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### 1

#### Interp: aff must only get offense off the desirability of the resolution.

#### They violate – they gain offense off of reducing all IP not just IP for medicines.

#### ‘reduce’

Merriam Webster 21 “Reduce.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce. Accessed 8 Aug. 2021.

Definition of reduce

[transitive verb](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transitive)

1a: to draw together or cause to converge : [CONSOLIDATE](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/consolidate) reduce all the questions to one

b(1): to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number reduce taxes reduce the likelihood of war

#### ‘ought’

Merriam Webster 21“Ought.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought. Accessed 8 Aug. 2021.

ought [noun](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/noun) \ ˈȯt \ Definition of ought (Entry 3 of 4) : moral obligation : [DUTY](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/duty)

#### ‘intellectual property’

WIPO [World Intellectual Property Organization, IP, “What is Intellectual Property?” https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/]/lm

What is Intellectual Property?

Intellectual property (IP) refers to creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; and symbols, names and images used in commerce.

IP is protected in law by, for example, [patents](https://www.wipo.int/patents/en/), [copyright](https://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/) and [trademarks](https://www.wipo.int/trademarks/en/), which enable people to earn recognition or financial benefit from what they invent or create. By striking the right balance between the interests of innovators and the wider public interest, the IP system aims to foster an environment in which creativity and innovation can flourish.

#### ‘medicines’

Merriam Webster 21 [“Medicine.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine. Accessed 11 Aug. 2021.]/](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine.%20Accessed%2011%20Aug.%202021.%5d/) lm

medicine [noun](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/noun) med·​i·​cine | \ ˈme-di-sən , British usually ˈmed-sən \ Definition of medicine 1a: a substance or preparation used in treating disease cough medicine b: something that affects well-being he's bad medicine— Zane Grey

#### ‘members nations of the WTO’

WTO 16 [World Trade Organization, Understanding the WTO: The Organization, “Members and Observers,” July 29th, 2016, [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/tif\_e/org6\_e.htm]/](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org6_e.htm%5d/) lm

Members and Observers

164  members since 29 July 2016 , with dates of WTO membership.

Click any member to see key information on trade statistics, WTO commitments, disputes, trade policy reviews, and notifications.

#### 1] Limits — a bounded topic serves as a predictable stasis point for debate that guarantees thematic coherence—absent defined limits, debate’s competitive incentives create a race to the margins that distorts topic research and kills education.

#### 2] Topic education, we only have two months per topic. debating non-T affs incentivizes debaters to dump the topic and forces me to spend time prepping those instead.

#### 3] Clash, A) ground skew, aff absent limits aff can just pick topics with no neg ground like racism bad, B) Predictability I can’t prep ATs to an infinite number of possible aff cases.

#### 4] Prep skew – they get infinite prep on their particular aff, but I get none, since there are infinite possible non-T affs they could’ve read – only focusing on the topic can gives me the opportunity to prep against their case.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### 1] Education, its important b/c a) it’s how debate gets funded and b) it’s the only takeaway.

#### 2] Fairness, a) it’s an intrinsic good, b) all args concede cause they assume the judge evaluates them fairly, c) debate is a game, if it’s unfair no one will want to play which kills education.

#### 3] Jurisdiction, judges can’t vote for substance beyond the purview of the resolution a) Judges don’t vote on args outside the round, b) judges don’t flow CX, c) your real life job at this tournament is to evaluate different arguments about the resolution, judges don’t get to decide what is topical, the tournament does, d) anything else allows judges to inject anti-black anti-women bias which turns case.

#### 4] Drop the debater, it deters further abuse and makes debate better for everyone and substance is skewed since I had to spend time on theory.

#### 5] No RVI’s, you don’t win for being fair. Also, debaters will bait out theory to win on RVI’s which reinforces bad tendencies.

#### 6] Competing interpretations, a) reasonability is bad b/c it requires judge intervention and b) arguing ab the norms is the only way to get the best norms possible

#### No cross apps from substance, a) testing, if they cross, it is impossible to win, even if they are unfair, b) logic, they are using unfairness to prove that they are fair, which is contradictory, c) a priori, T must be evaluated in a vacuum – otherwise it is not a fair testing of whether they are fair.

#### Any argument they’re winning supercharges the violation and is not a reason to vote for them since they’re winning it because I couldn’t engage.

#### TVA solves – Read a topical planless aff about XXXXXX in the context of the resolution, it’s the best of both worlds.

#### Switch sides debate solves, read the K on neg, best of both worlds, and you don’t read this aff every round so there’s no DA.

### 2

#### IPP is key to innovation, investment and R&D.

Servier 14 [Servier, Servier Laboratories is an international pharmaceutical company governed by a non-profit foundation, with its headquarters in France, “WHY PATENTS ARE NECESSARY FOR THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY,” 09/10/14, [https://servier.com/en/news/why-patents-are-necessary-for-the-pharmaceutical-industry/]/](https://servier.com/en/news/why-patents-are-necessary-for-the-pharmaceutical-industry/%5d/) lm

Patents are often accused of providing guaranteed income to private companies and thwarting innovation. Present in all industries, they still help to support innovation, promote investment in research and ensure the continuation of scientific progress.

