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### 1

#### Interp: The affirmative must correctly tell the negative which aff they will be reading, including any and all changes, within ten minutes of pairings being released.

#### Violation: screenshots – they wouldn’t tell me if there was a util advantage or which Kant fw even 25min later - at 5min before, they still didn't tell me what util advantage or which Kant fw– said it was most similar to most recent on the wiki but its completely different – no util adv

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generatedBackground pattern

Description automatically generated with low confidenceGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Negate:

#### 1] Prep and clash - they force us to spend pre-round prep prepping the wrong advantage which means I’m unprepared to engage - that decks clash and fairness

#### 2] No offense for disclosure bad - they posted cites on the wiki for all their affs but didn't give us the correct advantages till 10 minutes before - the only offense was us not being able to anticipate or prep the right advantage pre round because they forced us to split our time - proves any responses are in bad faith

#### 3] Academic integrity – you hide the aff for your own advantage which is the definition of being academically disingenuous. That’s a voter since it destroys the constitutive purpose of debate as an educational activity.

#### Voters:

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

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

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

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) baiting – incentivizes good debaters to be abusive, bait theory, then collapse to the 1AR RVI, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

#### Evaluate disclosure before 1AR theory – a) scope of norming – affects more rounds over time so it rectifies more abuse, b) magnitude – the aff advocacy and disclosure affects a larger portion of the debate since it determines every speech after it and pre round neg prep c) any 1nc abuse was justified by the aff not being properly disclosed

### 3

**Moral Realism is true – there is an ethical truth that exists metaphysically: a) otherwise we could not make moral claims since we would merely claim disagreement rather than an absolute wrong, justifying any ethical statement b) regressive moral debates always terminate in an endpoint of agreement, we just compare different values in an attempt to find the ultimate one.**

#### Synthetic a posteriori moral naturalism is the basis of realist ethics:

#### A] The normative supervenes on the natural – natural facts like whether brains develop to permit rationality or subjectivity determine whether non naturalist moral facts can be premised on things like capacity for reason

**Lutz and Lenman 18.** Lutz, Matthew and Lenman, James, "Moral Naturalism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/naturalism-moral/>. //Massa

The first argument against normative non-naturalism concerns normative supervenience. **The normative supervenes on the natural; in all** metaphysically **possible worlds in which the natural facts are the same as** they are in **the actual world, the moral facts are the same** as well. **This** claim **has been called the “least controversial thesis in metaethics”** (Rosen forthcoming); **it is very widely accepted.** But it is also a striking fact that stands in need of some explanation. **For naturalists**, such an explanation is easy to provide: **the moral facts just are natural facts, so when we consider worlds that are naturally the same** as the actual world, **we will ipso facto be considering worlds that are morally the same** as the actual world. But for the non-naturalist, no such explanation seems available. In fact, **it seems** to be in principle **impossible for a non-naturalist to explain how the moral supervenes on the natural.** And if the non-naturalist can offer no explanation of this phenomenon that demands explanation, this is a heavy mark against non-naturalism (McPherson 2012).

#### That outweighs – controversy prevents acting on moral laws, but lack of philosophical controversy on the correlation between moral and natural facts indicates naturalism guides action.

#### B] The problem of disagreement – resolving a priori conflicts requires indicting the epistemological basis of one’s judgement with a reliable process for deriving moral truths which is impossible given widespread moral disagreement about non verifiable a priori truth – grounding ethics with verifiable natural facts solve

#### Next, phenomenal introspection can bridge the gap from experiential natural facts to moral truths and necessitates hedonism. When I observe a lemon’s yellowness shifting my visual fields from darker to lighter shades, I can introspect on that experience and identify brightness as an intrinsic property of seeing a lemon. Similarly, when I feel pleasure, I can introspect on the shift in hedonic tones and identify that goodness is an intrinsic property of the pleasure that was increased.

#### This connection between pain and pleasure and phenomenal conceptions of intrinsic value and disvalue is irrefutable – everything else regresses – robust neuroscience proves.
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**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].

Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].

Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.

Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D

Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.

It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.

Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding.

There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.

Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.

Finding happiness is different between apes and humans

As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.

Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.

Desire and reward centers

It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.

In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].

Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].

Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].

Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.

Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]

In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.

In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.

Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### Finally, the Darwinian dilemma proves the accuracy of introspection and the failure of every non utilitarian ethic. Moral beliefs we hold have shift as we evolve which means either moral facts have changed which contradicts moral realism or evolution has randomly just now led us to moral truth. The latter is statistically impossible since evolution doesn’t track morality – there is no pressure to identify moral truths that have no bearing on survival and reproduction.

#### Hedonism escapes this dilemma through the byproduct hypothesis since natural selection proves the reliability of phenomenal introspection. When we introspect for survival on data from our eyes or ears, such as whether one sees or smells food or a predator, we use the same part of the brain that introspects on hedonic tones and identifies their moral relevance. The ability to correctly identify moral truths is evolutionarily advantageous if and only if that ability is a byproduct of a different trait that enables survival and reproduction.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with hedonic act utilitarianism. Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity –

#### A] Governments must aggregate because their policies benefit some and harm others

#### B] No intent-foresight distinction for governments – deliberating over an action requires analysis of foreseen consequences which could be prevented which makes them intrinsic to state action

#### C] Governments aren’t singular rational agents which makes theories about individuals irrelevant – only consequentialism solves by analyzing ends divorced from an actor

Ows their aspec warrants – is ought/ role of is as much good

#### 2] No act-omission distinction – governments are culpable for omissions cuz their purpose is to protect the constituency – otherwise they would have no obligation to make murder illegal. Actor spec o/w – different agents have different ethical standings that affect their obligations and considerations.

