### 1

#### Interpretation: The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing intellectual property protections for a subset of medicines.

#### Violation – they only defend COVID 19 medicines

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from COVID vaccines to HIV/AIDS to random biotech to insulin treatments and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible.

FDA 20 [(U.S. Food and Drug Administration, federal agency of the Department of Health and Human Service) “Fact Sheet: FDA at a Glance,” 11/18/2020] JL

There are over 20,000 prescription drug products approved for marketing.

FDA oversees over 6,500 different medical device product categories.

There are over 1,600 FDA-approved animal drug products.

There are about 300 FDA-licensed biologics products.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

### 2

**The United States federal government should:**

**- substantially increase production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine, specifically providing all necessary vaccines to India and South Africa, and Iran**

**- cooperate with allies to achieve increased production and global distribution of the COVID-19 Vaccine.**

**That comparatively solves better – IP rights don’t hinder vaccine cooperation, but manufacturing capacity is the current constraint.**

Hans **Sauer 6-17** [(Deputy General Counsel, Biotechnology Industry Organization.) “Web event — Confronting Joe Biden’s proposed TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines and treatments” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/210617-Confronting-Joe-Bidens-proposed-TRIPS-waiver.pdf?x91208&x91208] TDI

But contrary to what Lori said, **there are genuine real problems in the supply chain** that are **not caused by patents**, that are simply caused by the unavailability and the constraints on existing capacity. There is in this world such a thing as maxed-out capacity that just can’t be increased on a dime. It’s not all due to intellectual property. This is true for existing vaccines as well as for vaccine raw materials. There are trade barriers. There are export restrictions that we should all be aware of and that we need to work on. And there are very real political, I think, interests in finding an explanation for how we got to this place that absolve governments around the world from their own policy decisions that they made in the past. In the United States, again, it was the declared policy of the previous administration, as well as this one, that we would vaccinate healthy college kids and go all down the line and offer a vaccine to everybody who wants it before we start sharing any with grandmothers in Burkina Faso. That was the policy. You can agree with it or disagree with it, but that was policy. We had export restrictions in place before a lot of other countries did. And that, too, contributed to unequal access of vaccines around the world. Another thing that was predictable was that politicians and governments around the world who want to be seen as proactive, on the ball, in control, for a long time were actually very indecisive, very unsure about how to address the COVID problem, which has so many dimensions. Vaccines are only one of those. But with respect to vaccines, not many governments took decisive action, put money on the table, put bets on multiple horses, before we knew whether these vaccines would work, would be approved. And it was governments in middle-income countries who now, I think, justifiably are concerned that they’re not getting fast enough access, who didn’t have the means and who didn’t have the decision-making structure to place the same bets on multiple horses, if you will, that were placed in the relatively more wealthy, global North and global West. But there is, I think, a really good and, with hindsight, predictable explanation of how we got to this place, and I think it teaches us something about how to fix the problem going forward. **So why will the waiver not work**? Well, first of all, with complex technology like vaccines, Lori touched on it, reverse engineering, like you would for a small molecule drug, is much more difficult if not impossible. But it depends very much more than small molecule drugs on cooperation, on voluntary transfer of technology, and on mutual assistance. We have seen as part of the pandemic response an unprecedented level of collaborations and cooperation and no indication that IP has stood in the way of the pandemic response. **The waiver proponents have found zero credible examples of where IP has actually been an obstacle,** where somebody has tried to block somebody else from developing a COVID vaccine or other COVID countermeasure, right? It’s not there. **Second, the myth of this vast global capacity to manufacture COVID vaccines that somehow exists** **out there is unsubstantiated** and frankly, in my opinion, untrue. But there is no such thing as vast untapped, idle capacity that could be turned around on a dime to start making COVID vaccines within weeks or even months. This capacity needs to be built; it needs to be established. And at a time when time is of the essence to beat this pandemic, starting capacity-building discussions is helpful, but it won’t be the answer to beat this pandemic. It will be the answer if we do everything right to beating the next pandemic. And if we learn any lesson of this, and then I will stop, is that the COVID waiver as well as the situation in which we find ourselves — if anything, it’s a reminder that we definitely have to take global capacity-building more seriously than we did in the past. That is true for the global North, as well as for middle-income countries — all of whom have to dedicate themselves much more determinedly to pandemic preparedness. And there’s a need to invest both in preparedness and in public health systems that hasn’t happened in the wake of past pandemic threats. This is what we will need to do. We will need to reduce export restrictions, and we will need to rededicate ourselves to preparing for the next pandemic. As far as this pandemic goes, **there are 11 vaccines around the world that are already being shot into arms, only four of which come from the global North. How many more vaccines do we want?** I don’t know, maybe 11 is enough if we start making more of them. But there are manufacturers around the world who know how to do this — including in China, including in India, and including in Russia. All developed their homegrown vaccines, apparently without interference by IP rights, right? **So let’s make more of those. I think that’s going to be the more practical and realistic answer to solving the problem**. And we need to lean on governments to stop export controls and to dedicate themselves to more global equity.