Patents support innovation

Symbolically speaking, patents constitute an agreement between the company and the state: in exchange for public disclosure, the state grants an inventor the exclusive right to an invention for a limited time, allowing for the manufacture and sale of a product.

In return for this protection established for a period of 20 years, the patent owner publishes the results of the scientific research which led to innovation. The publication of the invention ensures the continuation of scientific progress, each invention building on previous ones. Each new invention is de facto immediately made ​​available to the international research community.

Of course, not everything can be patented: discoveries, ideas, laws of nature, physical phenomena are naturally excluded from the process. The rules are very clear: a patent must be based on an new, non-obvious and useful invention or the improvement of such an invention; it can only relate to a process or a product whose value is recognized. It is granted by a specialized authority such as the [European Patent Office (EPO)](http://www.epo.org/) in Europe or the [United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)](http://www.uspto.gov/) in the United States.

The pharmaceutical industry and the special status of the patent

Unlike other industries, pharmaceutical patents relate to products with particularly long development cycles. On average, a new treatment requires 10-15 years of development, from the early stages of conception to the final approval from the health authorities, namely obtaining the authorization to market.

This innovation process is complex, lengthy and expensive. Only 1 in 10,000 molecules becomes a drug and actually enters the market. It is estimated that the average cost of developing a drug candidate is nearly one billion euros.

Because of these significant investments, patent protection is vital to ensure a return on investment for companies and researchers and thus enable the creation of innovative new drugs.

If a drug patent is granted for 20 years, it effectively protects the commercial exclusivity for a limited period of 8 years. This is due to the fact that drugs require an average of 12 years of research before making it to market.

This short-term protection may discourage some investments in research, an area where the failure rate is already very high. Upon request, manufacturers can obtain an additional certificate that extends the duration of patent protection to 5 years.

Patents improve healthcare

The pharmaceutical industry contributes significantly to the advancement of health. Tremendous therapeutic advances have been achieved in recent decades thanks to successful molecules discovered by the pharmaceutical industry.

Numerous examples illustrate this fact:

Antiulceratives, first with H2 blockers and then with proton pump inhibitors, have almost solved the problem of ulcer disease which was previously treated with symptomatic treatments or heavy – and sometimes mutilating – surgical treatments.

Antiretroviral drugs have transformed what was mostly a fatal disease, HIV infection, into a chronic disease.

Anticholesteremic agents have significantly reduced cardiovascular risk, the leading cause of death in developed countries.

We could also mention vaccines, antibiotics, anti-inflammatory drugs, anticancer agents, anticoagulants and countless others…

All these discoveries and these drugs have improved the length and quality of life of millions of patients worldwide. Without patents, these advances would never have seen the light of day.

Pharmaceutical companies in France, Europe and around the world should benefit from strong intellectual property protection to enable them to continue their contributions to scientific and technological advances that improve the quality of life for billions of people.

#### **Reducing IP protections chills future investment – even the perception of wavering commitment scares off companies.**

Grabowski et al. ’15 (Harry; Professor Emeritus of Economics at Duke, and a specialist in the intersection of the pharmaceutical industry and government regulation of business; February 2015; “The Roles Of Patents And Research And Development Incentives In Biopharmaceutical Innovation”; Health Affairs; <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.1047>; Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