#### 3] Extinction comes first – moral theories converge

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

### 4

#### India walked out on RCEP now but can rejoin easily.

Raghavan 20 “RCEP: Door still open for India, may take part in meets as ‘observer’” Prabha Raghavan [Journalist @IndianExpress] November 16, 2020 <https://indianexpress.com/article/business/rcep-door-still-open-for-india-may-take-part-in-meets-as-observer-7052832/> SM

India, as an original negotiating participant of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), has the option of joining the agreement without having to wait 18 months as stipulated for new members in the terms of the mega trade pact. RCEP signatory states said they plan to commence negotiations with India once it submits a request of its intention to join the pact “in writing”, and it may participate in meetings as an observer prior to its accession. While India had been involved in RCEP negotiations since 2013, it walked out of the pact last year citing “significant outstanding issues” that were unresolved by the deadline to enter the agreement.

#### Strict IP protections are keeping India out of RCEP – plan reverses that.

Mitra-Jha 17 “Big pharma, IP wars and profit over people” Shreerupa Mitra-Jha [Senior correspondent for diplomacy and international affairs] August 21, 2017 <https://www.governancenow.com/news/regular-story/-big-pharma-ip-wars-and-profit-over-people> SM

Sticking points As is typical of many mega FTA negotiations, RCEP talks are shrouded in secrecy. The scope of the possible deal is staggering which aims to cover agreements on goods, services, investments, tariff and non-tariff barriers, technical cooperation, competition and intellectual property (IP) rights. The little that is known of the RCEP text, however, has rattled some Indian businessmen and activists alike. Reportedly, there were important talks finalising the maximum number of duty-free goods. Several governments want India to eliminate duties on about 90 percent of traded goods as part of the FTA. This may not be easy for India to agree to. Apart from other considerations, this could also affect the prime minister’s flagship programme of ‘Make in India’. “India’s trade deficit [annual] with RCEP nations is about $100 billion, and half of this is with China alone even without an FTA with China,” Siddhartha Roy, economic advisor, Tata Group, told The Hindu after the Hyderabad talks began. “Post India’s FTA with ASEAN, Japan and Korea [who are all RCEP members], our trade deficit with them have increased, and the government needs to take this into account during RCEP negotiations,” he added. India, on the other hand, wants greater market access for its services sector including IT/ITeS but finds its interests at odds with many of the developed nations who oppose this demand. This is a battle that India is also fighting at the Geneva-based World Trade Organisation (WTO) where it has submitted a proposal for a Trade Facilitation in Services on similar lines as the recently-adopted Trade Facilitation Agreement in goods. The proposal is being opposed by many of the richer member states. The most contentious part of the text, and possibly one that will have the most wide-reaching impact globally, however, is around IP issues. The award-winning American NGO Knowledge Ecology International (KEI) leaked parts of the RCEP’s IP-related text in 2015. The demands are nothing new or surprising. Like most FTAs that involve India, the pharmaceutical-hosting countries, like Japan and South Korea, want India to rein in its thriving generic industry, which has given India its moniker as the pharmacy of the developing world. Other FTAs that have similar IP asks are the EU-India FTA and the India-EFTA (European Free Trade Association comprising Switzerland, Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein) FTA – they have also run into a logjam. Additionally, like for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the RCEP draft text asks for the setting up of an Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism (more below), which allows private parties to drag governments to private courts, including for IP matters. RCEP, like many other FTAs, has IP protection requirements that not only go beyond international laws drawn up at the WTO through the agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) but are also Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA)-Plus. TRIPS protection grants the applicant a right to exclude others for a 20-year period from the date of filing. This is considered the length of a patent following which it can be accessed and used by anyone. The RCEP draft text proposes to increase patent terms beyond the stipulated 20 years, which ensures that patent holders can ward off generic competition and maintain artificially high prices. The proposed text also asks for data exclusivity for five years, which would protect results of clinical trial data that tests if a drug is safe and effective for human use. This means that generic drug manufacturers cannot rely on this data and have to conduct their own tests for submission to regulatory agencies, a process that can take several years, thus, again, preventing their entry into the competitive market. Additionally, sources indicate that Japan wanted to tamper with section 3(d) of the Indian Patents Act, which stipulates that the mere discovery of a new form of a known substance that does not enhance the known efficacy of that substance is not patentable. This was scrapped off after fierce opposition from India and other RCEP negotiating countries. What is at stake? To be precise: a lot. Barriers to entry of generic medicines to the market make drugs prohibitively expensive since their entry is the most effective way of reducing prices of essential medicines as well as ensure access to treatment. For instance, in 2001, the price of HIV medicines came down from $10,439 per patient per year to $350 per patient per year owing to competition from Indian generic manufacturers, mostly Cipla. Patented medicines have ensured that treatments to diseases like multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB), cancer, hepatitis-C are beyond the reach of most, even in rich European countries and the US. Health ministries, humanitarian medical treatment providers such as Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) have relied on affordable, quality generic medicines to address public health challenges. India manufactures two-thirds of all generic medicines, including 80 percent of all HIV medicines, while China is a big producer of active pharmaceutical ingredients (API) for the drug industry. “If the most aggressive provisions in the RCEP are in the final agreement, it will create a host of new barriers to making, selling and obtaining generic drugs and vaccines. Prices will be even higher and monopolies will last longer for new drugs,” Jamie Love, director of KEI, says. “The promise of access to medicines for all will become even more empty, and more a slogan than a reality. Negotiators who advocate TRIPS plus provisions on medicines should be ashamed, and acknowledge the consequences and their role in the outcome,” he adds. Japan’s negotiating text on IP is TRIPS-plus and if accepted it will roll back public health safeguards enshrined in international and Indian patent law, MSF says in a letter written to the Indian commerce minister, Nirmala Sitharaman, in August 2014. “They have not realised that ACTA is coming through the backdoor. Majority of the text is about IP enforcement ensuring that there is such a chilling effect that no generic manufacturer or third-party challenges their patents in court. They are skewing the judicial system in their favour,” Leena Menghaney, regional head of South Asia, MSF Access Campaign, told Governance Now. The draft text, if adopted with its current proposals, would impair legitimate trade between developing countries. It would allow the raiding of manufacturing premises of generic companies and the seizing of materials used for the manufacture of generics that includes API and machinery, say health activists. “The IP enforcement part is not something that countries are paying much attention on. Japan, Australia, South Korea are pushing very hard against Indonesia, Thailand, India and China,” Menghaney says. As pharmaceutical lobbies grow more powerful with active funding for political parties in many countries across the world, governments are succumbing to negotiating to further the lobbies’ interests. Japan is one such country, which is insisting on stricter IP rules, for instance, with a drug patented by Otsuka for the treatment of extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis. “The company has been strategically withholding the registration of the patent in India, thereby preventing a generic version of the drug from being manufactured,” writes Feroz Ali, IPR chair professor at IIT Madras, in the Hindu. “In the event that a provision of data exclusivity is passed, the millions of TB patients in India would have to buy the high-priced drugs, which would have no cheaper generic alternative,” he adds. He further argues that if India has an agreement with Japan through the RCEP, India will be obliged to offer the same concessions to other members of the WTO through the most-favoured-nation clause. “It is evident that developed countries are using FTAs to expand the existing standards of IP,” he writes. WTO is clear that such stringent IP protection is to be reserved for commercial piracy only – validity of drug patents have to be tested by courts first. According to WTO rules, governments can tailor their national IP policies taking into consideration a country’s economic, developmental and other objectives, including public health. Furthermore, least developed countries (LDCs) are allowed to maintain maximum flexibility in their approach to patenting pharmaceutical products until at least 2033, following a decision taken by the WTO’s Council for TRIPS in November last year. “The value of the WTO was supposed to be a rules-based trading regime with protections for weaker parties. The FTA negotiations have embraced indefensible secrecy to push an agenda that benefits the powerful and the rich at the expense of everyone else,” argues Love. Till now, India has had a “good position” on the RCEP negotiations and some other FTAs, says Menghanay, but the devil lies in the details. ASEAN is being represented by Singapore and Singapore has traditionally stood by TRIPS-plus provisions. This is what is worrying for activists and negotiators from middle-income and LDCs.

