall. Lower-carbon natural gas has displaced coal as the primary source of new fossil energy. The falling cost of wind and solar energy has begun to have an effect on the growth of fossil fuels. Even nuclear energy has made a modest comeback in Asia.

### Warming – Ice Age

#### Ice age coming but warming stops it – most recent ev

Martin 2/7 [Sean Martin, 2-7-2020, "Ice age shock: ‘Timing is right for the next ice age to come around soon’," Express.co.uk, https://www.express.co.uk/news/science/1239246/ice-age-long-range-weather-forecast-climate-change-weather-warning, accessed 9-5-2020]LHSBC

* Citing James Renwick from the School of Geography, Environment, and Earth Sciences at the University of Wellington

Over millions of years, Earth goes through ice ages and then warm periods depending on the planet’s rotation around the Sun. Currently, it is in a warmer period – although it is important to note that it is exacerbated by global warming and not an explanation for the unnaturally [warming planet](https://www.express.co.uk/latest/climate-change).∂ However, a climate scientist has said Earth should be gearing up to go through another ice age soon.∂ There have been at least five major ice ages on Earth throughout its history, with the last one ending roughly 12,800 years ago.∂ These ice ages lasted for hundreds of thousands of years and saw temperatures drop sharply across the globe – cold enough to stop snow from melting and causing glaciers to form.∂ Professor James Renwick from the School of Geography, Environment, and Earth Sciences at the University of Wellington has said the planet should be going through a cooler period in due time.∂ He wrote in an article for the Conversation: “The timing is right for the next ice age to come around soon.∂ “For the past two and a half million years, the Earth has experienced regular ice ages, related to slow changes to earth’s orbit around the sun and changes in the earth’s axis of rotation (Milankovitch cycles).∂ “We are currently in one of the warm periods (interglacials) between ice ages and the present interglacial should be ending about now.”∂ However, Prof Renwick added: “There is a catch”.∂ Due to human activity and the pumping of greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere, the next ice age has been seriously delayed.∂ Carbon dioxide traps heat within the atmosphere, which is preventing the planet from going into another cooling cycle.∂ This is yet further evidence that human activity is destroying the fragile ecosystem of the planet.∂ Prof Renwick said: “Ice ages didn’t happen for millions of years because there was too much carbon dioxide in the air.∂ “The change in sunlight associated with the ice age cycles is quite subtle and takes thousands of years to make a difference to temperatures and to ice gain or loss.∂ “When atmospheric carbon dioxide is above about 300 parts per million, the infrared warming effect is so strong it drowns out the more subtle Milankovitch cycles and there are no ice ages.∂ “Coming out of the Pliocene period just under three million years ago, carbon dioxide levels dropped low enough for the ice age cycles to commence.∂ “Now, carbon dioxide levels are over 400 parts per million and are likely to stay there for thousands of years, so the next ice age is postponed for a very long time.

#### Ice age causes extinction—

Chapman 8 (Phil, geophysicist and astronautical engineer, bachelor of science degree in Physics and Mathematics from Sydney University, a master of science degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh,” 4/23/08, The Australian, <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/sorry-to-ruin-the-fun-but-an-ice-age-cometh/story-e6frg73o-1111116134873>)

What is scary about the picture is that there is only one tiny sunspot. Disconcerting as it may be to true believers in global warming, the average temperature on Earth has remained steady or slowly declined during the past decade, despite the continued increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, and now the global temperature is falling precipitously. All four agencies that track Earth's temperature (the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy group at the University of Alabama, and Remote Sensing Systems Inc in California) report that it cooled by about 0.7C in 2007. This is the fastest temperature change in the instrumental record and it puts us back where we were in 1930. If the temperature does not soon recover, we will have to conclude that global warming is over. There is also plenty of anecdotal evidence that 2007 was exceptionally cold. It snowed in Baghdad for the first time in centuries, the winter in China was simply terrible and the extent of Antarctic sea ice in the austral winter was the greatest on record since James Cook discovered the place in 1770. It is generally not possible to draw conclusions about climatic trends from events in a single year, so I would normally dismiss this cold snap as transient, pending what happens in the next few years. This is where SOHO comes in. The sunspot number follows a cycle of somewhat variable length, averaging 11 years. The most recent minimum was in March last year. The new cycle, No.24, was supposed to start soon after that, with a gradual build-up in sunspot numbers. It didn't happen. The first sunspot appeared in January this year and lasted only two days. A tiny spot appeared last Monday but vanished within 24 hours. Another little spot appeared this Monday. Pray that there will be many more, and soon. The reason this matters is that there is a close correlation between variations in the sunspot cycle and Earth's climate. The previous time a cycle was delayed like this was in the Dalton Minimum, an especially cold period that lasted several decades from 1790. Northern winters became ferocious: in particular, the rout of Napoleon's Grand Army during the retreat from Moscow in 1812 was at least partly due to the lack of sunspots. That the rapid temperature decline in 2007 coincided with the failure of cycle No.24 to begin on schedule is not proof of a causal connection but it is cause for concern. It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850. There is no doubt that **the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do.** There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time. If the ice age is coming, there is a small chance that we could prevent or at least delay the transition, if we are prepared to take action soon enough and on a large enough scale. For example: We could gather all the bulldozers in the world and use them to dirty the snow in Canada and Siberia in the hope of reducing the reflectance so as to absorb more warmth from the sun. We also may be able to release enormous floods of methane (a potent greenhouse gas) from the hydrates under the Arctic permafrost and on the continental shelves, perhaps using nuclear weapons to destabilise the deposits. We cannot really know, but my guess is that the odds are at least 50-50 that we will see significant cooling rather than warming in coming decades. The probability that we are witnessing the onset of a real ice age is much less, perhaps one in 500, but not totally negligible. All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead. It will be difficult for people to face the truth when their reputations, careers, government grants or hopes for social change depend on global warming, but the fate of civilisation may be at stake. In the famous words of Oliver Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."