Patents and other forms of **intellectual property** **protection** play **essential roles** in encouraging innovation in biopharmaceuticals. As part of the “21st Century Cures” initiative, Congress is reviewing the policy mechanisms designed to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments. Debate continues about how best to balance patent and intellectual property incentives to encourage innovation, on the one hand, and generic utilization and price competition, on the other hand. We review the current framework for accomplishing these dual objectives and the important role of patents and regulatory exclusivity (together, the patent-based system), given the lengthy, costly, and risky biopharmaceutical research and development process. We summarize existing targeted incentives, such as for orphan drugs and neglected diseases, and we consider the pros and cons of proposed voluntary or mandatory alternatives to the patent-based system, such as prizes and government research and development contracting. We conclude that patents and regulatory exclusivity provisions are likely to remain the core approach to providing incentives for biopharmaceutical research and development. However, prizes and other voluntary supplements could play a useful role in addressing unmet needs and gaps in specific circumstances. Technological innovation is widely recognized as a key determinant of economic and public health progress. 1,2 Patents and other forms of intellectual property protection are generally thought to play essential roles in encouraging innovation in biopharmaceuticals. This is because the process of developing a new drug and bringing it to market is **long, costly, and risky**, and the costs of imitation are low. After a new drug has been approved and is being marketed, its **patents protect it** from competition from chemically identical entrants (or entrants infringing on other patents) for a period of time. **For firms** to have an **incentive** to **continue to invest** in innovative development efforts, they must have an **expectation** that they can **charge enough** during this period to **recoup** costs and make a profit. After a drug’s patent or patents expire, **generic rivals** can enter the market at **greatly reduced development cost** and prices, providing added consumer benefit but **eroding** the **innovator drug** company’s revenues. The Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (commonly known as the Hatch-Waxman Act) was designed to balance innovation incentives and generic price competition for new drugs (generally small-molecule chemical drugs, with some large-molecule biologic exceptions) by extending the period of a drug’s marketing exclusivity while providing a regulatory framework for generic drug approval. This framework was later changed to encompass so-called biosimilars for large-molecule (biologic) drugs through the separate Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009. Other measures have been enacted to provide research and development (R&D) incentives for antibiotics and drugs to treat orphan diseases and neglected tropical diseases. Discussion continues about whether current innovation incentives are optimal or even adequate, given evolving public health needs and scientific knowledge. For instance, the House Energy and Commerce Committee recently embarked on the “21st Century Cures” initiative, 3 following earlier recommendations by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology on responding to challenges in “propelling innovation in drug discovery, development, and evaluation.” 4 In this context, we discuss the importance of patents and other forms of intellectual property protection to biopharmaceutical innovation, given the unique economic characteristics of drug research and development. We also review the R&D incentives that complement patents in certain circumstances. Finally, we consider the pros and cons of selected voluntary (“opt-in”) or mandatory alternatives to the current patent- and regulatory exclusivity–based system (such as prizes or government-contracted drug development) and whether they could better achieve the dual goals of innovation incentives and price competition. The essential rationale for patent protection for biopharmaceuticals is that long-term benefits in the form of continued future innovation by pioneer or brand-name drug manufacturers outweigh the relatively short-term restrictions on imitative cost competition associated with market exclusivity. Regardless, the entry of other branded agents remains an important source of therapeutic competition during the patent term. Several economic characteristics make patents and intellectual property protection **particularly important** to **innovation incentives** for the biopharmaceutical industry. 5 The R&D process often takes more than a decade to complete, and according to a recent analysis by Joseph DiMasi and colleagues, per new drug approval (including failed attempts), it involves more than a **billion** dollars in out-of-pocket costs. 6 Only approximately one in eight drug candidates survive clinical testing. 6 As a result of the high risks of failure and the high costs, research and development must be funded by the **few successful, on-market products** (the top quintile of marketed products provide the dominant share of R&D returns). 7,8 Once a new drug’s patent term and any regulatory exclusivity provisions have expired, competing manufacturers are allowed to sell generic equivalents that require the investment of only several million dollars and that have a high likelihood of commercial success. **Absent intellectual property protections** that allow marketing exclusivity, innovative firms would be **unlikely** to make the costly and risky investments needed to bring a new drug to market. Patents confer the right to exclude competitors for a limited time within a given scope, as defined by patent claims. However, **they do not guarantee demand**, nor do they prevent competition from nonidentical drugs that treat the same diseases and fall outside the protection of the patents. New products may enter the same therapeutic class with common mechanisms of action but different molecular structures (for example, different statins) or with differing mechanisms of action (such as calcium channel blockers and angiotensin receptor blockers). 9 Joseph DiMasi and Laura Faden have found that the time between a first-in-class new drug and subsequent new drugs in the same therapeutic class has been dramatically reduced, from a median of 10.2 years in the 1970s to 2.5 years in the early 2000s. 10 Drugs in the same class compete through quality and price for preferred placement on drug formularies and physicians’ choices for patient treatment. Patents play an **essential role** in the economic “ecosystem” of **discovery and investment** that has developed since the 1980s. Hundreds of start-up firms, often backed by venture capital, have been launched, and a robust innovation market has emerged. 11 The value of these development-stage firms is largely determined by their proprietary technologies and the candidate drugs they have in development. As a result, the **strength of intellectual property protection** plays a **key role** in funding and partnership opportunities for such firms. Universities also play a key role in the R&D ecosystem because they conduct basic biomedical research supported by sponsored research grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). The Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980 (commonly known as the Bayh-Dole Act) gave universities the right to retain title to patents and discoveries made through federally funded research. This change was designed to encourage technology transfer through industry licensing and the creation of start-up companies. Universities received only 390 patents for their discoveries in 1980, 12 compared to 4,296 in 2011, with biotechnology and pharmaceuticals being the top two technology areas (accounting for 36 percent of all university patent awards in 2012). 13

#### Pharmaceutical innovation is key to disease response and preventing bioterrorism – COVID proves.

Marjanovic and Fejiao 20 [Marjanovic, Sonja, and Carolina Feijao. Sonja Marjanovic, Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitive biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon. "Pharmaceutical Innovation for Infectious Disease Management: From Troubleshooting to Sustainable Models of Engagement." (2020)]

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sci-ences companies have been called on to develop medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also infectious diseases that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a bioterrorism context.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by antimicrobial resistance is also well recognized as an area in need of pharmaceutical innovation. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and compe-tition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an indispensable partner in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceu-tical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is essential for socially responsible companies in the sec-tor.2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing indus-try-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently contributing in a variety of ways. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing com-pounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID-19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating tri-als for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accel-erate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The primary purpose of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be rela-tively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pres-sure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing com-bination product that is being tested for therapeutic poten-tial against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider how pharmaceutical innovation for responding to emerging infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many public health threats (including those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterror-ism agents and antimicrobial resistance) are urgently in need of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the imme-diate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infec-tious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contribu-tions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are important policy questions as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under improved innova-tion conditions.