#### Joining RCEP floods India with imports which guts domestic industry and wrecks the economy.

Dhar 19 “India Was Right to Walk Away from RCEP, But What Comes Next?” November 7, 2019, [Biswajit Dhar is a professor at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawharlal Nehru University] <https://thewire.in/economy/rcep-india-future> SM

Few realised that for the first time in post-independence India, a cross-section of domestic constituencies, including farmers, trade unions, representatives of major sectors of Indian industry and civil society organisations, spoke in one voice against the threats to their future posed by the RCEP. They gave a clear message that ceding the country’s economic space to foreign businesses by accepting the trade liberalisation commitments under RCEP would deal a body blow to the interests of domestic players. In other words, RCEP would have hurt an already stressed economy, which is saddled with a perceptible slowdown in the manufacturing sector coupled with an increasingly distressed farming sector. There were adequate reasons for India to avoid hopping on to the RCEP bandwagon when it was first proposed in 2012. India had concluded three free trade negotiations (FTAs) with ASEAN, Korea and Japan, and the benefits of concluding these deals were being questioned by farmers’ organisations and some state governments. However, those backing the deals saw benefits for India in terms of enhanced market access in one of the most dynamic regions and participation in regional value chains. Watch: ‘RCEP Is Neither Necessary nor Sufficient for Us to Achieve Our Export Targets’ The reality of these FTAs became apparent before long, with India failing to take advantage of any of the purported benefits. Expansion of exports were much below expectations, but imports from the FTA partners kept increasing since India had reduced/eliminated its relatively high tariffs. India’s participation in the value chains, too, became a distant dream. The NDA government fully understood this reality and took measured steps to engage in the RCEP negotiations in at least two important areas: market access to RCEP participating countries (RPCs), and protection and promotion of foreign investment. In the area of market access, India’s initial offer showed that the government had factored in the adverse implications of the three existing FTAs. A modest increase in market access was offered to ASEAN, Korea and Japan, its existing FTA partners. Further, the most significant RPC, namely China, was promised relatively less market access, the logic being that if China was able to establish such a large presence in the Indian market even when its products did not receive preferential tariffs, grant of tariff preferences to China under RCEP could result in rapid expansion of the Chinese footprint. But India’s initial offer was rejected by the RPCs, and the mandate of the RCEP, “progressively eliminating tariff and non-tariff barriers on substantially all trade” and achieving “high level of tariff liberalisation”, seemed to have been accepted by India. Also read: Why India Shouldn’t View its Refusal to Join RCEP as a Victory As regards the protection and promotion of foreign investment, RCEP negotiations saw the major economies among the RPCs, except India, argue in favour of an investment agreement that gave a strong endorsement to investor rights, often at the expense of the host country. India’s view was to the contrary mainly because foreign investors had taken advantage of the dispute settlement clauses (the so-called investor state dispute settlement mechanism, or ISDS) in the bilateral investment treaties that India had signed up to, and had taken the government of India into international arbitration. After India lost the first dispute in 2012, a review of the bilateral treaties was undertaken, an exercise that was completed in 2015. The NDA government revised the model text for the Indian bilateral investment treaty, which provided several safeguards against excesses by foreign investors. The government announced that future investment agreements negotiated by India would be based on the model text. However, RCEP investment negotiations did not have any space for India’s suggestions. Given the aforementioned, several issues arise regarding India’s continued engagement in RCEP negotiations. The first is the justification of remaining engaged when the government’s initial assessment of RCEP was clearly downbeat. In fact, this assessment was identical to those voiced by the stakeholders about the imminent risks of joining RCEP. A second issue arises with respect to the process that was followed while engaging in the negotiations. Here again, the government showed its willingness to put in the public domain its initial negotiating stance on the important issue of market access in the starting stages of the negotiations. This was in keeping with the democratic traditions of decision-making. But this changed dramatically afterwards, for in the critical later stages, the government negotiated the country’s economic future in complete secrecy. Also read: Invoking Mahatma Gandhi to Stay out of RCEP Is a Lazy Act A third issue relates to assessments of possible outcomes of the RCEP negotiations, which the government or its agencies never attempted, or even if they did, the assessments were not put in the public domain. Although the government was reluctant to walk this path, it had become clear from the implementation of the ASEAN, Korea and Japan FTAs, 12 of the 15 RPCs, that the growing trade deficits would become unsustainable after joining RCEP. What also became clear was that while in the three existing FTAs, India was able to protect the vulnerabilities in agriculture and the sensitive industries in the manufacturing sector, RCEP opens these sectors to import competition. Already suffering from the consequences of low productivities and efficiencies, such an external shock could certainly have resulted in disruption causing loss of jobs that the country