### Disease – Defense

### 1NC – AT: Disease

#### Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/]

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

#### No extinction from pandemics

* Death rates as high as 50% didn’t collapse civilization
* Fossil fuel record caps risk at .1% per century
* health, sanitation, medicine, science, public health bodies, solve
* viruses can’t survive in all locations
* refugee populations like tribes, remote researchers, submarine crews, solve

Ord 20 Ord, Toby. Toby David Godfrey Ord (born 18 July 1979) is an Australian philosopher. He founded Giving What We Can, an international society whose members pledge to donate at least 10% of their income to effective charities and is a key figure in the effective altruism movement, which promotes using reason and evidence to help the lives of others as much as possible.[3] He is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, where his work is focused on existential risk. BA in Phil and Comp Sci from Melbourne, BPhil in Phil from Oxford, PhD in Phil from Oxford. The precipice: existential risk and the future of humanity. Hachette Books, 2020.

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10 The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11 When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox. During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13 Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15 In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16 It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk. Our population now is a thousand times greater than over most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate.17 And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), SARS (probably bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds).18 Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate.19 Modern civilization may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the last 10,000 years.20 Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the last century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. 21 It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. But note that we are not merely interested in the direction of the change, but also in the size of the change. If we take the fossil record as evidence that the risk was less than one in 2,000 per century, then to reach 1 percent per century the pandemic risk would need to be at least 20 times larger. This seems unlikely. In my view, the fossil record still provides a strong case against there being a high extinction risk from “natural” pandemics. So most of the remaining existential risk would come from the threat of permanent collapse: a pandemic severe enough to collapse civilization globally, combined with civilization turning out to be hard to re-establish or bad luck in our attempts to do so.

#### No disease impact

– intervening actors check, resilience, burnout, and adaptation – this ev smokes them

Amesh 16 — (AMESH ADALJA is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh, 6-17-2016, "Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?," *The Atlantic*, http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/, Accessed 7-30-2016)

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians. The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies. HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk. Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care. Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt

to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions. While the immune system’s role can never be understated, an even more powerful protector is the faculty of consciousness. Humans are not the most prolific, quickly evolving, or strongest organisms on the planet, but as Aristotle identified, humans are the rational animals—and it is this fundamental distinguishing characteristic that allows humans to form abstractions, think in principles, and plan long-range. These capacities, in turn, allow humans to modify, alter, and improve themselves and their environments. Consciousness equips us, at an individual and a species level, to make nature safe for the species through such technological marvels as antibiotics, antivirals, vaccines, and sanitation. When humans began to focus their minds on the problems posed by infectious disease, human life ceased being nasty, brutish, and short. In many ways, human consciousness became infectious diseases’ worthiest adversary.

#### Inverse relationship between infection and lethality AND decreasing virulency

Ord 20 Dr. Toby Ord 20, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, DPhil in Philosophy from the University of Oxford, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Hachette Books, Kindle Edition, p. 124-126

Are we safe now from events like this? Or are we more vulnerable? Could a pandemic threaten humanity’s future?10

The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In 541 CE the Plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine Empire. Over three years it took the lives of roughly 3 percent of the world’s people.11

When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and especially smallpox.

During the next hundred years a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll—one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90 percent of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower.12 And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. As a rough upper bound, the Columbian exchange may have killed as many as 10 percent of the world’s people.13

Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Near the end of the First World War, a devastating strain of influenza (known as the 1918 flu or Spanish Flu) spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. At least a third of the world’s population were infected and 3 to 6 percent were killed.14 This death toll outstripped that of the First World War, and possibly both World Wars combined.

Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s longterm potential.15

[FOONOTE]

In addition to this historical evidence, there are some deeper biological observations and theories suggesting that pathogens are unlikely to lead to the extinction of their hosts. These include the empirical anti-correlation between infectiousness and lethality, the extreme rarity of diseases that kill more than 75% of those infected, the observed tendency of pandemics to become less virulent as they progress and the theory of optimal virulence. However, there is no watertight case against pathogens leading to the extinction of their hosts.

[END FOOTNOTE]

In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilization in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25 to 50 percent death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse of civilization. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have altered the course of history substantially, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilization is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale.

The 1918 flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development despite its global reach. It looks like it was lost in the wake of the First World War, which despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history.16

It is less clear what lesson to draw from the Columbian exchange due to our lack of good records and its mix of causes. Pandemics were clearly a part of what led to a regional collapse of civilization, but we don’t know whether this would have occurred had it not been for the accompanying violence and imperial rule. The strongest case against existential risk from natural pandemics is the fossil record argument from Chapter 3. Extinction risk from natural causes above 0.1 percent per century is incompatible with the evidence of how long humanity and similar species have lasted. But this argument only works where the risk to humanity now is similar or lower than the longterm levels. For most risks this is clearly true, but not for pandemics. We have done many things to exacerbate the risk: some that could make pandemics more likely to occur, and some that could increase their damage. Thus even “natural” pandemics should be seen as a partly anthropogenic risk.

#### b] Global Dispersal and Burnout

Farquhar et al. ’17 (Sebastian Farquhar – MPhysPhil @ the University of Oxford, Project Manager @ the Future of Humanity Institute @ Oxford, former Director of the Global Priorities Project. John Halstead. Owen Cotton-Barratt. Stefan Schubert. Haydn Belfield. Andrew Snyder-Beattie. “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

### Adv 2

### 1NC – Top-Level [Link]

#### Conceding WTO Credibility – the WTO is bad – yes the I/L is reverse causal since 1AC Meyer says collapse will happen in the Status Quo and the Plan prevents it.

