### 1NC – T

#### Interp: Reductions must be permanent, that’s distinct from a suspension

Reynolds 59 [J. Reynolds “Matter of Montesani v. Levitt” From: Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in the Third Judicial Department, August 13, 1959] [https://casetext.com/case/matter-of-montesani-v-levitt] || SM

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway. The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Violation – waivers arent permanent – their ev ill read yellow

#### Communication from India and South Africa to the WTO 20

(WAIVER FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE TRIPS AGREEMENT FOR THE PREVENTION,

CONTAINMENT AND TREATMENT OF COVID-19 <https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669.pdf&Open=True>, 10-2)

5. An effective response to COVID-19 pandemic

AND

the annexed decision text.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits and ground – allowing non-permanent affs deck neg ground by letting them shift out of any DAs we read via timeframe. We lose core generics like the R&D DA and any base DAs. K2 fairness cuz it controls access to the ballot. K2 education cuz we lose clash.

#### Voters:

#### 1] Fairness is a voter – debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### 2] Education is a voter – it’s the terminal impact of debate and the reason schools fund it

#### Drop the debater:

#### 1] The abuse already occurred and shifted my time allocation

#### 2] It’s the same as DTA since we indict your whole aff

#### Use Competing Interps for T:

#### 1] There’s no way to be “reasonably” topical, it’s a yes/no binary

#### 2] Reasonability collapses since we use offense defense to determine what’s reasonable

#### No RVI’s:

#### 1] It’s your burden to be topical means it’s a prereq to engaging in substance

#### 2] Encourages people to bait theory then win the RVI

### 1NC –DA

#### Midterms are super close but Dems are using Republican abortion bills to rally voters to the polls and tip them in their favor

Godfrey 9-3 [Elaine Godfrey “Is This How Democrats Break Their Midterm Curse?” Published: The Atlantic, September 3, 2021] [https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2021/09/texas-abortion-law-means-midterms/619966/] [Godfrey: Staff writer at the Atlantic, covering politics. Iowa State University B.S. in Journalism and Mass Communication, Minor in Political Science.] || SM

The new Texas law that bans abortion after a fetal heartbeat is detected—and which the Supreme Court has so far declined to block—is an enormous blow to abortion rights in America. But Democrats, who tend to support abortion access, aren’t all doom-and-gloom about the measure. The thinking among some in the party goes like this: An abortion ban is terrible for women—but it’s great for ginning up voter enthusiasm.

Democrats need the help. Republicans generally show up to the polls much more consistently in off-year elections, and next year, the primary target of Democratic voters’ ire—Donald Trump—won’t be on the ballot. Democrats have spent the past few months trying to decide how to zap their voters back to attention, and the party appears to have settled on a strategy of telling voters that Republicans are all extremists. They see the Texas abortion law as an example they can run with. “When you have Joe Biden in the White House and a Democratic Congress, you feel a little more calm than you did the last four years. You think you can watch Bachelor in Paradise in peace,” Lanae Erickson, a vice president at the moderate think tank Third Way, told me. “But this shows what the stakes really are.”

Democrats have public opinion on their side: Abortion bans aren’t broadly popular in any state, and although the Texas law isn’t a full ban, it comes close—and it will allow Democrats to paint Republicans as hard-liners who are out of touch with public opinion. This issue could very well be the tipping point in districts that are heavily suburban, with a lot of educated women. “It’s ultimately possible that Democrats are going to break their midterm curse,” the progressive pollster Sean McElwee told me. McElwee says his firm, Data for Progress, has already seen a jump in its own small-dollar donations following the Texas law’s passage. The Texas law allows private citizens to sue abortion providers and anyone else who “aids or abets” an abortion, and he expects that “each individual civil suit is going to be a rage-inducing piece of content for Democratic small-dollar donor fundraisers.”