can ill-afford in the face of growing unemployment. Also read: In India’s RCEP Exit, Domestic Compulsions Sideline Fear of Being Isolated Several narratives have appeared in the aftermath of India’s withdrawal from RCEP that are critical of the government’s decision. These use the arguments that India has lost export opportunities in East Asia by stepping aside and also that policy makers have foregone the opportunities to push domestic reforms by accepting the policy package that RCEP has to offer. The first argument, being made much like the way it was when India was negotiating the three FTAs with ASEAN, Korea and Japan, can effectively be addressed by considering ability or more pertinently, the lack of it, of domestic enterprises to utilise the market access opportunities provided by these FTAs. This effectively proves that domestic enterprises must be pulled up by their bootstraps before they are able to compete in global markets. The government must focus on this critical dimension going forward. As regards the second argument, it needs to be pointed out that the experience of successful economies, especially in the East Asian region, is all about the ability of their governments to utilise the policy space to make their domestic enterprises more efficient. These successful economies have crafted their policies with an eye on the domestic imperatives and have avoided importing policy packages promoted by other countries. https://www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/why-india-was-right-in-staying-out-of-rcep/story-IbGTgBnZBwS4vvJbzxITxH.html RCEP is a China club, best India stays out of it India joined the negotiations in 2012 and continued to be part of them until the Bangkok meet. It was flexible in negotiations and made adjustments in pursuit of a comprehensive, fair and a balanced agreement. In the end, the final document did not meet any of the three parameters. By Shishir Gupta UPDATED ON NOV 23, 2020 10:07 AM IST The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) was signed on November 15 at a virtual meeting of member-states, on the margins of the annual East Asia Summit, eight years after the bloc was launched in Phnom Penh. The timing is neither surprising nor linked to any geopolitical development — it was announced during the East Asia Summit in Bangkok in 2019. India joined the negotiations in 2012 and continued to be part of them until the Bangkok meet. It was flexible in negotiations and made adjustments in pursuit of a comprehensive, fair and a balanced agreement. In the end, the final document did not meet any of the three parameters. For one, it remained weak on services, especially in areas where India had a competitive advantage. But the breaking point was the absence of specific safeguards on imports from China. One circuit breaker was the steep rise in imports; another, because RCEP permits differential coverage of market access between countries, India wanted, but did not get, full assurance that China would not be able to take advantage of the higher coverage permitted to Association of South East Asian Nations (Asean) countries. And a third was adequate protection on tariff increases it had instituted on some products since the negotiations commenced, partly to remove anomalies such as levies on inputs being higher than those on finished goods. MORE FROM THIS SECTION Punjab Congress Committee president Navjot Singh Sidhu meeting with Punjab chief minister Capt. Amarinder Singh. (PTI File) Punjab: As Congress factionalism persists, Opposition smells an opportunity Representational Image. (Getty Images/iStockphoto) HT Explains | The pandemic’s missing AI response and why India should care Representational image. (HT Archive) Delhi Master Plan 2041: People, processes, accountability key to implementation Representational image. (HT PHOTO) There is a turn in India’s Covid infection trends — for the worse Facing a growing trade deficit with China, the risks were too high. There are also no guarantees that China will play by the rules. It did not do so as a World Trade Organization (WTO) member. India has found it hard to access Chinese markets in areas of its competitive advantage, despite this being routinely taken up at the highest levels. China has not stopped using coercive trade measures to express political displeasure against The Philippines, Vietnam, and even Singapore — all partners in Asean-China Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) – or, for that matter, with Japan, Korea and, more recently, Australia. India started entering into FTAs and Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreements (CEPAs) from the mid-2000s. Among RCEP members, it has FTAs or Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreements (CECA) with Asean, Singapore, Japan and Korea. RCEP would have added China, Australia and New Zealand to the list. But it would have been an FTA with China. India’s domestic industry, however, wasn’t competitive enough to benefit from the existing FTAs. In any case, India’s largest exports were going to countries it did not have FTAs with. It is unlikely that India would have been able to withstand the import surge (from China) and damage to its industry in the short-run had it signed RCEP. India’s focus should first be on becoming industrially strong through a “Make in India” programme. Many RCEP members have reached this stage. An industrially weak and economically vulnerable India would have hardly been able to shape the region’s rules, no matter what those arguing on the strategic merits of joining RCEP believe. And China, after all, did not become the world’s biggest manufacturing power by entering into FTAs. RCEP is being touted as a triumph of multilateralism in an age of protectionism. But it is, at best, regionalism and it militates against multilateralism, pursued through WTO. FTAs did not prevent supply shocks and disruptions during the pandemic. Supply chain resilience, trust and efficiency have become more important these days and will influence trade.