### 1NC – WTO Bad [Regionalism Good]

#### Low WTO causes regional trade – yes trade-off

Isfeld 14 Gordon Isfeld 3-17-2014 business.financialpost.com/2014/03/17/with-rise-of-shot-gun-trade-agreements-is-the-wto-even-relevant-anymore/ “With the rise of 'shot-gun' trade agreements, is the WTO even relevant anymore” //Elmer

OTTAWA — It’s getting awfully crowded out there in the free-trading world. The seemingly endless hunt for new global partners is redefining the traditional and hard-fought rules of engagement between nations. So much so, observers say, the old world order — remember the WTO, and GATT before it — has increasingly become a sideshow to the proliferation of bilateral, **trilateral** **and**, often, **multi-lateral** agreements. Even the term “free trade” no longer accurately describes the “new world” of negotiations — one that encompasses far more than what and how products are permitted to slide under domestic tariff radars. For Canada, we can now add South Korea and the European Union — deals long in the making but only weeks in the signing — after a string of minor agreements since the landmark free trade act 25 years ago with the United States, and later to include Mexico. Now, as the growing mass of country-to-country, region-to-region agreements has made apparent, it’s open season on anything that moves between borders — not only products, investments and intellectual property, but also new rules on competition, and the inclusion of labour laws and environmental guidelines. These are just some of the areas of possible disputes that the World Trade Organization “does not deal with,” said Debra Steger, a professor of law at University of Ottawa, specializing in international trade and development. “These are new models. These are not traditional trade agreements, per se.” Ms. Steger, who worked for the federal government on the Uruguay Round of negotiations that led to formation of the WTO, said the framework of recent deals goes “way beyond subjects that NAFTA dealt with.” “Trade, even in the WTO, isn’t only about tariffs. It’s not just about customs and border measures,” she said. “But it’s not about behind-the-border regulatory matters, like environmental regulation and labour standards, competition policy and human rights, corruption, and on and on it goes.” Free trade, between where ever, has become the go-to issue for politicians, business leaders, public-policy makers and private interest groups. Note, this month’s sudden but long-rumoured announcement by the Harper government of a free-trade deal with South Korea, nearly 10 years after talks began and stumbled, and resumed again. Arguably, the deal was finally done as a result of the resolution to Canada’s drawn-out dispute with Seoul over our beef exports — the so-called “mad cow” disease leading to a ban in that county and others. Of course, the United States, the European Union and Australia, among others, already had agreements in hand with South Korea. A few months earlier, Ottawa inked its EU deal — the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement — which was again the outcome of a seemingly endless circle of negotiations that still left Canada trailing similar pacts by the U.S. and others. Even so, these pacts “affect the WTO and WTO negotiations for a number of reasons. That’s a major problem,” said Ms. Steger. “The major developed countries have gone off and started these efforts to negotiate these big FTAs [free trade agreements] as a response to the declining situation in the Doha Round. The WTO — reborn in 1995 out of the General Agreement and Tariffs and Trade, the original body created in 1948 — has been struggling to maintain its relevance as the global arbiter of trade agreements and dispute resolution. The cachet of the 159-member body, however, has been diminished in recent years as countries moved to seal their own free-trade deals with major partners in the absence, some would argue, of any significant movement by the WTO on its own 2001 trade liberalization initiative, launched in Doha, Qatar. Late last year, members managed to agree to only limited movement on trade under the Doha Round of talks. Even now, details remain to be worked out. “One of the reasons why we’re seeing this sort of shot-gun approach [to trade agreements outside of the WTO] is because a number of countries are concerned that the big global deals are probably next to impossible at this stage, given how the Doha Round went and what we ended up with there, which was next to nothing,” said Douglas Porter, chief economist at BMO Capital Markets in Toronto. “They did manage to reach a tiny deal when all was said and done, but it was very modest in terms of its scope.” The move toward bilateral or multi-lateral agreements “is a symptom of the problems that we were running into at the WTO,” Mr. Porter said. “Important players are probably quietly questioning the future for the WTO…. Is it that death knell for the WTO? I don’t think so. [But] it just means we might not be able to accomplish grand, global deals in the future.” However, “there’s really no other way to approach trade disputes with, say, a country like China, then through that body at this point.” “Even 10 years ago, I think it was more straightforward to come to global trade rules. You had two major players, Europe and the U.S., and a few next tier players, including Japan,” Mr. Porter said. “Now, though, you have all kinds of important big players that have a huge chunk of global trade, and have very different goals and aims, and it might be the nature of the global economy now — the reality that we have many different groups in many different regions. “It might be impossible to square that circle.” Over the course of 25 years, Canada has piled on more than a dozen free trade agreements. The first — taking effect on Jan. 1, 1989 — was with the United States. A heated political issue in the 1988 federal election, which Brian Mulroney’s Conservatives won, the FTA was expanded in 1994 to include Mexico and rebranded as NAFTA. Other free trade deals, though much smaller, were signed in subsequent years, some yet to take effect: Israel, Jordan and Chile, followed later by Costa Rica, Peru, Panama, Honduras and Colombia, leading up to the pacts with EU and South Korea. Negotiations are ongoing for at least another dozen agreements. For countries such as Colombia, which has had an agreement in effect with Canada since 2011, the goal is “to insert our economy into the world economy,” said Alvaro Concha, trade commissioner of Proexport Colombia, based in Toronto. “At the beginning of this decade, we had only our preferential access to over 500 million consumers,” Mr. Concha said. “With all the potential FTAs we’ve been signing with potential markets and with potential partners, we believe that not just the potential buyers of our products, but also the potential investors in our country, we have opened our preferential access to over 1.5 billion consumers.” Likely to push the WTO further into the shadows of global trade will be the Trans Pacific Partnership. “In many ways, the Trans Pacific Partnership will be, if it is successful, an updating of the NAFTA, because the U.S. and Mexico are involved, as well as some [trading] partners we already have within Latin America, like Peru,” said Ms. Steger, at the University of Ottawa. “But [there are] also some key countries in Asia that we don’t have agreements with yet. And some other developed countries in that regional, New Zealand and Australia, that we don’t have agreements with,” she adds. “So that [TPP] agreement is very, very important. It’s also the first major plur-lateral agreement that the world has seen.”