#### The aff is massively unpopular – majority of voters oppose the aff – regardless of political affiliation

Schulte 5-4 [Gabriela Schulte, 5-4-2021, “Poll: Majority oppose proposal to temporarily waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines” The Hill, Accessed 8-11-2021, <https://thehill.com/hilltv/what-americas-thinking/551797-poll-majority-oppose-proposal-to-temporarily-waive-intellectual> ww

A majority of voters oppose the proposal to temporarily waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines, a new Hill-HarrisX poll finds.¶ The survey comes as the Biden administration faces mounting pressure to support a proposal led by India and South Africa that would waive an international intellectual property agreement that protects pharmaceutical trade secrets.¶ Backers of the move argue it would enable lower-income countries to manufacture the vaccines themselves while those opposed say it could make the vaccine less safe and damper production in existing locations.¶ Fifty-seven percent of registered voters in the May 3-4 survey said they oppose the proposal to waive intellectual property rights on COVID-19 vaccines. By contrast, 43 percent of respondents said they support the proposal. ¶ Sixty-four percent of Republican voters along with 52 percent of both Democratic and independent voters said they oppose waiving the intellectual property rights of vaccines.¶ "This is a complex issue with a remarkably sophisticated understanding by the public. The tension is as follows: On one hand you have the need to protect the intellectual property rights of the scientists and companies that brought about the fastest vaccine in history, and will likely need to produce new versions of the shot even faster to battle evolving strains," Dritan Nesho, chief researcher and CEO of HarrisX, told Hill.TV.¶ "On the other hand there’s the need to save lives, reaching global heard immunity and providing access to the vaccine as broadly and equitably as as possible," Nesho continued.¶ "Today a majority of 57 percent of U.S. voters would like to protect the intellectual property of vaccine makers, but as more and more people are vaccinated in advanced economies, voter pressure for broader and more equitable distribution will rise," Nesho added. "Already we see Democrats and independents here split on the issue of whether or not to waive IP rights to provide greater access to the vaccines."¶ President Biden is expected to weigh in on the proposal at a World Trade Organization meeting on Wednesday.¶ The most recent Hill-HarrisX poll was conducted online among 939 registered voters. It has a margin of error of 3.2 percentage points.

#### Midterm success k2 long term climate initiatives

Piotrowski et al 20 [Matt Piotrowski and Emma McMahon and Joshua McBee and Kyle Saukas, 12-14-2020, “Biden’s Climate Path Through the 2022 Midterms” Climate Advisers, <https://climateadvisers.org/blogs/bidens-climate-path-up-to-the-2022-midterms/> ww

\*Figures omitted\*

Joe Biden ran on a climate change agenda and has laid out his plans for early action, but what might the ‘medium-term’ for climate action and the 2022 midterms look like?¶ Beyond 2021¶ Although the configuration of the current Senate is not yet decided, political operatives are already looking forward to the 2022 mid-term election. If Democrats do not win both special elections in Georgia in January 2021, they will not have the majority in the Senate, which, as noted in earlier blogs, will greatly hamper the Democrats’ legislative agenda and make wide-ranging climate legislation a virtual impossibility.¶ However, they could capture the majority in 2022. U.S. Senators serve six-year terms, meaning that the same seats are up for re-election on a rotating six-year schedule. The seats up for re-election in 2022 pose better opportunities for Democratic gains than did the elections in 2018 or 2020, with three vulnerable Republican seats (see Figure 1 below).¶ It is too soon to tell what will happen in the mid-term elections, but the most recent data show Republicans are well-positioned to take back the House. Still, some Democrats are confident they can hold onto the House. If Democrats win majorities in both houses of Congress in 2022, then the second half of the Biden administration’s term could, unusually, be more productive than his first. This would give him greater opportunity to pass comprehensive climate legislation, which could include a carbon tax, major investments in green technology and infrastructure, and regulation of the energy sector. If Republicans maintain their lead in the Senate, with or without a majority in the House, it is unlikely that any of these would pass during Biden’s presidency.¶ With Congress shifting its focus to the mid-term elections in 2022, the Biden administration will still take advantage of its ability to advance climate initiatives in the executive branch. Increasing the use of clean fuels through government procurement, particularly in the military, is one major goal. The U.S. government spends approximately $500 billion per year on procurement, providing a large opportunity to develop a zero-emission transportation fleet. There will also be opportunities in rewriting agency rules and regulations (President Trump rolled back more than 100 environmental rules), increasing research and development in programs such as the Department of Energy’s Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and prioritizing the climate issue in diplomacy.¶ At the state and local level, Republicans performed better than expected in this year’s election, gaining seats in state legislatures, giving them the advantage in the redistricting process next year. Whichever party has the ability to redraw districts, which is done every 10 years, has the power to increase the number of districts in their favor. This dynamic may help Republicans retake the U.S. House of Representatives and hold onto the majority for some time as they did from 2010-18. In the map below, the Republicans hold both the legislatures and the governorships of the states in red.¶ These state-level legislatures and governorships could set the political map for a decade to come in Republicans’ favor. This could lead to more state-level opposition to President Biden’s executive actions. The recently failed attempt by Texas’ Attorney General to sue swing states whose electoral votes secured Biden’s victory that was supported by the Attorney Generals of 17 other states is an early-warning sign of state vs. federal animosity. Additionally, these state wins for Republicans could influence voting laws to favor Republicans to be elected at the Federal level, further frustrating Biden and future Democrats’ efforts to pursue ambitious climate legislation.