#### Empirical studies prove bioterrorism outweighs the aff and causes extinction.

Millet and Snyder-Beattie 17 [Piers Millett is a Senior Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute, where he focuses on pandemic and deliberate disease, Andrew leads Open Philanthropy's work on biosecurity and pandemic preparedness. He previously spent five years at the Future of Humanity, NCBI, PMC, US National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity,” August 1st, 2017, [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/]/](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/%5d/) lm

In the decades to come, advanced bioweapons could threaten human existence. Although the probability of human extinction from bioweapons may be low, the expected value of reducing the risk could still be large, since such risks jeopardize the existence of all future generations. We provide an overview of biotechnological extinction risk, make some rough initial estimates for how severe the risks might be, and compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing these extinction-level risks with existing biosecurity work. We find that reducing human extinction risk can be more cost-effective than reducing smaller-scale risks, even when using conservative estimates. This suggests that the risks are not low enough to ignore and that more ought to be done to prevent the worst-case scenarios.

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B1) while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B2) The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B3) while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B4) It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

Non-state actors may also pose a risk, especially those with explicitly omnicidal aims. While rare, there are examples. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan sought biological weapons for the express purpose of causing extinction.[28](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B28) Environmental groups, such as the Gaia Liberation Front, have argued that “we can ensure Gaia's survival only through the extinction of the Humans as a species … we now have the specific technology for doing the job … several different [genetically engineered] viruses could be released”(quoted in ref. [29](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B29)). Groups such as R.I.S.E. also sought to protect nature by destroying most of humanity with bioweapons.[30](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B30) Fortunately, to date, non-state actors have lacked the capabilities needed to pose a catastrophic bioweapons threat, but this could change in future decades as biotechnology becomes more accessible and the pool of experienced users grows.[31](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B31),[32](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B32)

An informal survey at the 2008 Oxford Global Catastrophic Risk Conference asked participants to estimate the chance that disasters of different types would occur before 2100. Participants had a median risk estimate of 0.05% that a natural pandemic would lead to human extinction by 2100, and a median risk estimate of 2% that an “engineered” pandemic would lead to extinction by 2100.[42](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B42)

The advantage of the survey is that it directly measures the quantity that we are interested in: probability of extinction from bioweapons. The disadvantage is that the estimates were likely highly subjective and unreliable, especially as the survey did not account for response bias, and the respondents were not calibrated beforehand. We therefore also turn to other models that, while indirect, provide more objective measures of risk.[§§](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#fn8)

Human extinction would not only end the 7 billion lives in our current generation, but also cause the loss of all future generations to come. To calculate the humanitarian cost associated with such a catastrophe, one must therefore include the welfare of these future generations. While some have argued that future generations ought to be excluded or discounted when considering ethical actions,[50](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B50) most of the in-depth philosophical work around the topic has concluded that future generations should not be given less inherent value.[51-55](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B51) Therefore, for our calculations, we include future lives in our cost-effectiveness estimate.[\*\*\*\*](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#fn13)

The large number of future generations at stake mean that reducing existential risk even by a small amount may have very large expected value. The Earth is thought to be habitable for roughly another billion years;[56](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B56) our closest relative, homo erectus, lasted over 1.6 million years,[57](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B57) and the typical mammalian species also lasts on the order of 1 to 2 million years.[58](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B58) Following Matheny,[29](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/#B29) if we were to assume that humanity would otherwise maintain a global population of 10 billion for the next 1.6 million years, human extinction would jeopardize on the order of 1.6 × 1016 life years.

Including future generations into our cost-effectiveness calculations demonstrates that reducing existential risks, even if they are improbable, can be incredibly cost-effective in expectation ([Table 2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5576214/table/T2/)). Depending on the model used, we estimate that we can purchase 1 quality adjusted life-year in expectation for 10s of dollars (with outliers suggested around 12 cents to $1,600). Even with the most conservative estimates of existential risk, reducing the risk of human extinction is at least 100 times more cost-effective than standard biosecurity interventions, and possibly up to 1 million times more cost-effective.