#### Regionalism promotes trade and stops war – avoids their impact because our regionalism is different than protectionist blocs.

Brkić 13, Snježana, and Adnan Efendic. "Regional Trading Arrangements–Stumbling Blocks or Building Blocks in the Process of Global Trade Liberalization?." 5th International Conference «Economic Integration, competition and cooperation», Croatia, Opatija. 2013. papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2239275 (Economics Prof at U of Sarajevo) //Elmer

Besides those advocating the optimistic or pessimistic view on regionalism effect on global trade liberalization, some economists, such as Frankel and Wei, hold a neutral position, in a way. Frankel and Wei believe that forms and achievements of international economic integrations can vary and that, for this reason, regionalism can be – depending on circumstances – linked to greater or smaller global trade liberalization. In the years-long period of regional integration development, four periods have been identified during which the integration processes were becoming particularly intensive and which have therefore been named "waves of regionalism". The first wave was taking place during the capitalism development in the second half of the 19th century, in the course of British sovereign domination over the world market. Economic integrations of the time primarily had the form of bilateral customs unions; however, owing to the comparative openness of international trading system based on the golden standard automatism, this period is called the "era of progressive bilateralism". The next two waves of **regionalism** occurred in the years following the world wars. Since the disintegration processes caused by the wars usually spawned economic nationalisms and autarchic tendencies, it is not surprising that post-war regionalisms were marked by discriminatory international economic integrations, primarily at the level of so-called negative integration, with expressedly “beggar-thy-neighbor” policies that resulted in considerable trade deviations. This particularly refers to the regionalism momentum after the First World War, which was additionally burdened by the consequences of Big Economic Crisis. The current wave of regionalism started in late 1980s and spread around the world to a far greater extent than any previous one did: it has covered almost all the continents and almost all the countries, even those which have mis to join all earlier regional initiatives, such as the USA, Canada, Japan and China. Integration processes, however, do not show any signs of flagging. Up till now, over 200 RTAs have been registered with GATT/WTO, more than 150 of them being still in force, and most of these valid arrangement have been made in the past ten years. Specific in many ways, this wave was dubbed "new regionalism". The most specific **characteristics** of new regionalism **include: geographic spread** **of RTAs** **in** terms of **encompassing entire continents;** **greater speed**; integration forms success; deepening of integration processes; **and**, the most important for this theoretical discussion, generally **non-negative impact on outsiders, world economy as a whole, and** the **multilateral liberalization** process. Some theorists (Gilpin) actually distinguish **between** the "**benign**" **and** "**malign**" **regionalism**. On the one hand, **regionalism can advance** the **international economic stability**, multilateral liberalization **and world peace**. On the other, it can have mercantilist features leading to economic well-being degradation and increasing international tensions and conflicts. Analyses of trends within the contemporary integration processes show that they mainly have features of "benign" regionalism. Reasons for this are numerous. **Forces driving** the **contemporary** **regionalism** development **differ from** those that used to drive **earlier** regionalism periods in the 20th century. The **present regionalism emerged in** the period characterized by the **increasing economic inter-dependence** between different world economy subjects, countries attempts to resolve trade disputes and multilateral framework of trade relations. As opposed to the 1930s episode, contemporary regional initiatives represent **attempts to make** the members' **participation in the world economy easier**, rather than make them more distant from it. As opposed to 1950s and 1960s episode, new **initiatives** are **less frequently motivated** **exclusively by political interests**, and are **less frequently** being used **for mercantilist purposes**. After the Second World War, more powerful countries kept using the economic integration as a means to strengthen their political influence on their weaker partners and outsiders. The examples include CMEA and European Community arrangements with its members' former colonies. As opposed to this practice, the new regionalism, mostly driven by common economic interests, yielded less trade diversion than previous one, and has also **contributed to** the **prevention of military conflicts of greater proportions**. Various analyses have shown that many regional integrations in earlier periods resulted in trade deviations, particularly those formed between less developed countries and between socialist countries. In recent years, however, the newly formed or revised regional **integrations** primarily seem to **lead to trade creation**. Contrary to the “beggar thy- neighbor” model of former international economic integrations, the integrations now offer certain advantages to outsiders as well, by stimulating growth and spurring the role of market forces. The analyses of contemporary trends in world economy also speak in favor of the "optimistic" proposition. The structural analysis shows that the world trade is growing and that this growth results both from the increase in intra-regional and from the increase in extra-regional trade value (Anderson i Snape 1994.)28. Actually, the intraregional trade has been growing faster, both by total value and by its share in world GDP. The extra-regional trade share in GDP was increasing in some regions – in North America, Asia-Pacific and Asian developing countries. However, the question arises as to whether the extra-regional trade would be greater without regional integrations or not? The answer would primarily depend both on the estimate of degree of some countries' trade policy restrictedness in such circumstances, and on factors such as geographic distance, transport communications, political relations among