#### Extinction.

Kareiva 18 [Peter,Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al., September 2018, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” Futures, Vol. 102, p. 39-50

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes. Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### 1NC – CP

#### Text: The Member nations of the World Trade Organization should incentivize COVID-19 Vaccine manufactures to enter voluntary license agreements.

#### The counterplan solves – Waiving IP proper would not solve due to generic manufactures not having the know how to create the vaccine – voluntary licenses bypass this.

Silverman 3-15 [Rachel Silverman, Policy fellow at the Center for Global Development, 3-15-2021,“Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations” The Washington Post, Accessed 8-15-2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/> ww

The coronavirus vaccine rollout in the United States is quickly ramping up: The Biden administration now promises enough supply for every American adult by the end of May. Yet as we look forward to family reunions, summer barbecues and rescheduled weddings, the world’s poorest countries still face a dire situation. Only in recent weeks did such nations as Ghana, Cambodia and Nigeria welcome their first vaccine shipments — and only enough to cover about 2 percent of their populations. One grim projection suggests that most poor countries will have to wait years — until at least 2023 — to achieve mass vaccination.¶ According to some activists, the solution to this inequity is relatively simple: By suspending protections on covid-19 vaccine patents, the international community “could help break Big Pharma monopolies and increase supplies so there are enough doses for everyone, everywhere,” claims the People’s Vaccine Alliance. Indeed, 58 low- and middle-income countries have mobilized in support of a proposed World Trade Organization waiver that would temporarily exempt coronavirus-related intellectual property from normal international rules and protections. And while the effort to waive IP protections has been a global health hot topic for months, it gained a high-profile endorsement in the United States recently from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). In a March 10 video statement, Sanders called upon President Biden to support the IP suspension while slamming “huge, multibillion-dollar pharmaceutical companies [that] continue to prioritize profits by protecting their monopolies.”¶ The logic of the argument seems clear and intuitive — at first. Without patents, which serve narrow commercial interests, companies all over the world could freely produce the vaccine. Sure, Big Pharma would lose money — but this is a pandemic, and human life comes before private profit, especially when vaccines receive substantial public financing to support research and development. As with HIV drugs in years past, widespread generic production would dramatically increase supply and drive down prices to levels affordable even in the developing world.¶ Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have little effect. It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts. There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents.¶ The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna announced in October that it would not enforce IP rights on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has taken no steps to share information about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the company’s direct control within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine not yet participating in Covax, a global-aid-funded effort (including a pledged $4 billion from the United States) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries.¶ It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own.¶ We focused on covid. Now our other patients are suffering.¶ One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, lowering prices dramatically.¶ Vaccines, in contrast, are complex biological products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.¶ There are better options than broadly waiving IP rules — notably, encouraging (and pressuring) vaccine manufacturers to cooperate and share knowledge with partners across the globe. Voluntary licensing is one route: It’s a common arrangement in which developers enter into binding contractual agreements with generic producers. Generic manufacturers get permission, know-how and assistance from the patent-holder to produce the vaccine for sales in specified markets; in exchange, the patent-holder can ensure quality of the generic product and may receive royalties on its sales, usually representing less than 10 percent of sales value.¶ These royalties may be lower than the profit margin on direct sales; for example, Pfizer expects a 25 to 30 percent profit on its vaccine sales, or roughly $5 for every $19.50 dose. (The U.S. government has agreed to buy 300 million doses at that price.) But voluntary licensing deals offer a new revenue stream that would otherwise be captured by competitors — not to mention good publicity. Already, voluntary licensing deals from AstraZeneca and Novavax are facilitating large-scale production in India, Japan and South Korea; many of the resulting vaccines are destined for lower-income countries through Covax.