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

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

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

### 3

**US dominance is secured in biotech now, but China’s closing the gap fast – that allows geopolitical and economic advantages**

Scott **Moore** **2020** [(Director of the Penn Global China Program at the University of Pennsylvania. Previously, Moore was a Young Professional and Water Resources Management Specialist at the World Bank Group, and Environment, Science, Technology, and Health Officer for China at the U.S.) “China’s Role In The Global Biotechnology Sector And Implications For U.S. Policy” https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/FP\_20200427\_china\_biotechnology\_moore.pdf]TDI

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Even by the standards of emerging technologies, **biotechnology has the potential to utterly transform geopolitics, economics**, and society in the 21st century. Yet while the United States has long been the world leader in most segments of the global biotechnology sector, **China is fast becoming a significant player**. This brief assesses the implications of China’s changing role in biotechnology for the United States, which span national security, data security, and economic competitiveness. On current trends the United States is likely to remain the world leader in most biotechnology areas. **However, the gap between China and the U.S. is narrowing in the biotechnology sector,** and U.S. policymakers must boost public investment, liberalize immigration and foreign student visa policies, and enact regulatory reforms to ensure America remains competitive. At the same time, areas like vaccine development and regulation of emerging technologies like synthetic biology present rich opportunities for Sino-U.S. cooperation. INTRODUCTION Thanks to extensive government funding for biomedical research, an unparalleled ability to translate basic research into commercial products and applications, and strong intellectual property protections, the United States has been the dominant global player in developing and commercializing biotechnology for decades.1 This dominance is reflected in the fact that United States accounted for almost half of all biotechnology patents filed worldwide from 1999 to 2013.2 However, in the intervening years, and just as in the case of artificial intelligence and other emerging technologies, other nations, including South Korea and Singapore, have invested heavily in developing their biotechnology sectors and industries. These efforts pale, however, in comparison to those of China, and the sheer size and scale of the Chinese biotechnology industry pose a range of economic, security, and regulatory issues for American policymakers. The determination of China’s one-party state to become a leading player in biotechnology is reflected by the rapid growth in investment in the sector. Some estimates claim that collectively, **China’s** central, local, and provincial **governments have invested over $100 billion in life sciences** research and development. Regardless of the true figure, official encouragement has led to a torrid place of investment. In just the two-year period from 2015 to 2017, venture capital and private equity investment in the sector totaled some $45 billion.3 The value of commercial deals concluded in the fields of biology, medicine and medical machine technology, meanwhile increased from 25.8 billion renminbi (RMB), or $3.6 billion, in 2011 to over 75 billion RMB ($10.6 billion) in 2017.4 Annual research and development expenditures by Chinese pharmaceutical firms, the foundation of the biotechnology sector, rose from some 39 billion RMB in 2014 ($5.5 billion) to over 53 billion RMB (US$7.5 billion) by 2017. Expenditure on new product development among these firms, an important indicator of future growth potential, increased from just over 40 billion RMB ($5.6 billion) to almost 60 billion ($8.4 billion).5 By Western standards, some of these figures are still low. Swiss drugmaker Roche, the world leader in biotechnology research and development, spent some $11 billion in 2018 alone.6 As these figures suggest, the development of China’s biotechnology sector paints a nuanced picture for U.S. policymakers. On one hand, the sector’s rapid growth, and high-level commitment to continued investment, means that China will inevitably become an increasingly important player in the global biotechnology sector, **with implications for national security, economic competitiveness, and regulation**. An executive from In-Q-Tel, the U.S. government’s inhouse national security venture capital fund, warned Congress in a November 2019 hearing, for example, that China “intends to own the biorevolution… and they are building the infrastructure, the talent pipeline, the regulatory system, and the financial system they need to do that.”7 The CEO of European drugmaker AstraZeneca has similarly opined that “Much of [China’s] innovation in the last three to four years has been ‘me too,’ but now on the horizon we can see firstin-class innovation.”8 Yet on the other hand, while China’s biotechnology sector will almost certainly continue to grow in scale, sophistication, and competitiveness, there is little reason to believe on current trends that the United States will lose its edge in the sector. Indeed, the biggest risk to the global competitiveness of the U.S. biotechnology industry likely comes from the prospect of declining public investment and reduced mobility for world-class researchers and industry professionals. Moreover, the COVID-19 crisis underscores both the importance of continued investment in biotechnology and the many challenges to promoting effective international cooperation on global health security. This brief first examines the key policies and actors in China’s biotechnology sector, then offers an assessment of the sector’s current capabilities and future trends, and finally further explores the implications of developments in Chinese biotechnology for U.S. policy.