states. One should also take into account certain contemporary integration features – the primarily economic, rather than strategic motivation, and continuous expansion, which mostly includes countries that are significant economic partners. With respect to NAFTA, many believe that the negative effects on outsiders will be negligible, since the USA and Canada have actually been highly integrated economies for a long time already, while the Mexican economy is relatively small. The same view was pointed out by the EU, with respect to its expansion. It particularly refers to the inclusion of the remaining EFTA countries, because this will actually only complete, in institutional terms, the EU strong economic ties with these countries. Most EFTA countries have been part of the European economic area (EEA), i.e. the original EC-EFTA agreement, for a few years already, and conduct some 70% of their total international exchange with the Union countries. EU countries are also the most significant foreign-trade partners of Central and East Europe countries, and the recent joining the Union of several of them is not expected to cause a significant trade diversion. Besides, according to some earlier studies, during the previous wave of regionalism, in the 1967-70 period, the creation of trade in EEC was far greater than trade diversion: trade creation ranged from 13 to 23% of total imports, while trade diversion ranged from 1 to 6%. In Latin America, the new regionalism resulted in the faster growth of intra-regional trade, while the extra-regional exports and imports also continued to grow. Since early 1990s, the value of intra-regional imports registered the average annual growth of 18%. In the same time, the extra-regional exports were also growing, although at a lower rate of 9% average a year; its share in the total Latin America exports at the end of decade amounted to 18% as compared to 12% in 1990. In the 1990-1996 period, the intraregional imports grew by some 18% a year. The extra-regional imports were also growing very fast, reaching the 14% rate. These data reflect a great unbalance in the trade with extra-regional markets, since the imports from countries outside the region grew much faster the exports.30 Since the described trends point to the continued growth of extra-regional imports and exports, they also show that regional integration in Latin America has had the open regionalism character. Besides, the pending establishment of FTAA – Free Trade Area of Americas will gather, in the same group, the so-called "natural" trade partners – countries that have had an extremely extensive mutual exchange for years already, and the outsiders are therefore unlikely to be affected by strengthening of regionalism in this part of the world. Contemporary research shows that intra-regional trade is growing, however, same as interdependence between North America and East Asia and between the EU and East Asia. It can also be seen that the biggest and the **most powerful** countries, i.e. **blocs**, **are extremely dependent** **on the rest of the world in terms of trade.** For the EU, besides the intra-European trade, which is ranked first, foreign trade has the vital importance since it accounts for 10% of European GDP. In early 1990s, EU exchanged 40% of its foreign trade with non-members, 16% out of which with North America and East Asia together. EU therefore must keep in mind the rest of the world as well. The growing EU interest in outsiders is confirmed by establishing "The Euro-Med Partnership", which proclaimed a new form of cooperation between the EU and the countries at its South periphery32. Besides, the past few years witnessed a series of inter-regional agreements between the EU on the one hand, and certain groups from other regions on the other (MERCOSUR, CARICOM, ASEAN and GCC). In case of North America the ratio between intra-regional and inter-regional trade is 40:60, and in East Asia, it is 45:55. Any attempt to move towards significantly closed blocs ("fortresses") would require overcoming the significant inter-dependence between major trading blocs. Besides the analysis of contemporary trends in extra- and intra-regional trade, other research was conducted that was supposed to point to the reasons why the **new regionalism has** mainly a **non-negative impact on** outsiders and **global liberalization**. The distinctive features of new regionalism were also affected to characteristics of international economic and political environment it sprouted in. In the 1980s, economic nationalisms were not so expressed as in the interventionism years following the Second World War; however, the neo-liberalism represented by GATT activities did not find the "fertile ground” in all parts of the world. Regionalism growth in the circumstances of multilateral system existence is, among other things, the consequence of distrust in multilateralism. „The revival of the forces of regionalism stemmed from frustration with the slow pace of multilateral trade liberalization... If the world trade regime could not be moved ahead, then perhaps it was time for deeper liberalization within more limited groups of like-minded nations... Such efforts would at least liberalize some trade... and might even prod the other nations to go along with multilateral liberalization.“33 Kennedy's round and Tokyo round of trade negotiations under GATT auspices brought a certain progress in the global trade liberalization. However, the 1980s witnessed significant changes in the world economy that the GATT trade system was not up to. Besides. GATT had not yet managed to cover the entire trade in goods, since there were still exceptions in the trade in agricultural and textile products that particularly affected the USA and developing countries. GATT system of conflict resolutions, and its organizational and administrative mechanism in general also required revision. In this vacuum that was created in promoting trade and investment multilateralism from the point when GATT inadequacy became obvious until the start of the Uruguay round and the establishment of World Trade Organization, the wave of regionalism started spreading across the world again. Prodded by the Single European Act and the success of European integration, many countries turned to an alternative solution – establishment of new or expansion and deepening of the existing economic integrations. Even the USA, the multilateralism bastion until then, made a radical turn in their foreign-trade policy and started working on designing a North American integration.