¶ The best route to vaccine equity involves creating the conditions to facilitate more of these voluntary deals.¶ How can governments and activists help push things in the right direction? By lifting the export curbs on materials such as filters and bioreactor bags intended to protect domestic supply, countries can help lubricate supply chains, creating a better environment for cross-national collaboration. Governments and development-finance institutions can invest to build up the capabilities of potential vaccine manufacturing plants, making it easier for originators to say yes. Domestically, the Biden administration did something like this when it invested $269 million under the Defense Production Act to prepare Merck’s manufacturing facilities to produce the Johnson & Johnson vaccine — a crucial plank of the joint production deal announced this month. Similar efforts are underway abroad. On March 12, for example, the “Quad” — the United States, India, Japan and Australia — announced a joint pledge to produce and disseminate 1 billion vaccine doses; as part of this effort, the Biden administration announced that it would help finance an Indian generic manufacturer to make coronavirus vaccines, including the Johnson & Johnson product. The contractual language of licensing deals can explicitly protect IP from broader dissemination, helping originators feel more comfortable sharing commercially valuable information.¶ In praise of vaccine selfies¶ Sticks as well as carrots can facilitate partnerships. Under existing World Trade Organization rules, countries already have the right to issue “compulsory licenses” in certain cases pertaining to public health, allowing them to produce or import generic health products without permission from the patent-holder. Advocates correctly point out that countries face potential retaliation from industry and wealthy governments when they try to use these tools — a strong disincentive. (In 2006-2007, Thailand’s use of compulsory licenses to access more affordable AIDS drugs led the United States to revoke preferential trade status for some Thai exports.) This should change. The Biden administration and other global leaders should make clear that they will support legitimate compulsory licensees of coronavirus vaccines in cases where a valid voluntary license request has been rejected or ignored.¶ But compulsory licensing is vastly inferior to voluntary deals in the case of vaccines, because with the former the generic producer would still need to figure out how to make the vaccines without the originator’s assistance — again, an extraordinarily difficult task. It is useful mainly as a threat held in reserve, paired with the “carrots” of subsidies to local plants and so on. Firms may choose to play ball on voluntary licensing deals rather than face a mess of legal challenges and bad publicity. This month, for example, Canadian biotech firm Biolyse Pharma publicly requested a voluntary license to manufacture the Johnson & Johnson vaccine for global distribution. If Johnson & Johnson is unwilling, Biolyse made clear in its announcement, the company will appeal to the Canadian government for a compulsory license. The ball is now in Johnson & Johnson’s court — but this seems like the type of offer it should choose to accept, both for the global good and its self-interest.¶ Scaling up vaccine production is an imperative for equitable global access and an end to the pandemic. But it is smart incentives for sharing knowledge, not the wholesale elimination of intellectual-property rights, that will get us to the finish line.

# Case

### 1AR – No

#### No 1ar theory –

#### 1] Time skew – Forces me to answer the shell, which distracts from substance – substantive clash is k2 education and 1ar theory distracts from it.

#### 2] Judge intervention – I only have 1 speech to answer it and no 3NR which means that the judge has to intervene and decide if my answers were good enough after taking into account to 2ars lies.

#### 3] Reciprocity – I only have once chance to respond after it is introduced while they have two chances

#### 4] Persuasive spin in the 2ar appeals to judges more ows on judge psychology bc they will always win that debate

#### 5] DTA Solves – they can indict the arguments that are abusive and I have strategic options to respond

## Contentions

### Vaccine inequality

#### 1] extinction ows

#### 2] Waivers don’t solve – the issue is in lack of materials. Moderna literally tried the aff

Tabarrok 21

Alex Tabarrok (Bartley J. Madden Chair in Economics at the Mercatus Center and am a professor of economics at George Mason University). “Patents are Not the Problem!” Marginal Revolution. 6 May 2021. JDN. https://marginalrevolution.com/marginal revolution/2021/05/ip‐is‐not‐the‐constraint.html [Brackets in original] || cut SM