### 3

**CP: States ought to abolish the WTO.**

**Hawley 20**

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, **the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.**

**Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony and exceptionalism – outweighs and ultimate way to reduce state interference, wins under their FW**

**Bello, PhD, 2000**

(Walden, Sociology @ Stanford, https://users.ox.ac.uk/~magd1352/ecologist/Should%20WTO%20be%20abolished.pdf)

The idea that the world needs the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of the biggest lies of our time. The WTO came about, in 1995, mainly because it was in the interest of the US and its corporations. The European Union, Japan and especially the developing countries were mostly ambivalent about the idea; it was the US which drove it on. Why? Because though the US, back in 1948, blocked the formation of an International Trade Organisation (ITO), believing that, at that time, the interests of its corporations would not be served by such a global body, it had changed its mind by the 1990s. Now it wanted an international trade body. Why? Because its global economic dominance was threatened. The flexible GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) system, which preceded the WTO, had allowed the emergence of Europe and East Asia as competing industrial centres that threatened US dominance even in many high-tech industries. Under GATT’s system of global agricultural trade, Europe had emerged as a formidable agricultural power even as Third World governments concerned with preserving their agriculture and rural societies limited the penetration of their markets by US agricultural products. In other words, before the WTO, global trade was growing by leaps and bounds, but countries were using trade policy to industrialise and adapt to the growth of trade so that their economies would be enhanced by global trade and not be marginalised by it. That was a problem, from the US point of view. And that was why the US needed the WTO. The essence of the WTO is seen in three of its central agreements: the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA), and the Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs). The purpose of TRIPs is not to promote free trade but to enhance monopoly power. One cannot quarrel with the fact that innovators should have preferential access to the benefits that flow from their innovation for a period of time. TRIPs, however, goes beyond this to institutionalise a monopoly for high-tech corporate innovators, most of them from the North. Among other things, TRIPs provides a generalised minimum patent protection of 20 years; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and – contrary to the judicial principle of presuming innocence until proven guilty – places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. What TRIPs does is reinforce the monopolistic or oligopolistic position of US high tech firms such as Microsoft and Intel. It makes industrialisation by imitation or industrialisation via loose conditions of technology transfer – a strategy employed by the US, Germany, Japan, and South Korea during the early phases of their industrialisation – all but impossible. It enables **the technological leader**, in this case **the US, to greatly influence** **the pace of technological and industrial development in the rest of the world**.

#### Counterplan competes ---

#### 1] “Member” is defined as part of a group---the counterplan abolishes the broader group

**Merriam Webster n.d.** “Member,” <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/member>,

**:**one of the individuals composing a group

#### 3] “Member of” means “to be contained in” “to be included in” and “be part of” --- none of those are possible if the broader group is gone.[[1]](#footnote-1)

# Case

### Toplevel

#### Extinction first no matter what

#### A] extinction o/ws under any framework- moral uncertainty and future gens

Pummer 15 — (Theron Pummer, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford, “Moral Agreement on Saving the World“, Practical Ethics University of Oxford, 5-18-2015, Available Online at http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/, accessed 7-2-2018, HKR-AM) \*\*we do not endorse ableist language=

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)

#### B] prereq to their offense- it forecloses all future value and causes massive structural violence

### Cap good

#### **Capitalism uniquely solves for environmental issues**

Franz 17 (Caleb, podcast director for *Outset* magazine. “Markets Work: Capitalism and Innovation Heal the Earth”, 4/25/17. <http://outsetmagazine.com/2017/04/25/capitalism-and-innovation-heal-the-earth/>, 7/7/17)//JM

When it comes to opposing factions, it seems as though no two factions could be more averse to each other than environmentalists and capitalists. We are taught to believe that those who care about economic growth cannot possibly care about environmental protection and vice versa. While this rhetoric is a good way to polarize those with opposing priorities, the truth is that they can co-exist. In fact, not only can capitalism and environmentalism co-exist, but only with free market capitalism can the environment ever hope to be clean. Even though critics of capitalism accuse the system of placing profits above people or the environment, the reality sets a different tone. The market demand for clean and renewable energy is growing every day. Companies and businesses are finding it profitable to keep the environment that their costumers live in clean. There is also an opportunity for those who care about the cause to take action like never before and to do so within the market. Technology and innovation are evolving at such a rate that dirty fuels and pollution will soon become a thing of the past. Elon Musk is the perfect example of this concept. Musk has created an entire empire based on clean and affordable energy; not because of government decree or regulation, but from private incentives to innovate and compete, which drives product quality up. Because Musk is allowed to profit and gain from the demand of the marketplace, his companies are on the cutting edge of innovation changing the world and the environment. Musk recently announced that he could produce roof solar panels at a cheaper rate than even conventional roofs. He is using Tesla Motors to revolutionize the automobile and clean energy industries. While Tesla cars are currently not as quite as profitable as I’m sure he would like, these innovations are setting the essential groundwork for years to come. On a smaller scale, new industries are finding innovative ways to help fight pollution and restore clean water to the planet. The only reason any company is even able to do this is capitalism. Competition is a powerful force, and people often forget that the market is what we make it. Going to government is not just a lazy way of trying to achieve sustainability, but it is also ineffective and does more harm than good. The market, so long as it is free and without crony assistance from the government, always hold businesses accountable. Sure, in a genuinely free market, a business might pollute, but the decision to pollute in excess will eventually prove counter to business interests. First, a company’s pollution would significantly affect the water that their employees drink or the air that they breathe, which would raise employment costs. Second, and more importantly, the company would also be polluting the water or air of their customers, who will be far less likely to continue doing business with the company after they have damaged the ecosystem of the community. Pollution would leave the company vulnerable to outside competition that recognizes these environmental concerns as well as the economic concerns. The business that pollutes the air and waters of the community it serves will quickly lose customers and suffer significant losses because the community, and not the government, will punish the business. Not only should we explore innovation with the market to protect the environment, but we must also act to curtail the world’s largest polluter: the U.S. Government. While environmentalist protest and rally against large corporations who pollute the air and water, the government remains the world’s largest overall polluter. Calls for government reform are silent. Not only are they the largest overall, but the federal government is also the fourth largest contributor to greenhouse gas pollution alone. Of course, we also cannot forget about the terrible EPA mine spill polluting the Colorado River in 2015. If environmentalists want to be serious about reducing pollution, they must focus on cutting the size of government. We should all strive for sustainability. Therefore, we should not view capitalism at odds with a clean Earth. Only through capitalism can we have a realistic expectation of a cleaner Earth. Government intervention only hinders economic progress and does little to protecting the environment. The path to a clean and sustainable planet cannot and should not go through the government but through competition and innovation. The government cannot mandate economic growth. The only thing it can and should do is get out of the way and remove all restrictions that slow innovation. Fossil fuels are already on their way out, and clean energy is the way of the future. But that fact does not, by itself make clean energy affordable. Only with the creative destruction that the market provides can we have a clean and sustainable future that coincides with our economic growth and prosperity. Capitalism leading the way to heal the planet is just one excellent example of how well markets work.