**The aff’s waiving of IP doesn’t solve but it does give away sensitive national security information that allows China to lead ahead in biotech**

Josh **Rogin 4-8**. [(Washington Post Columnist covering National Security Issues.) “Opinion: The wrong way to fight vaccine nationalism” https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/the-wrong-way-to-fight-vaccine-nationalism/2021/04/08/9a65e15e-98a8-11eb-962b-78c1d8228819\_story.html ] TDI

Americans will not be safe from covid-19 until the entire world is safe. That basic truth shows why vaccine nationalism is not only immoral but also counterproductive. But the simplest solutions are rarely the correct ones, **and some countries are using the issue to advance their own strategic interests**. The Biden administration must reject the effort by some nations to turn our shared crisis into their opportunity. As the inequities of vaccine distribution worldwide grow, a group of more than 50 developing countries led by India and South Africa is pushing the World Trade Organization to dissolve all international intellectual property protections for pandemic-related products, which would include vaccine research patents, manufacturing designs and technological know-how. The Trump administration rejected the proposal to waive the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) for the pandemic when it was introduced in October. Now, hundreds of nongovernmental organizations and dozens of Democratic lawmakers are pushing the Biden administration to support the proposal. But many warn **the move would result in the United States handing over a generation of advanced research** — much of it funded by the U.S. taxpayer — **to** our country’s greatest competitors, above all **China**. In Congress, there’s justified frustration with the United States’ failure to respond to China’s robust vaccine diplomacy, in which Beijing has conditioned vaccine offers to pandemic-stricken countries on their ignoring security concerns over Chinese telecom companies or abandoning diplomatic recognition of Taiwan. There’s also a lot of anger at Big Pharma among progressives for profiting from the pandemic. “We are in a race against time, and unfortunately Big Pharma is standing in the way of speedily addressing this problem,” Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-Ill.), who supports the effort to waive intellectual property protections, told me in an interview. “I think the real security issue is that while the United States balks in making sure that we help ourselves, that these adversaries will just jump right in.” Schakowsky argued that alternative measures for helping poor countries manufacture vaccines are simply not moving fast enough to save lives and that the United States has a duty to respond. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) personally conveyed her support for the waiver to President Biden, Schakowsky said. But Big Pharma is just one piece of the puzzle. Countries such as India and South Africa have been trying to weaken WTO intellectual property protections for decades. **The mRNA technology that underpins the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines was funded initially by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and has national security implications.** Inside the Biden administration, the National Security Council has already convened several meetings on the issue. The waiver is supported by many global health officials in the White House and at the U.S. Agency for International Development, who believe the United States’ international reputation is suffering from its perceived “America First” vaccine strategy. On Wednesday, U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai spoke with WTO Director General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala about the waiver issue. USTR is convening its own interagency meetings on the issue, which many see as a move to reassert its jurisdiction over WTO matters. If and when this does get to Biden’s desk, he will also hear from national security officials who believe that waiving TRIPS would result in the forced transfer of national security-sensitive technology to China, **a country that strives to dominate the biotechnology** ***field*** as part of its Made in China 2025 strategy. **Once countries such as China have this technology, they will apply their mercantilist industrial models to ensure their companies dominate these strategically important industries, potentially erasing thousands of U.S. jobs.** “We would be delivering a competitive advantage to countries that are increasingly viewed as our adversaries, at taxpayer expense, when there are other ways of doing this,” said Mark Cohen, senior fellow at the University of California at Berkeley Law School. **A preferable approach would be to build more vaccine-manufacturing capacity** in the United States and then give those vaccines to countries in need, said Cohen. The U.S. pharmaceutical industry would surely benefit, but **that’s preferable to being dependent on other countries when the next pandemic hits.** “If there’s anything that the pandemic has taught us, it’s that we need to have a robust supply chain, for ourselves and for the world generally,” Cohen said. What’s more, it’s not clear that waiving the TRIPS agreement for the pandemic would work in the first place. Bill Gates and others involved in the current vaccine distribution scheme have argued that it would not result in more vaccines, pointing out that licensing agreements are already successfully facilitating cooperation between patent-holding vaccine-makers and foreign manufacturers. Critics respond that such cooperation is still failing to meet the urgent needs in the developing world. Vaccine equity is a real problem, but waiving intellectual property rights is not the solution. If the current system is not getting shots into the arms of people in poor countries, we must fix that for their sake and ours. But the pandemic and our responses to it have geopolitical implications, whether we like it or not. **That means helping the world and thinking about our strategic interests at the same time.**

**China will convert biotechnology gains to military advantages, undermining US primacy – specifically true in the context of vaccines**

Mercy A. **Kuo 2017** [(Executive Vice President at Pamir Consulting.) “The Great US-China Biotechnology and Artificial Intelligence Race” <https://thediplomat.com/2017/08/the-great-us-china-biotechnology-and-artificial-intelligence-race/>] TDI