Patents are not the problem. All of the vaccine manufacturers are trying to increase supply as quickly as possible. Billions of doses are being produced–more than ever before in the history of the world. Licenses are widely available. AstraZeneca have licensed their vaccine for production with manufactures around the world, including in India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, China and South Africa. J&J’s vaccine has been licensed for production by multiple firms in the United States as well as with firms in Spain, South Africa and France. Sputnik has been licensed for production by firms in India, China, South Korea, Brazil and pending EMA approval with firms in Germany and France. Sinopharm has been licensed in the UAE, Egypt and Bangladesh. Novavax has licensed its vaccine for production in South Korea, India, and Japan and it is desperate to find other licensees but technology transfer isn’t easy and there are limited supplies of raw materials:

Virtually overnight, [Novavax] set up a network of outside manufacturers more ambitious than one outside executive said he’s ever seen, but they struggled at times to transfer their technology there amid pandemic travel restrictions. They were kicked out of one factory by the same government that’s bankrolled their effort. Competing with larger competitors, they’ve found themselves short on raw materials as diverse as Chilean tree bark and bioreactor bags. They signed a deal with India’s Serum Institute to produce many of their COVAX doses but now face the realistic chance that even when Serum gets to full capacity — and they are behind — India’s government, dealing with the world’s worst active outbreak, won’t let the shots leave the country.

Plastic bags are a bigger bottleneck than patents. The US embargo on vaccine supplies to India was precisely that the Biden administration used the DPA to prioritize things like bioreactor bags and filters to US suppliers and that meant that India’s Serum Institute was having trouble getting its production lines ready for Novavax. CureVac, another potential mRNA vaccine, is also finding it difficult to find supplies due to US restrictions (which means supplies are short everywhere). As Derek Lowe said:

Abolishing patents will not provide more shaker bags or more Chilean tree bark, nor provide more of the key filtration materials needed for production. These processes have a lot of potential choke points and rate‐limiting steps in them, and there is no wand that will wave that complexity away.

Technology transfer has been difficult for AstraZeneca–which is one reason they have had production difficulties–and their vaccine uses relatively well understood technology. The mRNA technology is new and has never before been used to produce at scale. Pfizer and Moderna had to build factories and distribution systems from scratch. There are no mRNA factories idling on the sidelines. If there were, Moderna or Pfizer would be happy to license since they are producing in their own factories 24 hours a day, seven days a week (monopolies restrict supply, remember?). Why do you think China hasn’t yet produced an mRNA vaccine? Hint: it isn’t fear about violating IP. Moreover, even Moderna and Pfizer don’t yet fully understand their production technology, they are learning by doing every single day. Moderna has said that they won’t enforce their patents during the pandemic but no one has stepped up to produce because no one else can.

### GPW

#### Nonuq – covid has already destroyed econs which means war wont happen or it should’ve already

#### Natural pandemics won’t cause human extinction

Sebastian Farquhar 1/23/17, director at Oxford's Global Priorities Project, Owen Cotton-Barratt, a Lecturer in Mathematics at St Hugh’s College, Oxford, John Halstead, Stefan Schubert, Haydn Belfield, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, "Existential Risk Diplomacy and Governance", GLOBAL PRIORITIES PROJECT 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>

1.1.3 Engineered pandemics For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are very unlikely to cause human extinction. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, less than 4% (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is very numerous, globally dispersed, and capable of a rational response to problems, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic. One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

#### Diseases don’t cause extinction – burnout

Owen Cotton-Barratt 17, et al, PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, 2/3/2017, Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are **very unlikely to cause human extinction**. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, **less than 4%** (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is **very numerous**, **globally dispersed**, and capable of a **rational response to problems**, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic.

One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a **selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal**. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

#### No China war – fears are overblown

Shifrinson 2/8/19 [Joshua Shifrinson is an assistant professor of international relations at Boston University. The ‘new Cold War’ with China is way overblown. Here’s why. February 8, 2019. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2019/02/08/there-isnt-a-new-cold-war-with-china-for-these-4-reasons/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.f8ca8195c4e4]

Is a new Cold War looming — or already present — between the United States and China? Many analysts argue that a combination of geopolitics, ideology and competing visions of “global order” are driving the two countries toward emulating the Soviet-U.S. rivalry that dominated world politics from 1947 through 1990.