#### **capitalism creates world peace right now.**

Mousseau, 19—Professor in the School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs at the University of Central Florida (Michael, “The End of War: How a Robust Marketplace and Liberal Hegemony Are Leading to Perpetual World Peace,” International Security, Volume 44, Issue 1, Summer 2019, p.160-196, dml)

Is war becoming obsolete? There is wide agreement among scholars that war has been in sharp decline since the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945, even as there is little agreement as to its cause.1 Realists reject the idea that this trend will continue, citing states' concerns with the “security dilemma”: that is, in anarchy states must assume that any state that can attack will; therefore, power equals threat, and changes in relative power result in conflict and war.2 Discussing the rise of China, Graham Allison calls this condition “Thucydides's Trap,” a reference to the ancient Greek's claim that Sparta's fear of Athens' growing power led to the Peloponnesian War.3 This article argues that there is no Thucydides Trap in international politics. Rather, the world is moving rapidly toward permanent peace, possibly in our lifetime. Drawing on economic norms theory,4 I show that what sometimes appears to be a Thucydides Trap may instead be a function of factors strictly internal to states and that these factors vary among them. In brief, leaders of states with advanced market-oriented economies have foremost interests in the principle of self-determination for all states, large and small, as the foundation for a robust global marketplace. War among these states, even making preparations for war, is not possible, because they are in a natural alliance to preserve and protect the global order. In contrast, leaders of states with weak internal markets have little interest in the global marketplace; they pursue wealth not through commerce, but through wars of expansion and demands for tribute. For these states, power equals threat, and therefore they tend to balance against the power of all states. Fearing stronger states, however, minor powers with weak internal markets tend to constrain their expansionist inclinations and, for security reasons, bandwagon with the relatively benign market-oriented powers. I argue that this liberal global hierarchy is unwittingly but systematically buttressing states' embrace of market norms and values that, if left uninterrupted, is likely to culminate in permanent world peace, perhaps even something close to harmony. My argument challenges the realist assertion that great powers are engaged in a timeless competition over global leadership, because hegemony cannot exist among great powers with weak markets; these inherently expansionist states live in constant fear and therefore normally balance against the strongest state and its allies.5 Hegemony can exist only among market-oriented powers, because only they care about global order. Yet, there can be no competition for leadership among market powers, because they always agree with the goal of their strongest member (currently the United States) to preserve and protect the global order based on the principle of self-determination. If another commercial power, such as a rising China, were to overtake the United States, the world would take little notice, because the new leading power would largely agree with the global rules promoted and enforced by its predecessor. Vladimir Putin's Russia, on the other hand, seeks to create chaos around the world. Most other powers, having market-oriented economies, continue to abide by the hegemony of the United States despite its relative economic decline since the end of World War II.6 To support my theory that domestic factors determine states' alignment decisions, I analyze the voting preferences of members of the United Nations General Assembly from 1946 to 2010. I find that states with weak internal markets tend to disagree with the foreign policy preferences of the largest market power (i.e., the United States), but more so if they are major powers or have stronger rather than weaker military and economic capabilities. The power of states with robust internal markets, in contrast, appears to have no effect on their foreign policy preferences, as market-oriented states align with the market leader regardless of their power status or capabilities. I corroborate that this pattern may be a consequence of states' interest in the global market order by finding that states with higher levels of exports per capita are more likely than other states to have preferences aligned with those of the United States; those with lower levels of exports are more likely to have interests that do not align with the United States, but again more so if they are stronger rather than weaker. Liberal scholars of international politics have long offered explanations for why the incidence of war may decline, generally beginning with the assumption that although the security dilemma exists, it can be overcome with the help of factors external to states.7 Neoliberal institutionalists treat states as like units and international organization as an external condition.8 Trade interdependence is dyadic and thus an external condition.9 Democracy is an internal factor, but theories of democratic peace have an external dimension: peace is the result of the expectations of states' behavior informed by the images that leaders create of each other's regime types.10 In contrast, I show that the security dilemma may not exist at all and how peace can emerge in anarchy with states pursuing their interests determined entirely by internal factors.11