#### That outweighs—multilateral trade causes wars with a larger impact

Thoma 7 Mark Thoma July 2007 “Trade Liberalization and War” <http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2007/07/trade-liberaliz.html> (Economics Professor at the University of Oregon)//Elmer

Globalisation is by construction an increase in both bilateral and multilateral trade flows. What then was the net effect of increased trade since 1970? We find that it **generated an increase in the probability of a bilateral conflict by** around **20%** for those **countries separated by less than 1000kms,** the group of countries for **which the risk of disputes that can escalate militarily is the highest.** The effects are much smaller for countries which are more distant. Contrary to what these results (aggravated by our nationality) may suggest, we are not anti-globalisation activists even though we are aware that some implications of our work could be (mis)used in such a way. The result that bilateral trade is pacifying brings several more optimistic implications on globalisation. First, if we think of a world war as a war between two large groups or coalitions of countries, then globalisation makes such a war less likely because it increases the opportunity cost of such a conflict. Obviously, this conclusion cannot be tested but is a logical implication of our results. From this point of view, our work suggests that globalisation may be at the origin of a change in the nature of conflicts, less global and more local. Second, our results do confirm that increased trade flows **created by regional trade agreements** (such as the EU) are indeed **pacifying** as intended. Given that most military conflicts are local, because they find their origins in border or ethnic disputes, **this is not a small achievement**. These beneficial political aspects of regional trade agreements are not usually considered by economists who often focus on the economic distortions brought by their discriminatory nature. Given the huge human and economic costs of wars, this political effect of regional trade agreements should not be discounted. This opens interesting questions on how far these regional trade agreements should extend – a topical issue in the case of the EU. The entry of Turkey in the EU would indeed pacify its relations with EU countries (especially Greece and Cyprus), but also increase the probability of a conflict between Turkey and its non-EU neighbours. However, our simulations suggest that in this case, the first effect dominates the second by a large margin. More generally, our results should be interpreted as a word of caution on some political aspects of globalisation. As it proceeds and weakens the economic ties of proximate countries, those with the highest risk of disputes that can escalate into military conflicts, local conflicts may become more prevalent. Even if they may not appear optimal on purely economic grounds, regional and bilateral trade agreements, by strengthening local economic ties, may therefore **be a necessary political counterbalance to economic globalisation**.

#### 2] Regionalism solves – it’s a building block – prefer gradual change to immediate ones.

Brkić 13, Snježana, and Adnan Efendic. "Regional Trading Arrangements–Stumbling Blocks or Building Blocks in the Process of Global Trade Liberalization?." 5th International Conference «Economic Integration, competition and cooperation», Croatia, Opatija. 2013. papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2239275 (Economics Prof at U of Sarajevo) //Elmer

There are **over 180 independent states** in the modern world, most of which **differ** enormously **in economic development and power**. World economy is therefore a battlefield of varied interests expressed in the action of different national economic policies. In such conditions, **attempts to integrate** world **economy** **by global liberalization of** international **trade cannot yield** significant **results overnight.** Global free trade is considered the first best solution, but is not feasible immediately and at once, since too many people believe that they would lose with global liberalization. According to the view believed to be optimistic, creation of international economic integrations could be a distinctive inter-step in the process of free world market creation. Lester Thurow points out: "In the long run, **regionalism** development **could be favorable** for the world. **Free trade within regions** and regulated trade between regions **could be** the **proper road to free world trade in a long term**. The shift from national to world economy at once would be too big a jump. One should first make a few smaller inter-steps, and pseudo-trading blocs coupled with regulated trade could be such a necessary inter-step." The essential rationale of this view is actually the speed of reforms - the gradual versus “big bang” approach. Many contemporary economists, in their analyses of world economy trends, conclude that political forces behind regional integration show signs of consistency with those acting towards global world trade. According to the optimistic view, the multilateralization process is slowed down by different standpoints on the free trade usefulness, by economic nationalisms, even by varying political interests, and therefore another way had to be found in order to achieve the world market integration – a slower one, but more effective in the existing constellation of international economic relations. This view denies the opposition between regionalism and multilateralism, and explains it as follows: Since integration improves economic relations between members through removing trading and other barriers, and since all these integrated regions are part of the world territory, the advancement of economic relations within regions can be understood as the advancement of global economic relations. Regional trading, i.e. economic blocs would in this case be only a bypass towards the creation of unified world market. "... What could not be achieved in global relations was achieved within regions, through multilateralization of the European economic area. These achievements were later followed by many countries in other world regions, in their mutual relations practice. Practically, we thus got regional multilateralisms." Regionalism advocates also point out that the formation of economic integrations could facilitate the pending WTO negotiation rounds. Actually, the Uruguay round was partly protracted due to a great number of participants and the "free riders" issue. Viewed in broader context, one could say that regionalism contributes to overall globalization as well, since these are processes motivated from the same source. Both regionalism and globalization are driven by big capital interests, and that these two phenomena are actually ways to make the centuries-long capitalism aspiration – unified world market - come true. According to this view, the globalization process as a process of world economy functional integration under the circumstances of imperfect market and hegemony weakening early in the 20th century has to be supported by the institutional component, either on a multilateral basis through international organizations and institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and WTO, or on regional scale through regional trading arrangements.

### 1NC – AT: Trade Impact [AT Lake]

#### [AT Lake] I’ll answer the Trade Impact here:

#### 1] Current Regional Trade isn’t Great Power Competition – it’s regional integration that’s far more open which takes out their Exclusion I/L – that’s 1NC Brkic.

#### 2] Their card concedes a] the impact isn’t inevitable BUT driven by contingent choices which we control the U/Q that countries won’t by driven by those Great Power competitions and b] protectionism is driven by domestic forces – if that’s true, then WTO credibility doesn’t matter and they’ll defy the WTO anyways – here’s a re-highlighting.

1AC Lake 18. [(David Lake is a Professor of Social Sciences and Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. "Economic Openness and Great Power Competition: Lessons for China and the United States,” April 30, 2018. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3171196/>] TDI