#### Economic downturn compounds risk of Indopak conflict.

Kugelman 19 “India and Pakistan Are Edging Closer to War in 2020” Michael Kugelman is the writer of Foreign Policy’s weekly South Asia Brief. He is the Asia Program deputy director and senior associate for South Asia at the Wilson Center in Washington. 12/31/2019 <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/12/31/afghanistan-taliban-nuclear-india-pakistan-edging-closer-war-2020/> SM

Meanwhile, 2019 was a dangerously tense year for India and Pakistan—two rivals that are both neighbors and nuclear states. In February, a young Kashmiri man in the town of Pulwama staged a suicide bombing that killed more than three dozen Indian security forces—the deadliest such attack in Kashmir in three decades. Jaish-e-Mohammad—a Pakistan-based terror group with close ties to Pakistan’s security establishment—claimed responsibility. India retaliated by sending jets across Pakistan-administered Kashmir and launching limited strikes, for the first time since a war in 1971. Soon thereafter, Pakistan claimed it had carried out six air strikes in Kashmir to showcase its might, and it also shot down an Indian fighter jet and captured the pilot. The confrontation, which de-escalated when Islamabad announced the pilot’s release several days later, represented the most serious exchange of hostilities in years. Then, in August, India revoked the autonomy of Jammu and Kashmir, the India-administered part of Kashmir, and declared it a new territory of India. New Delhi also imposed a security lockdown in Kashmir that included the detention of hundreds of people and a communication blackout. For Islamabad, which claims Jammu and Kashmir as its own, the move amounted to a serious provocation, if not a hostile act. Pakistan retaliated by expelling India’s envoy from Islamabad and suspending trade with New Delhi. Undaunted, in the weeks that followed, senior Indian officials—including the defense and foreign ministers—turned their attention to Pakistan-administered Kashmir, which New Delhi has long claimed, and suggested they eventually planned to reclaim it. Bilateral relations remained fraught over the last few months of the year. Islamabad issued constant broadsides against New Delhi for its continued security lockdown in Kashmir. By year’s end, an internet blackout was still in effect. Then, in December, India’s parliament passed a controversial new citizenship law that affords fast-track paths to Indian citizenship for religious minorities—but not Muslims—fleeing persecution in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. The new law angered Islamabad not just for excluding Muslims, but because of the implication—accurate but not something Islamabad likes to admit—that Pakistan persecutes its Hindu and Christian communities. These prolonged tensions often overshadowed what was arguably the biggest story in both countries in 2019: economic struggle. India suffered its biggest economic slowdown in six years, and Pakistan confronted a serious debt crisis. The two weren’t unconnected: Given the inability of New Delhi and Islamabad to fix their economies, both governments arguably sought political advantages from the distractions of saber rattling. READ MORE Indian police try to detain supporters of the hardline faction of the All Parties Hurriyat Confrence (APHC) as they clash during a protest following the house arrest of APHC leader, Syed Ali Shah Geelani in Srinagar on August 23, 2015. Geelani was placed under house arrest shortly before attempting to leave his residence to address a seminar organised by the APHC. Police used tear smoke shells and water cannons to disperse hundreds of supporters protesting Geelani's arrest. AFP PHOTO/ Tauseef MUSTAFA (Photo credit should read TAUSEEF MUSTAFA/AFP/Getty Images) Crisis Mode in South Asia The best hope India and Pakistan have for moving forward is dealing with all of their issues simultaneously instead of piecemeal. THE SOUTH ASIA CHANNEL | MOEED YUSUF Against this tense backdrop, the opening in November of a new border corridor that enables Indian Sikhs to enter Pakistan visa-free to worship at a holy shrine, which in better times could have been a bridge to an improved relationship, amounted to little more than a one-off humanitarian gesture. Bad as these crises are, they are poised to get worse next year. The good news for Americans is that a U.S.-Taliban deal likely isn’t far off; both sides are fully invested in a troop withdrawal. For Trump, the importance of troop departures will grow as the U.S. presidential election draws closer, and especially because the Washington Post’s release in December of the “Afghanistan Papers”—documents that feature senior U.S. officials admitting failure in the war—will likely solidify U.S. public opinion in favor of winding down America’s role in the 18-year war. However, any U.S.-Taliban deal will do little to reduce violence, other than halting attacks on U.S. troops. In other words, the war will continue. A U.S.-Taliban accord would clear the path for an intra-Afghan dialogue between the Afghan government, other political stakeholders, and the Taliban that aims to produce a cease-fire and an eventual political settlement that ends the war. The path to intra-Afghan dialogue, however, is fraught with obstacles. Afghanistan held a presidential election in September. The preliminary results—released in December—showed President Ashraf Ghani in the lead, but with barely the 50 percent of votes needed to avoid a second round of voting with the second-place finisher, his bitter rival Abdullah Abdullah (who rejected the results). The close margin suggests that when final results are announced, the loser won’t accept them. This means Afghanistan is unlikely to have a new government in place for at least another few months, and even longer if the final results are different from the initial ones and require a second vote. Due to winter weather in Afghanistan, a runoff likely wouldn’t occur until the spring. Without a new government in place, it beggars belief that Afghanistan could launch a process to establish an intra-Afghan dialogue, much less negotiate an end to the war. And even if and when an intra-Afghan dialogue is launched, the hardest of sells will be required to convince the Taliban to lay down arms and agree to share power within a political system that it has long rejected and vowed to overthrow by force. Consequently, Afghanistan in 2020 is likely to see a withdrawal of U.S. forces before a peace agreement is in place—a demoralizing outcome for already struggling Afghan forces that would deliver another boost to the Taliban and further increase violence. Meanwhile, the underlying tensions between India and Pakistan remain sharp. Pakistan arrested dozens of Islamist militants this past year, but New Delhi wasn’t convinced Islamabad was taking strong and “irreversible” steps against India-focused terrorists and their networks. And New Delhi’s actions in Kashmir in 2019 represented worst-case scenarios for Islamabad. The two nuclear-armed nations will enter 2020 just one big trigger event away from war. The trigger could be another mass-casualty attack on Indian security forces in Kashmir traced back to a Pakistan-based group, or—acting on the threats issued repeatedly by New Delhi in 2019—an Indian preemptive operation to seize territory in Pakistan-administered Kashmir. In either scenario, escalation would be swift. Bilateral relations are much worse than they were during last February’s confrontation. Ever since its resounding reelection victory last spring, India’s ruling party has pursued its Hindu nationalist agenda in increasingly aggressive fashion—which gives it no incentive to go easy on Islamabad. Pakistan, not wanting to show weakness, will not give in easily.