Trans-Pacific View author Mercy Kuo regularly engages subject-matter experts, policy practitioners, and strategic thinkers across the globe for their diverse insights into the U.S. Asia policy. This conversation with Eleonore Pauwels – Director of Biology Collectives and Senior Program Associate, Science and Technology Innovation Program at the Wilson Center in Washington D.C. – is the 104th in “The Trans-Pacific View Insight Series.” Explain the motivation behind Chinese investment in U.S. genomics and artificial intelligence (AI). With large public and private investments inland and in the U.S., China plans to become the next AI-Genomics powerhouse, which indicates that these technologies will soon converge in China. China’s ambition is to lead the global market for precision medicine, **which necessitates acquiring strategic tech**nological and human capital in both genomics and AI. And the country excels at this game. A sharp blow in this U.S.-China competition happened in 2013 when BGI purchased Complete Genomics, in California, with the intent to build its own advanced genomic sequencing machines, therefore securing a technological knowhow mainly mastered by U.S. producers. There are significant economic incentives behind China’s heavy investment in the increasing convergence of AI and genomics. This golden combination will drive precision medicine to new heights by developing a more sophisticated understanding of how our genomes function, leading to precise, even personalized, cancer therapeutics and preventive diagnostics, such as liquid biopsies. By one estimate, the liquid biopsy market is expected to be worth $40 billion in 2017. Assess the implications of iCarbonX of Shenzhen’s decision to invest US$100 million in U.S.-company PatientsLikeMe relative to AI and genomic data collection. iCarbonX is a pioneer in AI software that learns to recognize useful relationships between large amounts of individuals’ biological, medical, behavioral and psychological data. Such a data-ecosystem will deliver insights into how an individual’s genome is mutating over time, and therefore critical information about this individual’s susceptibilities to rare, chronic and mental illnesses. In 2017, iCarbonX invested $100 million in PatientsLikeMe, getting a hold over data from the biggest online network of patients with rare and chronic diseases. If successful, this effort could turn into genetic gold, making iCarbonX one of the wealthiest healthcare companies in China and beyond. The risk factor is that iCarbonX is handling more than personal data, but potentially vulnerable data as the company uses a smartphone application, Meum, for customers to consult for health advice. Remember that the Chinese nascent genomics and AI industry relies on cloud computing for genomics data-storage and exchange, creating, in its wake, new vulnerabilities associated with any internet-based technology. This phenomenon has severe implications. How much consideration has been given to privacy and the evolving notion of personal data in this AI-powered health economy? And is our cyberinfrastructure ready to protect such trove of personal health data from hackers and industrial espionage? In this new race, will China and the U.S. have to constantly accelerate their rate of cyber and bio-innovation to be more resilient? Refining our models of genomics data protection will become a critical biosecurity issue. Why is Chinese access to U.S. genomic data a national security concern? **Genomics** and computing research **is inherently dual-use, therefore a strategic advantage in a nation’s security arsenal.** Using AI systems to understand how the functioning of our genomes impacts our health **is of strategic importance for biodefense.** This knowledge will lead to increasing developments at the forefront of medical countermeasures, **including vaccines**, antibiotics, and targeted treatments relying on virus-engineering and microbiome research. Applying deep learning to genomics data-sets could help geneticists learn how to use genome-editing (CRISPR) to efficiently engineer living systems, but also to treat and, even “optimize,” human health, **with potential applications in military enhancements**. A $15 million partnership between a U.S. company, Gingko Bioworks, and DARPA aims to genetically design new probiotics as a protection for soldiers against a variety of stomach bugs and illnesses. China could be using the same deep learning techniques on U.S. genomics data to better comprehend how to develop, patent and manufacture tailored cancer immunotherapies in high demand in the United States. Yet, what if Chinese efforts venture into understanding how to impact key genomics health determinants relevant to the U.S. population? **Gaining access to increasingly large U.S. genomic data-sets gives China a knowledge advantage into leading the next steps in bio-military research.** Could biomedical data be used to develop bioweapons? Explain. Personalized medicine advances mean that personalized bio-attacks are increasingly possible. The combination of AI with biomedical data and genome-editing technologies will help us predict genes most important to particular functions. Such insights will contribute to knowing how a particular disease occurs, how a newly-discovered virus has high transmissibility, but also why certain populations and individuals are more susceptible to it. Combining host susceptibility information with pathogenic targeted design, **malicious actors could engineer pathogens that are tailored to overcome the immune system or the microbiome of specific populations.**

**Maintenance of the ILO is key to reduce a host of existential threats – establishes great-power peace.**

**Brands 18**. [(Hal Brands is a Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. “America’s Global Order Is Worth Fighting For, Bloomberg Opinion, Politics & Policy,” August 14, 2018, Bloomberg. <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-08-14/america-s-global-order-is-worth-fighting-for>] TDI