I develop two central arguments. First, historically, great power competition has been driven primarily by exclusion or fears of exclusion from each power’s international economic zone, including its domestic market. Great powers in the past have often used their international influence to build zones in which subordinate polities – whether these be colonies or simply states within a sphere of influence – are integrated into their economies. These economic zones, in turn, are typically biased in favor of the great power’s firms and investors, with the effect of excluding (in whole or part) the economic agents of other great powers. These other great powers, in response, are then compelled to develop or expand their own exclusive economic zones. The “race” for economic privilege can quickly divide the world up into economic blocs. Like the security dilemma, great powers need not actually exclude one another from their zones; the fear of exclusion alone is enough to ignite the process of division. The race for privilege then draws great powers into over-expanding into unprofitable regions and, more important, militarized competition. Economic and military competition are thus linked, with the former usually driving the latter. The most significant military crises have, historically, been over where to draw the boundaries between economic zones and subsequent challenges to those boundaries. Economic closure and fear of closure have been consistent sources of great power conflict in the past – and possibly will be in the future. The **major exception** to this trend **was** the **peaceful transfer of** **dominance** **in Latin America** from Britain to the United States in the late nineteenth century. This suggests that **economic closure and great power competition** **is not inevitable**, **but a choice of the great powers themselves**. Second, this **international competition is driven**, in turn, **by domestic**, rent-seeking groups and their economic **interests**. In all countries, scarce factors of production, import competing sectors, and domestically-oriented firms have concentrated and intense preferences for market restricting policies, including tariffs and the formation of exclusive economic zones. Consumers and free trade-oriented groups have diffuse preferences for market enhancing policies, and thus tend to lose at the ballot box and in the making of national policy. This inequality in preference intensity does not mean protectionists always win; after 1934, the United States insulated itself by shifting authority to the executive and negotiating reductions through broad, multi-product international agreements.8 Yet, as the recent return to economic nationalism of the Trump administration suggests, protectionism often wins out. Rent-seeking is **a central tendency, not an inevitable success.** Contemporary great power relations are at a critical juncture. As China’s influence expands, the role of special economic interests in China is especially worrisome. In pursuit of stability, political support, or private gains, the government will always be tempted to create economic zones that favor its nationals. In this way, China will be no different than the majority of great powers before it. But, given the expansive role of the state in the Chinese economy, especially its backing of outward foreign investments by its state-owned enterprises (SOEs), and the close ties between business elites and its authoritarian political leaders, however, it will be even harder for China to resist biasing any future economic zone to benefit its own firms. Although China has gained greatly from economic openness, its domestic political system will be prone to rent-seeking demands by important constituents in areas of future influence. Critically, the United States is also moving toward economic closure with the election of President Trump on a platform of economic nationalism. Demands for protection against Chinese goods have been growing over time.9 The “China shock” that followed Beijing’s joining the World Trade Organization was a huge disruption to the international division of labor, U.S. comparative advantage, and especially U.S. industry.10 The Trans-Pacific Partnership, though now defunct, was “marketed” by President Barak Obama as a means of “containing” China, both economically and militarily, but was opposed by virtually all of the candidates in the 2016 presidential election for its trade-enhancing potential. President Trump has already signaled a much more hostile and protectionist stance toward China – as well as calling for the repeal of NAFTA and even questioning the utility of the European Union. Not only has he imposed tariffs on washing machines, solar panels, steel and aluminum, dangerously declaring the latter two issues of national security, he is making exceptions on these tariffs for friends and allies. 11 Implicitly targeting China, these protectionist moves by the administration risk creating preferential trading blocs not seen since the 1930s. He has also now proposed punitive tariffs on over $60 billions of imports from China into the United States.12 Acknowledging his inconsistencies on many policy issues, Trump’s economic nationalism has remained the core of his political agenda. The threat to the liberal international economy is not only that China might seek an economic bloc in the future, but that the United States itself is turning more exclusionary. For each great power to fear that the other might seek to exclude it from its economic zone is not unreasonable. If so, great power competition could break out in the twenty-first century not because of bipolarity or any inevitable tendency toward conflict, but because neither great power can control its own protectionist forces nor signal to the other that it would not exclude it from its economic zone. The British-U.S. case, again, suggests that exclusion and competition are not inevitable, but the current danger of economic closure is real and increasing. This article is synthetic in its theory and merely suggestive in its use of historical evidence. The theory aims to integrate current work on political economy and national security, not to develop a completely original take on this relationship. In turn, rather than testing the theory in any rigorous sense or delving into particular cases to show the theoretical mechanisms at work, so to speak, it surveys selected historical episodes to illustrate central tendencies. It is the recurring pattern across multiple cases that suggests why we should worry today. The remainder of this essay is divided in three primary sections. Section I briefly outlines the analytics of economic openness and great power competition. Section II focuses on historical instances of great power competition, highlighting the role of economic openness as a central cleavage in international politics. Section III examines contemporary policies in and between China and the United States. The conclusion suggests ways that the potential for conflict may be mitigated. The Open Economy Politics of Great Power Competition All states have a tendency towards protectionism at home and exclusive economic zones abroad. A tendency, though, is not an inevitability. The pursuit of protection and economic zones by domestic interests is conditioned by the political coalition in power at any given time and institutions that aggregate and bias the articulation of social groups. 13 The tendency is also influenced, however, by the actions of other countries. Protectionism can sour great power relations, but it is the desire for exclusive economic zones that drives great power competition and, given the possibility of coercion, influences grand strategy. Thus, the theory sketched here integrates insights from international political economy (see below), the literature on domestic politics and grand strategy,14 and systemic theories of international relations.15

#### 3] Regionalism solves – it’s a building block – prefer gradual change to immediate ones.

Brkić 13, Snježana, and Adnan Efendic. "Regional Trading Arrangements–Stumbling Blocks or Building Blocks in the Process of Global Trade Liberalization?." 5th International Conference «Economic Integration, competition and cooperation», Croatia, Opatija. 2013. papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2239275 (Economics Prof at U of Sarajevo) //Elmer