#### **Capitalism is the only viable system and capitalism is inevitable**

Stromberg 4 - Joseph R. Stromberg, Research Fellow at the Independent Institute and has held the JoAnn B. Rothbard chair in History at the Ludwig von Mises Institute. He received his BA and MA from Florida Atlantic University, and his further graduate work was completed at the University of Florida, 2004 ("Why Capitalism is Inevitable," Mises Institute, 7-09-2004, Available Online at https://mises.org/library/why-capitalism-inevitable, Accessed on 7-5-2017 //JJ)

How striking to discover, then, how few writers and thinkers are willing to spell out precisely what they mean when they refer to the economics of capitalism. For many, the term capitalism is nothing but a vessel into which they pour all the people, institutions, and ideas that they hate. And so capitalism emerges as a synonym for greed, dirty rivers and streams, pollution, corrupt businessmen, entrenched social privilege, the Republican Party, criminal syndicates, world Jewry, war for oil, or what have you. In fact, the advocates of capitalism themselves haven't always been entirely clear on the meaning and implications of capitalist theory. And this is why Murray Rothbard went to such lengths to spell out precisely what he was endorsing when he championed the economics of capitalism. This was especially necessary when he was writing in 1973, a time which was arguably the low point for capitalist theory. Mises died that year, all economists were said to be Keynesians, Nixon closed the gold window, wage and price controls were fastened on industry as an inflation fix, and the US was locked in a titanic Cold War struggle that emphasized government weaponry over private enterprise. Murray Rothbard, meanwhile, was hard at work on his book For A New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto, an effort to breath new life into a traditionally liberal program by infusing it with a heavy dose of political radicalism. It must have seemed like a hopeless task. The same year, he was asked to contribute an essay in a series of readings called Modern Political Economy (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973). He was to address "The Future of Capitalism" (pp. 419-430), the conclusion of which might have seemed self-evidently bleak. But not to Rothbard. His contribution to the volume was lively, optimistic, enormously clarifying, and prescient to the extreme. Above all, he used the opportunity to explain with great clarity what precisely he means when he refers to capitalism: no more and no less than the sum of voluntary activity in society, particularly that characterized by exchange. Does that seem like a stretch? Rothbard explains that the term capitalism itself was coined by its greatest enemy Karl Marx, and ever since the term has conflated two very different ideas: free-market capitalism, on the one hand, and state capitalism, on the other. "The difference between them, Rothbard notes, "is precisely the difference between, on the one hand, peaceful, voluntary exchange, and on the other, violent expropriation." This may seem like a small point, but the confusion accounts for why whole swaths of American historiography are incorrect, for example, in distinguishing Alexander Hamilton's supposed sympathy for capitalism from Thomas Jefferson's sympathy for "agrarianism." Rothbard points out that Jefferson was in fact an advocate of laissez-faire who had read and understood the classical economists; as an "agrarian" he was merely applying the doctrine of free markets to the American regional context, even as Hamilton's mercantilist and inflationist sympathies are best described as a preference for state capitalism. As Rothbard explains, capitalism is nothing but the system that emerges in the framework of free exchange of property and the absence of government efforts to stop it. Whether you are talking about buying a newspaper from a vendor or a group of stockholders hiring a CEO, the essence of the exchange is the same: two parties finding ways to benefit by the trade goods and services. From the exchange, both parties expect to benefit else the trade would not have occurred. The global marketplace at all levels is nothing but the extension of the idea of mutual betterment through peaceful exchange. In contrast to market exchange, we have its opposite in government intervention. It can be classified in two ways: either as prohibiting or partially prohibiting an exchange between two people or forcing someone to make an "exchange" that would otherwise not take place in the market. All government activity—regulation, taxation, protectionism, inflation, spending, social insurance, ad infinitum—can be classified as one of those two types of interventions. Taxation is nothing more than robbery (Rothbard challenges anyone to define taxation in a way that would not also describe high-minded theft), and the state itself is nothing but a much-vaunted robber on a mass scale—and it matters not whether the state is conducting domestic or foreign policy; the essence of statecraft is always coercion whereas the essence of markets is always voluntarism. In Rothbard's conception, it is not quite correct to characterize support for free markets as either right or left. In 1973, he heard as many complaints about the supposed greed unleashed by markets from the followers of Russell Kirk as he did from the new left socialists. The right, in fact, was afflicted with a serious intellectual attachment to pre-capitalistic institutional forms of monopoly privilege, militarism, and the unrelenting drive to war. This was what Rothbard saw the political establishment of 1973 bringing to the US: the march of the partnership between government and business that is nothing but the reinvention of political forms that pre-dated the capitalist revolution that began in the Italian city states