The first argument is **easily disposed** of. Yes, the postwar world has been **thoroughly imperfect**, featuring nuclear arms races, genocides, widespread poverty and other scourges. But the world has **always been** imperfect, and by **any** meaningful **comparison**, the last **seven decades** have been a **veritable golden age**. The **liberal international** economic order has led to an **explosion** of **domestic** and **global prosperity**: According to World Bank data, both U.S. and global **per capita** income have increased **roughly three-fold** (in inflation-adjusted terms) since 1960, with U.S. gross domestic product increasing nearly six-fold. The U.S. **system** of alliances and forward military deployments has **contributed critically** to the **longest period** of **great-power peace** in modern history, and **the incidence of war** and conquest **more broadly** have dropped **dramatically**. The number of **democracies** in the world has **increased** from perhaps a dozen during World War II to well over 100 today; **respect for basic** human rights has also reached **impressive levels**. As a **bevy of scholarship** has shown, the policies that the U.S. has **pursued** and the **international order** it has built have contributed **enormously** and **directly** to these **outcomes**. If the **liberal international order** can’t be considered a **smashing success**, no **international order** could be. The second critique is also overstated. It is true that Washington, like all great powers throughout history, has been willing to bend the rules to get its way. It is hard to reconcile Cold War-era interventions in Guatemala, Chile and other countries with a professed solicitude for human rights and democracy; the Iraq War of 2003 is only one instance in which the U.S. brushed aside the concerns of international organizations such as the U.N. Security Council. Likewise, when the U.S. government determined that the Bretton Woods system of monetary relations no longer suited its interests in the 1970s, it terminated that scheme and insisted on creating a more favorable one. But again, the proper standard here is not sainthood but reality. And the U.S. has **generally** enlisted its power in the **service** of **universal values** such as **democracy** and **human rights**; it has, more often than not, promoted **a positive-sum** international system in which **like-minded** nations can be **secure** and **wealthy**. This goes back to the very beginning of the liberal order: Washington did not seek to hold its defeated adversaries in subjugation after World War II; it rebuilt Japan and western Germany into thriving, democratic allies that became fierce economic competitors to the U.S. The U.S. has taken this approach not simply because it wanted to do good in the world — powerful as this motivation is — but because of a hard-headed desire to do good for itself. In an interdependent global environment, American officials have long calculated, the U.S. cannot divorce its own well-being from that of the wider world. And in contrast to how other great powers — Imperial Japan, for instance, or the Soviet Union — ruled their spheres of influence, American behavior has been positively enlightened. It is this relatively benign behavior that has convinced so many countries to tolerate American leadership — and it is the emergence of a darker form of U.S. hegemony under the Trump administration that so profoundly worries them today. As for the third critique, the premise is right, but the **conclusion** can easily **go too far**. It is always **dangerous** to become **so enraptured** by past **achievements** that one **loses sight** of the **need for adaptation** in **the future**. This is particularly true today, because the strength of the liberal order is being tested from within and without, by issues ranging from unequal burden-sharing among American allies to the ambivalence of the American people themselves. There is **little evidence** to suggest, however, that either American power or **the liberal order** it supports have **eroded** so **dramatically** that **Washington**’s postwar project cannot be **sustained**. Quite the contrary — the U.S. is likely to remain the **world’s strongest power** for **decades to come**.

### WTO Legitimacy turn

#### THE WTO UNDERMINES INITIATIVES THAT FIGHT CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOSTERS A GLOBAL ECONOMIC ORDER THAT PRIVILEGES PROFIT OVER ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH. IN ORDER TO STOP CLIMATE CHANGE THE WTO MUST DIE.

Campesina 13 Via Campesina (international farmers organization founded in 1993 in Mons, Belgium, formed by 182 organisations in 81 countries,[1] and describing itself as "an international movement which coordinates peasant organizations of small and middle-scale producers, agricultural workers, rural women, and indigenous communities from Asia, Africa, America, and Europe), 9/9/13, To confront the climate emergency we need to dismantle the WTO and the free trade regime, VIA CAMPESINA, https://viacampesina.org/en/to-confront-the-climate-emergency-we-need-to-dismantle-the-wto-and-the-free-trade-regime/SJEP