#### Extinction.

Roblin 21. [(Sébastien Roblin holds a master’s degree in Conflict Resolution from Georgetown University and served as a university instructor for the Peace Corps in China, "If the Next India-Pakistan War Goes Nuclear, It Will Destroy the World," The National Interest, March 26, 2021. <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/reboot/if-next-india-pakistan-war-goes-nuclear-it-will-destroy-world-181134>] TDI

Here's What You Need to Remember: India and Pakistan account for over one-fifth world’s population, and therefore a significant share of economic activity. Should their major cities become irradiated ruins with their populations decimated, a tremendous disruption would surely result.

Between February 26 and 27 in 2019, Indian and Pakistani warplanes launched strikes on each other’s territory and engaged in aerial combat for the first time since 1971. Pakistan ominously hinted it was convening its National Command Authority, the institution which can authorize a nuclear strike.

The two states, which have retained an adversarial relationship since their founding in 1947, between them deploy nuclear warheads that can be delivered by land, air and sea.

However, those weapons are inferior in number and yield to the thousands of nuclear weapons possessed by Russia and the United States, which include megaton-class weapons that can wipe out a metropolis in a single blast.

Some commenters have callously suggested that means a “limited regional nuclear war” would remain an Indian and Pakistani problem. People find it difficult to assess the risk of rare but catastrophic events; after all, a full-scale nuclear war has never occurred before, though it has come close to happening.

Such assessments are not only shockingly callous but shortsighted. In fact, several studies have modeled the global impact of a “limited” ten-day nuclear war in which India and Pakistan each exchange fifty 15-kiloton nuclear bombs equivalent in yield to the Little Boy uranium bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

Their findings concluded that spillover would in no way be “limited,” directly impacting people across the globe that would struggle to locate Kashmir on a map.

And those results are merely a conservative baseline, as India and Pakistan are estimated to possess over 260 warheads. Some likely have yields exceeding 15-kilotons, which is relatively small compared to modern strategic warheads.

Casualties

Recurring terrorist attacks by Pakistan-sponsored militant groups over the status of India’s Muslim-majority Jammu and Kashmir state have repeatedly led to threats of a conventional military retaliation by New Delhi.

Pakistan, in turn, maintains it may use nuclear weapons as a first-strike weapon to counter-balance India’s superior conventional forces. Triggers could involve the destruction of a large part of Pakistan’s military or penetration by Indian forces deep into Pakistani territory. Islamabad also claims it might authorize a strike in event of a damaging Indian blockade or political destabilization instigated by India.

India’s official policy is that it will never be first to strike with nuclear weapons—but that once any nukes are used against it, New Dehli will unleash an all-out retaliation.

The Little Boy bomb alone killed around 100,000 Japanese—between 30 to 40 percent of Hiroshima’s population—and destroyed 69 percent of the buildings in the city. But Pakistan and India host some of the most populous and densely populated cities on the planet, with population densities of Calcutta, Karachi and Mumbai at or exceeding 65,000 people per square mile. Thus, even low-yield bombs could cause tremendous casualties.

A 2014 study estimates that the immediate effects of the bombs—the fireball, over-pressure wave, radiation burns etc.—would kill twenty million people. An earlier study estimated a hundred 15-kiloton nuclear detonations could kill twenty-six million in India and eighteen million in Pakistan—and concluded that escalating to using 100-kiloton warheads, which have greater blast radius and overpressure waves that can shatter hardened structures, would multiply death tolls four-fold.

Moreover, these projected body counts omit the secondary effects of nuclear blasts. Many survivors of the initial explosion would suffer slow, lingering deaths due to radiation exposure. The collapse of healthcare, transport, sanitation, water and economic infrastructure would also claim many more lives. A nuclear blast could also trigger a deadly firestorm. For instance, a firestorm caused by the U.S. napalm bombing of Tokyo in March 1945 killed more people than the Fat Man bomb killed in Nagasaki.

Refugee Outflows

The civil war in Syria caused over 5.6 million refugees to flee abroad out of a population of 22 million prior to the conflict. Despite relative stability and prosperity of the European nations to which refugees fled, this outflow triggered political backlashes that have rocked virtually every major Western government.