There are **over 180 independent states** in the modern world, most of which **differ** enormously **in economic development and power**. World economy is therefore a battlefield of varied interests expressed in the action of different national economic policies. In such conditions, **attempts to integrate** world **economy** **by global liberalization of** international **trade cannot yield** significant **results overnight.** Global free trade is considered the first best solution, but is not feasible immediately and at once, since too many people believe that they would lose with global liberalization. According to the view believed to be optimistic, creation of international economic integrations could be a distinctive inter-step in the process of free world market creation. Lester Thurow points out: "In the long run, **regionalism** development **could be favorable** for the world. **Free trade within regions** and regulated trade between regions **could be** the **proper road to free world trade in a long term**. The shift from national to world economy at once would be too big a jump. One should first make a few smaller inter-steps, and pseudo-trading blocs coupled with regulated trade could be such a necessary inter-step." The essential rationale of this view is actually the speed of reforms - the gradual versus “big bang” approach. Many contemporary economists, in their analyses of world economy trends, conclude that political forces behind regional integration show signs of consistency with those acting towards global world trade. According to the optimistic view, the multilateralization process is slowed down by different standpoints on the free trade usefulness, by economic nationalisms, even by varying political interests, and therefore another way had to be found in order to achieve the world market integration – a slower one, but more effective in the existing constellation of international economic relations. This view denies the opposition between regionalism and multilateralism, and explains it as follows: Since integration improves economic relations between members through removing trading and other barriers, and since all these integrated regions are part of the world territory, the advancement of economic relations within regions can be understood as the advancement of global economic relations. Regional trading, i.e. economic blocs would in this case be only a bypass towards the creation of unified world market. "... What could not be achieved in global relations was achieved within regions, through multilateralization of the European economic area. These achievements were later followed by many countries in other world regions, in their mutual relations practice. Practically, we thus got regional multilateralisms." Regionalism advocates also point out that the formation of economic integrations could facilitate the pending WTO negotiation rounds. Actually, the Uruguay round was partly protracted due to a great number of participants and the "free riders" issue. Viewed in broader context, one could say that regionalism contributes to overall globalization as well, since these are processes motivated from the same source. Both regionalism and globalization are driven by big capital interests, and that these two phenomena are actually ways to make the centuries-long capitalism aspiration – unified world market - come true. According to this view, the globalization process as a process of world economy functional integration under the circumstances of imperfect market and hegemony weakening early in the 20th century has to be supported by the institutional component, either on a multilateral basis through international organizations and institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and WTO, or on regional scale through regional trading arrangements.

### 1NC – AT: Econ Impact

#### No Economic Transition Wars – prefer post-COVID evidence

Walt 20 Stephen M Walt 5-13-2020 "Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?" <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/> (Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University.)//Elmer

For these reasons, the pandemic itself may be conducive to peace. But what about the relationship between broader economic conditions and the likelihood of war? Might a few leaders still convince themselves that provoking a crisis and going to war could still advance either long-term national interests or their own political fortunes? Are the other paths by which a deep and sustained economic downturn might make serious global conflict more likely? One familiar argument is the so-called diversionary (or “scapegoat”) theory of war. It suggests that leaders who are worried about their popularity at home will try to divert attention from their failures by provoking a crisis with a foreign power and maybe even using force against it. Drawing on this logic, some Americans now worry that President Donald Trump will decide to attack a country like Iran or Venezuela in the run-up to the presidential election and especially if he thinks he’s likely to lose. This outcome strikes me as unlikely, even if one ignores the logical and empirical flaws in the theory itself. War is always a gamble, and should things go badly—even a little bit—it **would hammer the last nail** in the coffin of Trump’s declining fortunes. Moreover, none of the countries Trump might consider going after **pose an imminent threat** to U.S. security, and even his staunchest supporters may wonder why he is wasting time and money going after Iran or Venezuela at a moment when thousands of Americans are dying preventable deaths at home. Even a successful military action won’t put Americans back to work, create the sort of testing-and-tracing regime that competent governments around the world have been able to implement already, or hasten the development of a vaccine. The same logic is likely to guide the decisions of other world leaders too. Another familiar folk theory is “military Keynesianism.” War generates a lot of economic demand, and it can sometimes lift depressed economies out of the doldrums and back toward prosperity and full employment. The obvious case in point here is World War II, which did help the U.S economy finally escape the quicksand of the Great Depression. Those who are convinced that great powers go to war primarily to keep Big Business (or the arms industry) happy are naturally drawn to this sort of argument, and they might worry that governments looking at bleak economic forecasts will try to restart their economies through some sort of military adventure. I doubt it. It takes a really big war to generate a significant stimulus, and it is **hard to imagine** any country launching a large-scale war—with all its attendant risks—at a moment **when debt** levels are already soaring. More importantly, there are lots of easier and more direct **ways to stimulate the economy**—**infrastructure spending, unemployment insurance, even “helicopter payments**”—and launching a war has to be one of the least efficient methods available. The threat of war usually spooks investors too, which any politician with their eye on the stock market would be loath to do. Economic downturns can encourage war in some special circumstances, especially when a war would enable a country facing severe hardships to capture something of immediate and significant value. Saddam Hussein’s decision to seize Kuwait in 1990 fits this model perfectly: The Iraqi economy was in terrible shape after its long war with Iran; unemployment was threatening Saddam’s domestic position; Kuwait’s vast oil riches were a considerable prize; and seizing the lightly armed emirate was exceedingly easy to do. Iraq also owed Kuwait a lot of money, and a hostile takeover by Baghdad would wipe those debts off the books overnight. In this case, Iraq’s parlous economic condition clearly made war more likely. Yet I cannot think of any country in similar circumstances today. Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that Trump occasionally hints at—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible. If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished. On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, **there would be a lot more** of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).” Second**, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick** and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself. The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success. Third, and most important, **the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain**. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term. To be sure, I can’t rule out another powerful cause of war—stupidity—especially when it is so much in evidence in some quarters these days. So there is no guarantee that we won’t see misguided leaders stumbling into another foolish bloodletting. But given that it’s hard to find any rays of sunshine at this particular moment in history, I’m going to hope I’m right about this one.