These existing WTO trade rules are currently undermining initiatives to tackle climate change and they can be further aggravated by the attempt of new negotiations in the upcoming 9th Ministerial meeting in Bali, Indonesia. How the corporate rules of the WTO work Under the WTO logic, each country should specialize in what they can produce best -what is called their “comparative advantages”- and then trade these products in exchange for products that other countries produce best. This logic however promotes the construction of market-oriented and imbalanced economies that focus on the demands of the market rather than the needs of their people on the ground. These export-oriented economies also bleed Mother Nature in order to exploit the most out of it provoking disruptions in the environment as we are seeing now with climate change, biodiversity loss and the destruction of ecosystems. This is the capitalist logic – nature is just a thing to be exploited for profit. The real beneficiaries of this imbalanced trade rules of the WTO are the transnational corporations since in reality, they are the ones that have more “comparative advantages” than fledgling national and domestic infant industries. In a world of free trade flows – as the WTO aspires – transnational corporations are free to enter and move between countries, choosing those with cheap labor and relaxed regulations and at the same time able to exit and move out just as easily after it has exhausted and grabbed the natural resources, leaving in several cases, their toxic waste. At the same time, the losers are many – the farmers who lose their farms as they cannot compete with cheap food imports that flood the local markets, the workers whose jobs are made even more unstable and precarious with the pressure to lower labor standards, the persons who are forced to migrate because of loss of livelihood, the women who are most times those who bear the brunt of economic distress on the family and community, the indigenous people who are displaced from their lands, and Mother Earth. Global Trade Rules and the Environment The WTO, of course, claims to be committed to “environmental protection” and “sustainable development.” Citing Article XX from the old GATT[[1]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1#140f3245da855c0a__ftn1)regime that was grandfathered into the WTO, any country can be exempted from the WTO rules to bring in policy measures “necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health” [Article XX–b] or measures “relating to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources…” [Article XX–g]. At first glance this may sound ‘environmentally friendly,’ but it is conditioned by a big caveat in the Article’s preamble [or ‘chapeau’] which, in effect, puts the onus on countries initiating environmental protection measures to prove that their actions will not cause “arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination” or pose a “disguised restriction on international trade.” In other words, global trade rules guaranteeing the free flow of capital, goods and services trump environmental protection priorities. As a result, environmental protection measures are often challenged and struck down for being a “disguised restriction on international trade.” Indeed, under the overarching ‘most favored nation’ and ‘national treatment’ clauses of the WTO regime, those transnational corporations based in member countries effectively have ‘sovereign rights.’ Moreover, even the scope of environmental protection covered by Article XX is too narrowly defined to adequately safeguard measures urgently needed today to combat climate change, let alone the further commodification of nature. Recent WTO ruling against climate initiatives In the province of Ontario, Canada, the WTO recently struck down a law and program designed to promote the development of renewable energy as a measure for mitigating climate change while also creating jobs. The program allots the majority of producer power rights to Ontario companies thereby making it possible for the province to make the transition from coal, oil and gas without completely damaging its local economy. Its ‘domestic content requirements’ ensure that new manufacturing jobs will be created in Ontario by requiring that 25 percent of the content of all wind projects and 50 percent of the content of all solar projects are produced by workers and industries in the province. This program also guaranteed preferential 20-year purchase price per kilowatt-hour for electricity from wind and solar generators from companies that had a certain percentage of their costs originating from Ontario. In its first two years, this program created more than 20,000 climate jobs in Ontario and was on track to create a total of 50,000. It was accelerating the production of renewable energy while simultaneously reducing both greenhouse gas emissions and unemployment. While there are particular concerns about the program’s implementation, it is recognized as an innovative step toward tackling climate change. In 2010/2011, however, Japan and the European Union representing the interest of their transnational corporations filed cases in the WTO against Ontario’s renewable energy incentives program claiming that it was violating the “national treatment” rule of the WTO. This rule establishes: “The products of the territory of any contracting party [country member of the WTO] imported into the territory of any other contracting party [country member of the WTO] shall be accorded treatment no less favourable than that accorded to like products of national origin in respect of all laws, regulations and requirements affecting their internal sale, offering for sale, purchase, transportation, distribution or use.” [Art. III. 4 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) of the WTO] This means that you can give more benefits to foreign transnational corporations but never less than what you have given to a domestic enterprise. When it comes to climate change, this implies that a State cannot promote the development of a national industry of solar panels, wind energy or renewable energy by using national regulations primarily designed to benefit domestic companies or products. If a State wants to give subsidies or preferences to those national companies or products it must also give the same incentives to foreign transnational corporations. In other words an infant domestic effort at generating renewable energy, will have to compete from the first day with a big foreign transnational corporation of “clean energy”, most of them main actors of the so-called “Green Economy”, that care much more about their markets than the climate of the world and that in reality still promote a market-based and exploitative model of “renewable energy”. On May 2013, the Dispute Settlement Body of the WTO in its final ruling said that Canada/Ontario was in violation of WTO rules. One month later, the Ontario Minister of Energy announced that they will “comply with the World Trade Organization’s ruling on the domestic content provision”. The WTO ruling against Ontario is just the tip of the iceberg. There are other cases, for example, in India, who is still suffering the deaths of almost 1,000 persons, the disappearances of 3,000 and the evacuation of 100,000 