of the 16th century. The US conservatives were entirely complicit in this attempt to reverse the classical liberal revolution in favor of free markets in order to fasten an old-world monopolist system on society. In this, the conservatives resembled their supposed enemies, the socialists. After all, socialism was, as Rothbard put it, "essentially a confused, middle-of-the-road movement." Its supposed goal of liberty, peace, and prosperity was to be achieved through the imposition of new forms of regimentation, mercantilism, and feudalism. Socialism seeks, in Rothbard's words, "liberal ends by the use of conservative means." ("Left and Right: The Prospects for Liberty," Left and Right, I, 1, Spring 1965). Conservatives could be counted on to support the means but not the ends, and the result is something that approaches the current status quo in the US: a mixed political system that combines the worst features of egalitarian ideology with corporate militarism—a system that leaves enough of the private sector unhampered to permit impressive growth and innovation. It was precisely the productive power of market, as versus the dead-end of statist methods favored by both left and right, that led Rothbard to see that the gains of capitalism could not finally be reversed. In addition, he may have been the first to anticipate the way in which the terms left and right would eventually come to mean their precise opposite in the reforming economies of Eastern Europe. He was fascinated but not entirely surprised by the events in old Yugoslavia, where a Stalinist system had been forced to reform into a more market oriented economy. In fact, he noted that the trend had begun in the 1960s, and extended all over Eastern Europe. What was essentially happening, Rothbard wrote, was that socialism had been tried and failed and now these countries were turning to market models. Keep in mind that this was 1973, when hardly anyone else believed these countries capable of reform: "In Eastern Europe, then, I think that the prospects for the free market are excellent--I think we’re getting free-market capitalism and that its triumph there is almost inevitable." Ten years later, it was still fashionable to speak of authoritarian regimes that could reform, as contrasted with socialist totalitarianism that could not be reform and presumably had to be obliterated. Rothbard did not believe this, based on both theory and evidence. Rothbard saw that all sectors in all countries moving either toward capitalism or toward socialism, which is to say, toward freedom or toward control. In the US, the trends looked very bleak indeed but he found trends to cheer in the antiwar movement, which he saw as a positive development against military central planning. "Both in Vietnam and in domestic government intervention, each escalating step only creates more problems which confront the public with tile choice: either, press on further with more interventions, or repeal them--in Vietnam, withdraw from the coun­try." His conclusion must have sounded impossibly naïve in 1973 but today we can see that he saw further than any other "futurists" of his time: "the advent of industrialism and the Industrial Revolution has irreversibly changed the prognosis for freedom and statism. In the pre-industrial era, statism and despotism could peg along indefinitely, content to keep the peasantry at subsistence levels and to live off their surplus. But industrialism has broken the old tables; for it has become evident that socialism cannot run an industrial system, and it is gradually becoming evident that neomercantilism, interventionism, in the long run cannot run an industrial system either. Free-market capi­talism, the victory of social power and the economic means, is not only the only moral and by far the most productive system; it has become the only viable system for mankind in the industrial era. Its eventual triumph is therefore virtually inevitable." Rothbard's optimism about the prospects for liberty is legendary but less well understood is the basis for it: markets work and government do not. Left and right can define terms however much they want, and they can rant and rave from the point of view of their own ideological convictions, but what must achieve victory in the end is the remarkable influence of millions and billions of mutually beneficial exchanges putting relentless pressure on the designs of central planners to thwart their will. To be optimistic about the prospects for capitalism requires only that we understand Mises's argument concerning the inability of socialist means to produce rational outcomes, and to be hopeful about the triumph of choice over coercion.

### Counter-ROTB

#### The counter ROTJ is to vote for the better debater. The ROTB is whoever best argues for or against the policy implementation of the resolution.

#### 1] Turn their case, understanding the viewpoint of the oppressor by speaking the language of power is the only way to dismantle the system, their model of debate does nothing but ours teaches students political activism.

#### 2] Inclusion – their model debate is great for X, but exclusionairy of everyone else. Regulating debate to focus on one group is inherently exclusionary, focusing on substance and policy solves.

#### 3] Solves the T-fw shell and its standards.

#### 4] Topics ed – tying our model of debate to the topic is key to it being good, topic eds key to education, ground, clash, fairness etc.

#### 5] Arg diversity – their model of debate creates a performative echo chamber where students just repeat prewritten k affs every two months, forgoing substantive clash, policy discussion, and topic ed.

#### 6] Our model of debate is a prereq to theirs, we can only read kritiks of policies and policy discussion, if it’s happening.

1. https://www.thesaurus.com/browse/be%20a%20member%20of [↑](#footnote-ref-1)