But such concerns are overblown. Here are four big reasons why.

1. The historical backdrops of the two relationships are very different

When the Cold War began, the U.S.-Soviet relationship was fragile and tenuous. Bilateral diplomatic relations were barely a decade old, U.S. intervention in the Russian Revolution was a recent memory, and the Soviet Union had called for the overthrow of capitalist governments into the 1940s. Despite their Grand Alliance against Nazi Germany, the two countries shared few meaningful diplomatic, economic or institutional links.

In 2019, the situation between the United States and China is very different. Since the 1970s, diplomatic interactions, institutional ties and economic flows have all exploded. Although each side has criticized the other for domestic interference (such as U.S. demands for journalist access to Tibet and China’s espionage against U.S. corporations), these issues did not prevent cooperation on a host of other issues. Yes, there were tensions over the past decade, but these occurred against a generally cooperative backdrop.

2. Geography and powers’ nuclear postures suggest East Asia is more stable than Cold War-era Europe

The Cold War was shaped by an intense arms race, nuclear posturing and crises, especially in continental Europe. Given Europe’s political geography, the United States feared a “bolt from the blue” attack would allow the Soviet Union to conquer the continent. Accordingly, the United States prepared to defend Europe with conventional forces, and to deter Soviet aggrandizement using nuclear weapons.

Unsurprisingly, the Soviet Union also feared that the United States might attack and wanted to deter U.S. adventurism. Concerns that the other superpower might use force and that crises could quickly escalate colored Cold War politics.

Today, the United States and China spend proportionally far less on their militaries than the United States and the Soviet Union did. Though an arms race may be emerging, U.S. and Chinese nuclear postures are not nearly as large or threatening: Arsenals remain far below the size and scope witnessed in the Cold War, and are kept at a lower state of alert.

As for geography, East Asia is not primed for tensions akin to those in Cold War Europe. China can threaten to coerce its neighbors, but the water barriers separating China from most of Asia’s strategically important states make outright conquest significantly harder. Of course, as scholars such as Caitlin Talmadge and Avery Goldstein note, crises may still erupt, and each side may face pressures to escalate. Unlike the Cold War, however, U.S.-Chinese confrontations occur at sea with relatively limited forces and without clear territorial boundaries. This suggests there are countervailing factors that may give the two sides room to negotiate — and limit the speed with which a crisis unfolds.

3. The Cold War had just two major powers

The Cold War took place in a bipolar system, with the United States and Soviet Union uniquely powerful, compared with other nations. This dynamic often pushed the United States and the U.S.S.R. toward confrontation and contributed to more or less fixed alliances; moreover, it encouraged efforts to suppress prospective great powers, such as Germany.

In 2019, it’s not at all clear we are back to bipolarity. Analysts remain divided over whether the U.S. unipolar era is waning (or is already over) — and, if so, whether we are heading for a new period of bipolarity, modern-day multipolarity or something else. Regardless, most analysts accept that other countries will play a central role in East Asian security affairs.

Russia, for example, still benefits from legacy military investments, India is developing economically and militarily, and Japan is beginning to build highly capable military forces to complement its still-significant economic might. Even if these nations aren’t as powerful as the United States or China, their presence makes for more fluid diplomatic arrangements and more diffuse security concerns than during the U.S.-Soviet competition. The resulting security dynamics are therefore likely to look very different.

4. Ideology plays less of a role in U.S.-Chinese relations

Many people see the Cold War as an ideological contest between U.S.-backed liberalism and Soviet-backed communism. But that’s not the whole story.

The early 20th century saw liberalism, communism and fascism vie for ideological preeminence. With fascism defeated alongside Nazi Germany, the postwar stage was set for a struggle between communism and liberalism to reinforce the U.S.-Soviet contest. That each ideology claimed universal scope ensured that the ideologies served as rallying cries for Third World conflicts, which were subsequently associated with the U.S.-Soviet struggle.

The respective “ideologies” of the United States and China do not favor this type of contest today. Indeed, analysts calling for a hard-line stance against China have faced difficulties even identifying a coherent Chinese ideological alternative. And while some researchers claim that a nascent ideological contest pitting an “autocratic” China against the “liberal” United States is emerging, this narrative ignores the political contests that shape Chinese politics (and have parallels in U.S. politics). Autocracies and democracies often cooperate. And on one important ideological issue — how they organize their economic lives — China and the United States have both embraced economic growth via trade, the private sector and semi-free markets.