due to the extreme floods caused by deforestation and climate change in Uttarakhand, there was a case filed by the United States in February 2013 in the WTO challenging India’s use of subsidies and “buy local” rules in its domestic solar program. The WTO rules that the United States has based its complaints on that India has supposedly violated are the very same ones that forced Ontario to change its renewable energy program. Furthermore, there are disputes in the WTO between China, the United States and the European Union in relation to wind power equipment and solar panels. These disputes don’t aim to lower the prices of renewable energy but rather the contrary. Their main aim is to preserve the markets and profits of their respective corporations. Bali: New attempt to expand the WTO and FTAs At the next ministerial meeting of the WTO, they will not try to conclude the “Doha Development Round.” This has proven to be too difficult as it is a massive agreement encompassing numerous areas and with the “single undertaking” clause of the WTO, where everything or nothing is agreed, this has led to the impasse in the negotiations. However, with a new Director General supported by the influential developing country coalition BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), the transnational corporations and big players in the WTO have a new strategy to unlock the stalemate and promote an “early harvest” of some agreements, what they call the “Bali Package”, and push forward agreements that will include environmental goods and services like the White House has recently announced: “The U.S. will work with trading partners to launch negotiations at the World Trade Organization towards global free trade in environmental goods, including clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, hydro and geothermal… Over the next year, we will work towards securing participation of countries, which account for 90 percent of global trade in environmental goods, representing roughly $481 billion in annual environmental goods trade. We will also work in the Trade in Services Agreement negotiations towards achieving free trade in environmental services.” [[2]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1#140f3245da855c0a__ftn2) In effect, these measures are part of the follow-up to the false ‘green economy’ agenda promoted and adopted at the Rio+20 Earth Summit last June 2012. A prime objective of this Rio+20 plan of action is to promote and accelerate the commodification of both material and non-material parts of nature. Here, for example, the functions of forests are to be extended beyond just the provision of wood products to be used for environmental services ranging from green tourism to carbon capture and storage. In turn, this calls for the establishment of markets for ecosystem services and biodiversity offsets. However, in order to create and advance markets for environmental services and goods, they must be aided and abetted by global trade rules. In other words, the false ‘green economy’ agenda simply cannot operate without the WTO regime and the FTAs. And we need to remember that the rules of the WTO are the basis for all other free trade agreements, whether bilateral or regional, (TPP, TTIP, EPAs, CAFTA, NAFTA, EU-Association Agreements and others[[3]](https://mail.google.com/mail/ca/u/0/?shva=1#140f3245da855c0a__ftn3)). These WTO-plus agreements are also in their own right, undermining and working counter to initiatives to care for the environment and address climate change. There are dozens of cases all over the world of foreign corporations demanding huge compensations from States, using the FTAs clause allowing lawsuits from investor to State, because of national environmental regulations. Occidental v. Ecuador, Pacific Rim Mining Corp v. El Salvador, Vattenfall v. Germany, Renco vs. Peru are just some examples of how free trade and investment rules are designed and used to undermine initiatives to heal nature. In many situations a simple threat of a lawsuit from an investor, eases national environmental regulations. International trade law has legal mechanisms to sanction and implement their rulings while environmental provisions are mainly declarations that have no compliance mechanisms and are easily trumped by trade agreements. People and Nature first! To address the climate emergency we need to not only stop the expansion of the WTO and FTAs but we need to go beyond that and call for an end to the WTO itself and the free trade regime. There is no more time for half-measures. If we are to save nature and humanity, we need to change the system and changing the system means dismantling the free trade regime. WTO rulings like in the Ontario case cannot be allowed to proliferate. Governments should not have to follow rulings that undermine initiatives to address climate change. Human rights, labor rights, indigenous rights and the rights of Mother Earth have to be above trade rules if we want to preserve life as we know it. In the WTO and the FTAs, there are clauses that guarantee the patents of transnational corporations over inventions that can save millions of lives and that can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We are living a global emergency situation, greater than any that we have lived, and intellectual property rights for profit should not have precedence over nature and humanity. Trade is needed but a different kind of trade, one that is not based on the exploitation of people and nature and whose rules benefit the communities and not the corporations. The kind of trade we need is complementary and equitable trade not corporate free trade. We need to guarantee that all countries and especially those that are least responsible and most affected by climate change have the right and the capacity to: Support their national and domestic renewable energy sector trough “buy local” regulations, subsidies and all kinds of measures that allow them to get rid of fossil fuels as soon as possible. Have free access to all patents concerning renewable energy and inventions that can help limit the impacts of climate change. Promote food sovereignty and agroecology to not only cool the planet but to feed the people without agrotoxics and GMOs. Stimulate local production and consumption of durable goods to meet the fundamental needs of the people and avoid the transport of goods that can be produced locally. Guarantee the human right to water, reverse the privatization of public water services and preserve the watersheds. Push for clean and accessible public transport infrastructure to take cars off the roads to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Establish regulations and sanctions against industries that destroy and pollute the environment without the threat of international disputes. Encourage the nationalization and control of the society over the energy sector to dismantle the dirty component and accelerate the expansion and promote community based renewable forms of clean energy. Promote economies that are diverse and resilient to climate change. To really address the climate crisis, a world without the WTO and the FTAs, one that is not dominated by transnational corporations and the global free trade regimes, is necessary! We have to change the system, and we have to do this now.