Now consider likely population movements in event of a nuclear war between India-Pakistan, which together total over 1.5 billion people. Nuclear bombings—or their even their mere potential—would likely cause many city-dwellers to flee to the countryside to lower their odds of being caught in a nuclear strike. Wealthier citizens, numbering in tens of millions, would use their resources to flee abroad.

Should bombs beginning dropping, poorer citizens many begin pouring over land borders such as those with Afghanistan and Iran for Pakistan, and Nepal and Bangladesh for India. These poor states would struggle to supports tens of millions of refugees. China also borders India and Pakistan—but historically Beijing has not welcomed refugees.

Some citizens may undertake risky voyages at sea on overloaded boats, setting their sights on South East Asia and the Arabian Peninsula. Thousands would surely drown. Many regional governments would turn them back, as they have refugees of conflicts in Vietnam, Cambodia and Myanmar in the past.

Fallout

Radioactive fallout would also be disseminated across the globe. The fallout from the Chernobyl explosion, for example, wounds its way westward from Ukraine into Western Europe, exposing 650,000 persons and contaminating 77,000 square miles. The long-term health effects of the exposure could last decades. India and Pakistan’s neighbors would be especially exposed, and most lack healthcare and infrastructure to deal with such a crisis.

Nuclear Winter

Studies in 2008 and 2014 found that of one hundred bombs that were fifteen-kilotons were used, it would blast five million tons of fine, sooty particles into the stratosphere, where they would spread across the globe, warping global weather patterns for the next twenty-five years.

The particles would block out light from the sun, causing surface temperatures to decrease an average of 2.7 degrees Fahrenheit across the globe, or 4.5 degrees in North American and Europe. Growing seasons would be shortened by ten to forty days, and certain crops such as Canadian wheat would simply become unviable. Global agricultural yields would fall, leading to rising prices and famine.

The particles may also deplete between 30 to 50 percent of the ozone layer, allowing more of the sun’s radiation to penetrate the atmosphere, causing increased sunburns and rates of cancer and killing off sensitive plant-life and marine plankton, with the spillover effect of decimating fishing yields.

To be clear, these are outcomes for a “light” nuclear winter scenario, not a full slugging match between the Russian and U.S. arsenals.

Global Recession

Any one of the factors above would likely suffice to cause a global economic recession. All of them combined would guarantee one.

India and Pakistan account for over one-fifth world’s population, and therefore a significant share of economic activity. Should their major cities become irradiated ruins with their populations decimated, a tremendous disruption would surely result. A massive decrease in consumption and production would obviously instigate a long-lasting recessionary cycle, with attendant deprivations and political destabilization slamming developed and less-developed countries alike.

Taken together, these outcomes mean even a “limited” India-Pakistan nuclear war would significantly affect every person on the globe, be they a school teacher in Nebraska, a factory-worker in Shaanxi province or a fisherman in Mombasa.

Unfortunately, the recent escalation between India and Pakistan is no fluke, but part of a long-simmering pattern likely to continue escalating unless New Delhi and Islamabad work together to change the nature of their relationship.

## u/v

## util adv

#### Restricting IP protections undermines innovation and profit margins – turns case by precluding vaccine distribution to developing countries.

Cueni 12/10 [(Thomas, Director General of IFPMA, chair of the AMR Industry Alliance, Industry Co-Chair APEC Biopharmaceutical Working Group on Ethics, MA in politics from the London School of Economics) “The Risk in Suspending Vaccine Patent Rules,” New York Times, 12/10/2020] TDI

It is unclear how suspending patent protections would ensure fair distribution. But what is clear is that if successful, the effort would jeopardize future medical innovation, making us more vulnerable to other diseases.

Intellectual property rights, including patents, grant inventors a period of exclusivity to make and market their creations. By affording these rights to those who create intangible assets, such as musical compositions, software or drug formulas — people will invent more useful new things.

Development of a new medicine is risky and costly. Consider that scientists have spent decades — and billions of dollars — working on Alzheimer’s treatments, but still have little to show for it. The companies and investors who fund research shoulder so much risk because they have a shot at a reward. Once a patent expires, generic companies are free to produce the same product. Intellectual property rights underpin the system that gives us all new medicines, from psychiatric drugs to cancer treatments.

In trying to defend these rights, the drug industry has made mistakes in the past that have lost people’s trust. More than 22 years ago, for example, a group of drug companies sued the South African government for trying to import cheaper anti-AIDS drugs amid an epidemic. With price standing between patients and survival, the suit, which the companies eventually dropped, was a terrible misjudgment. The current situation is not parallel.

Several major drug companies, including AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline and Johnson & Johnson, have pledged to offer their vaccines on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic. Others are considering differential pricing for different countries. As of last month, four major pharmaceutical companies had already agreed to eventually produce at least three billion vaccine doses for low- and middle-income nations, according to one analysis.

In South Africa and India, pharmaceutical companies are already working with local partners to make their vaccines available. Johnson & Johnson has entered into a technology transfer partnership for its candidate vaccine with South Africa’s Aspen Pharmacare, and AstraZeneca has reached a licensing agreement with the Serum Institute of India to develop up to 1 billion doses of its vaccine for low and middle-income countries.

Companies can afford to license patents for free, or sell drugs at cost, precisely because they know that their intellectual property will be protected. That’s not a flaw in the system; it’s how the system ensures that pharmaceutical research will continue to be funded.