#### No risk of Russian escalation

Khramchikhin 18 ― Aleksander Khramchikhin, Deputy Director at the Institute for Political and Military Analysis, 2018. (“Rethinking the Danger of Escalation: The Russia-NATO Military Balance”, Carnegie Endowment, January 25th, 2018, Available Online at: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/01/25/rethinking-danger-of-escalation-russia-nato-military-balance-pub-75346> Accessed 11-13-2018)

NOBODY WANTS TO FIGHT The August 2008 war between Russia and Georgia revealed that NATO had lost its will to fight. Despite the pro-Western policies of then president Mikheil Saakashvili and his push for Georgia to join NATO, the latter offered no assistance to Georgia during the war with Russia. Moreover, after the war, NATO introduced an unspoken but strictly enforced embargo on supplying any military hardware to Georgia. NATO’s inaction during the 2008 Georgian-Russian conflict and the 2014 Ukrainian crisis sent a signal to both the Baltic and Polish elites and publics that their NATO membership would be unlikely to save them in the event of Russian aggression and that their fellow NATO countries would not help them. “Old” NATO countries, not least the United States, could ill afford to ignore such sentiments, and since 2014, they have felt compelled to send a political signal by deploying at least some military forces to Eastern Europe. That deployment cannot be large for several reasons. First, not even the United States, to say nothing of its European allies, has sufficient military and financial resources to deploy large military units in Eastern Europe. Second, despite their tough anti-Russian rhetoric, NATO leaders are apprehensive about the prospect of escalating tensions with Moscow, and such escalation is likely if they deploy significant military forces in countries along Russia’s borders. Third, even though the likelihood of Russian aggression in that region is tantamount to zero, NATO leaders believe that it cannot be ruled out. Military deployments from other NATO countries to Poland and especially to the Baltic states have a purely political rather than military rationale, one that official NATO representatives recognize. Because NATO’s military units in the Baltic states would likely be quickly defeated in a Russian attack, there would be no point in sacrificing them or deploying them only to be held hostage there. Their mission would be not to repel Russian aggression, but to provide a guarantee that in the event of such an aggression the United States and Western Europe would go to war, since their troops would also come under attack from the Russian armed forces. All of the talk in Russia about the threat of a NATO attack is nothing more than a propaganda ploy. And in light of this situation, it makes no sense whatsoever to deploy U.S. military equipment and personnel in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania. All the same, recent NATO exercises have included a U.S. Stryker brigade conducting maneuvers in several Eastern European countries. A Stryker Brigade Combat Team, equipped with rather thin-skinned armored personnel carriers (APCs) driving around Eastern European countries, is hardly a show of force. Stryker brigades can be meaningfully employed against poorly equipped, underdeveloped militaries, but not against well-organized and trained combatants. When such limited exercises accompany statements by NATO officials that they are sending a clear and strong message to Russia, that message takes on a grotesque quality. A military confrontation between NATO and Russia would take on an entirely different quality than the campaigns in Libya, Iraq, or Serbia. They have never defended against modern strike aircraft and never waged wars in an environment of wide-scale electronic countermeasures saturation by the adversary. In recent decades, NATO air forces have engaged in dogfights only with a small number of Iraqi and Serbian MiG-29 fighters of the earliest export modifications. NATO pilots have had to contend with third-generation fighters and surface-to-air missile systems produced in the 1960s and 1970s.4 They have never engaged in dogfights against more advanced aircraft like the Su-27 (even those of earlier modifications), MiG-31, Su-30M2/SM, or Su-35C fighters, and they have never confronted the S-300P/V (those of earlier modifications) and S-400 missile systems, the Buk anti-aircraft missile systems, and the Tor (all modifications) surface-to-air missile systems. Similarly, they have never dealt with the Tunguska and Pantsir anti-aircraft missile and gun systems. Quantitatively and qualitatively, NATO forces are unprepared to wage war against the modern armed forces of the Russian Federation. Even if NATO is able to successfully develop and deploy a Prompt Global Strike—similar to the concept of network-centric noncontact warfare in that it aims to destroy an adversary’s ability to retaliate against an attack—NATO will be unable to go to war against Russia. The arsenal of sea- and air-launched cruise missiles at the disposal of the U.S. Navy and Air Force is insufficient to simultaneously destroy Russia’s strategic nuclear forces and its aircraft defenses in a surprise attack. A partial success in this context is meaningless, inasmuch as it would result in an all-out nuclear exchange with mutually assured destruction. A sea- and air-launched cruise missile strike against Russian conventional forces only would not be successful either, if only because it would be impossible to achieve surprise in this situation. Such scenarios would be fraught with an extremely high risk of rapid nuclear escalation. Russia would construe an attack using intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) or submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) with conventional warheads as the beginning of a nuclear attack, which would trigger an immediate retaliatory strike. In all likelihood, the West will not be able to gain decisive technological superiority over the armed forces of the Russian Federation for the foreseeable future, a precondition for being able to wage war almost without losses, as its current operational approach seems to prefer. Since the downturn in East-West relations following the 2014 crisis in Ukraine, it has become popular to claim that Russian President Vladimir Putin has “reenergized NATO.” Such statements appear to be exaggerations to say the least. Aside from the limitations of its military capacity, NATO’s inadequate capabilities are also a consequence of its psychological disarmament, which in turn is a product of the prevailing ideology in the West. Trends of pacifism and Europeans’ reluctance to use military force, the transition to all-volunteer militaries, the tendency to treat any combat veteran as a victim of post-traumatic stress disorder, and the pursuit of gender diversity amount to a powerful psychological barrier that makes it impossible for Europe to wage an offensive or a defensive war against Russia. The U.S. military is generally better prepared and equipped than those of the Europeans, but it too is affected by the same trends as Europe’s armies. Moreover, the United States is not facing the threat of “Russian aggression” even as a matter of propaganda. Therefore, one can only wonder about the willingness of American soldiers to die in Europe by the thousands, when their presence in combat there would likely increase the probability of Russian ICBMs and SLBMs striking cities in the United States in the event of war.