#### Warming encompasses AND outweighs every existential threat

Torres 16 (Phil, affiliate scholar @ Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies PhD candidate @ Rice University in tropical conservation biology, Op-ed: Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk, <http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/Torres20160807>)

Humanity faces a number of formidable challenges this century. Threats to our collective survival stem from asteroids and comets, supervolcanoes, global pandemics, climate change, biodiversity loss, nuclear weapons, biotechnology, synthetic biology, nanotechnology, and artificial superintelligence. With such threats in mind, an informal survey conducted by the Future of Humanity Institute placed the probability of human extinction this century at 19%. To put this in perspective, it means that the average American is more than a thousand times more likely to die in a human extinction event than a plane crash.\* So, given limited resources, which risks should we prioritize? Many intellectual leaders, including Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and Bill Gates, have suggested that artificial superintelligence constitutes one of the most significant risks to humanity. And this may be correct in the long-term. But I would argue that two other risks, namely climate change and biodiveristy loss, should take priority right now over every other known threat. Why? Because these ongoing catastrophes in slow-motion will frame our existential predicament on Earth not just for the rest of this century, but for literally thousands of years to come. As such, they have the capacity to raise or lower the probability of other risks scenarios unfolding. Multiplying Threats Ask yourself the following: are wars more or less likely in a world marked by extreme weather events, megadroughts, food supply disruptions, and sea-level rise? Are terrorist attacks more or less likely in a world beset by the collapse of global ecosystems, agricultural failures, economic uncertainty, and political instability? Both government officials and scientists agree that the answer is “more likely.” For example, the current Director of the CIA, John Brennan, recently identified “the impact of climate change” as one of the “deeper causes of this rising instability” in countries like Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, and Ukraine. Similarly, the former Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, has described climate change as a “threat multiplier” with “the potential to exacerbate many of the challenges we are dealing with today — from infectious disease to terrorism.” The Department of Defense has also affirmed a connection. In a 2015 report, it states, “Global climate change will aggravate problems such as poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership and weak political institutions that threaten stability in a number of countries.” Scientific studies have further shown a connection between the environmental crisis and violent conflicts. For example, a 2015 paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences argues that climate change was a causal factor behind the record-breaking 2007-2010 drought in Syria. This drought led to a mass migration of farmers into urban centers, which fueled the 2011 Syrian civil war. Some observers, including myself, have suggested that this struggle could be the beginning of World War III, given the complex tangle of international involvement and overlapping interests. The study’s conclusion is also significant because the Syrian civil war was the Petri dish in which the Islamic State consolidated its forces, later emerging as the largest and most powerful terrorist organization in human history. A Perfect Storm The point is that climate change and biodiversity loss could very easily push societies to the brink of collapse. This will exacerbate existing geopolitical tensions and introduce entirely new power struggles between state and nonstate actors. At the same time, advanced technologies will very likely become increasingly powerful and accessible. As I’ve written elsewhere, the malicious agents of the future will have bulldozers rather than shovels to dig mass graves for their enemies. The result is a perfect storm of more conflicts in the world along with unprecedentedly dangerous weapons. If the conversation were to end here, we’d have ample reason for placing climate change and biodiversity loss at the top of our priority lists. But there are other reasons they ought to be considered urgent threats. I would argue that they could make humanity more vulnerable to a catastrophe involving superintelligence and even asteroids. The basic reasoning is the same for both cases. Consider superintelligence first. Programming a superintelligence whose values align with ours is a formidable task even in stable circumstances. As Nick Bostrom argues in his 2014 book, we should recognize the “default outcome” of superintelligence to be “doom.” Now imagine trying to solve these problems amidst a rising tide of interstate wars, civil unrest, terrorist attacks, and other tragedies? The societal stress caused by climate change and biodiversity loss will almost certainly compromise important conditions for creating friendly AI, such as sufficient funding, academic programs to train new scientists, conferences on AI, peer-reviewed journal publications, and communication/collaboration between experts of different fields, such as computer science and ethics. It could even make an “AI arms race” more likely, thereby raising the probability of a malevolent superintelligence being created either on purpose or by mistake. Similarly, imagine that astronomers discover a behemoth asteroid barreling toward Earth. Will designing, building, and launching a spacecraft to divert the assassin past our planet be easier or more difficult in a world preoccupied with other survival issues? In a relatively peaceful world, one could imagine an asteroid actually bringing humanity together by directing our attention toward a common threat. But if the “conflict multipliers” of climate change and biodiversity loss have already catapulted civilization into chaos and turmoil, I strongly suspect that humanity will become more, rather than less, susceptible to dangers of this sort. Context Risks We can describe the dual threats of climate change and biodiversity loss as “context risks.” Neither is likely to directly cause the extinction of our species. But both will define the context in which civilization confronts all the other threats before us. In this way, they could indirectly contribute to the overall danger of annihilation — and this worrisome effect could be significant. For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as a 2016 study published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, a recent article in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet another study suggests that we could be approaching a sudden, irreversible, catastrophic collapse of the global ecosystem. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars, nuclear terrorism, engineered pandemics, a superintelligence takeover, and perhaps even an impact winter, it ought to take precedence over all other risk concerns — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.