#### IP protections are key to pharmaceutical investment in developing countries.

Ezell and Cory 19 [(Stephen, vice president, global innovation policy, at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, B.S. from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, and Nigel, associate director covering trade policy at the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, former researcher in the Southeast Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, MA in public policy from Georgetown University) “The Way Forward for Intellectual Property Internationally,” Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, 4/25/2019] TDI

Academic research also signals a strong correlation between IPR and technology transfer. Lippoldt showed that IPR strengthening in countries—particularly with respect to patents—is associated with increased technology transfer via trade and investment.34 Research has revealed that a country’s level of intellectual property protection considerably affects whether foreign firms will transfer technology into it.35 That matters because the welfare gains from the importation of technology via innovative products, while differing across countries, can be substantial.36 For instance, foreign sources of technology account for over 90 percent of domestic productivity growth in all but a handful of countries.37 The research on this matter is clear and consistent. For example, a 1986 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) study found that direct investment in new technology areas such as computer software, semiconductors, and biotechnology is supported by stronger intellectual property rights policy regimes.38 (However, as this report later clarifies, subsequent UNCTAD reports have lamentably taken a more skeptical view toward IP.) A 1989 study by the United Nations Commission on Transnational Corporations (UNCTC) found that weak IP rights reduce computer software direct investment; and a 1990 study by UNCTC found that weak IP rights reduce pharmaceutical investment.39 Mansfield conducted firm-level surveys and found that perceptions of strong IP rights abroad have a positive effect on incentives to transfer technologies abroad. Likewise, survey research by the World Bank’s International Finance Corporation found that, with variations by sector, country, and technology, at least 25 percent of American and Japanese high-tech firms refuse to directly invest, or enter into a joint venture, in developing countries with weak intellectual property rights; and a later study confirmed those survey findings with actual foreign direct investment data.40 And an Institute for International Economics study of World Bank data concluded that weak intellectual property rights reduce flows of all these commercial activities, regardless of nations’ levels of economic development.41

Studies have also shown how the benefits of intellectual property extend to developing countries. Diwan and Rodrik demonstrated that stronger patent rights in developing countries give enterprises from developed countries a greater incentive to research and introduce technologies appropriate to developing countries.42 Similarly, Taylor showed that weak patent rights in developing countries lead enterprises from developed countries to introduce less-than-best-practice technologies to developing countries.43 Interestingly, the relationship goes in both directions. Branstetter and Saggi showed that strengthened IPR protection not only improves the investment climate in the implementing countries, but also leads to increased FDI in the country producing the original innovation.44 They concluded that IPR reform in the “global South” (e.g., developing countries) may be associated with FDI increases in the “global North” (e.g., developed countries). As northern firms shift their production to southern affiliates, this FDI accelerates southern industrial development, creating a cyclical feedback mechanism that also benefits the North. Another study by Liao and Wong, which focused on firm-level analysis, highlights the inter-relationship of IPR reform in developed and developing countries. Their study concluded that developing countries can entice technology transfer from the North by providing IPR protection for incoming products (although they note there is a need for redoubled R&D efforts in developed countries to spur needed innovations).45

#### COVID reduces the risk of conflict.

Gul 20. [(Ayaz Gul) “Kashmiri Leader: COVID-19 Lowers Chances of Pakistan-India War” VOA News. April 28, 2020. <https://www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/kashmiri-leader-covid-19-lowers-chances-pakistan-india-war>] TDI

ISLAMABAD - Pakistan and India are locked in almost daily military clashes across their Kashmir frontier, but the president of the Pakistani-ruled part of the disputed territory says the coronavirus pandemic has for now **diminished chances, if any, of the tensions escalating into a full-blown war.** Islamabad and New Delhi routinely accuse each other of firing the first shot that started the clashes in violation of a 2003 mutual truce across what is referred to as the Kashmir Line of Control (LoC). Critics say the increased violence in recent years, however, already has rendered the truce ineffective. The clashes have caused dozens of casualties on both sides, mostly civilians living in villages close to the LoC. “**I don’t foresee a war in the near future**,” said President Masood Khan of Azad (independent) Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), the official name Pakistan uses for the part of the divided region it administers. India controls the remaining two-thirds of the largely Muslim Himalayan region, claimed by both of the nuclear-armed rival nations. “Right now, the world is **preoccupied with the COVID-19 pandemic**, and nobody **seriously expects India and Pakistan to go to war**. And we do not know what the world would look like once this pandemic is over,” Khan told VOA in an interview at his camp office in the Pakistani capital.

## Case

#### E] Concedes extinction justifies moral loopholes

Korsgaard PhD 02 [Christine, PhD in Philosophy, works at Harvard] “Internalism and the Sources of Normativity” RE

But actions are also events in the world (or correspond to events in the world, at least), and they too have consequences. There are a number of different ways in which one can deal with worries about what happens to the consequences in Kant’s ethical theory. It is worth pointing out that Kant himself not only did not ignore the consequences, but took the fact that good actions can have bad effects as the starting point for his religious philosophy. In his religious thought, Kant was concerned with the question how the moral agent has to envision the world, how he has to think of its metaphysics in order to cope with the fact that the actions morality demands may have terrible effects that we never intended, or may simply fail to have good ones. I myself see the development of what Rawls has called “nonideal theory” to be the right way of taking care of a certain class of cases, in which the consequences of doing the right thing just seem too appalling for us to simply wash our hands of. But I do not want to say that just having bad consequences is enough to put an action into the realm of nonideal theory. I think there is a range of bad consequences that a decent person has to be prepared to live with, out of respect for other people’s right to manage their own lives and actions, and to contribute to shared decisions. But I also think that there are cases where our actions go wrong in such a way that they turn out in a sense not to be the actions we intended to do, or to instantiate the values we meant them to instantiate. I think that some of these cases can be dealt with by introducing the kind of double-level structure into moral philosophy that I have described in the essay on “The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil.”3 But I also think there are cases that cannot be domesticated even in this way, cases in which, to put it paradoxically, the good person will do something “wrong.” I have written about that sort of case too, in “Taking the Law into Our Own Hands: Kant on the Right to Revolution.”4