### WTO Collapse

#### WTO collapse inevitable – strong divide between rich and developing countries – Doha Round proves

Kleimann et al. 11 David Kleimann, Research Associate at the European Centre for International Political Economy, Joe Guinan, Director of TransFarm Africa at Aspen Institute, Petros C. Mavroidis, former WTO legal advisor, Professor at Columbia University, “The Doha Round: An Obituary,” June 2011 <https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/docs/pubs/TheDohaRound_AnObituary_June2011.pdf> wesle

Is there any political imperative for such a deal? Not that anyone can see. Simon Evenett has summed it up well: “I see no basis for a deal… There are a small number of countries (notably the U.S.) who can’t do a low-ambition deal and a large number of countries that can’t do a high-ambition deal. Domestic developments in the main trading parties account for this outcome—until they change, the impasse continues.” So what has been lost? To some degree, the errors of overestimating the gains from Doha may have given way to an underestimation. Modeling analysis has some serious limitations and cannot capture many dynamic effects. Trade in services—the fastest growing and potentially largest tradable sector— is either not included in the models for technical reasons or included in a very crude fashion. Aid for Trade and trade facilitation are also outside of the models. The benefits stemming from a trade facilitation agreement—already within reach at the WTO but currently held hostage under the Single Undertaking—could dwarf those resulting from the rest of a Doha deal. The World Bank estimates that bringing countries whose trade facilitation capacity is below average even halfway up to the average could increase overall trade by almost $400 billion annually. Another element to appreciate when thinking about a failed Doha is the importance of the multilateral trading system itself to developing countries. Even absent a massive upswing in protectionism following a failed round, the WTO system risks erosion and a loss of credibility. Lacking the reinforcement of progressive agreements, there are clear limitations to what even a fully functioning WTO dispute settlement mechanism can achieve on the basis of current rules. Current protectionist pressures around the globe, resulting from prevailing high unemployment rates in many larger economies in the wake of the economic crisis, are likely to provide further challenges to the WTO as the guardian of international trade. This represents a serious problem for developing country members, particularly the small and vulnerable. Alternatives to multilateralism such at bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) are skewed in favor of the powerful, whereas the WTO’s Most Policy Brief Issue 2011/1 Global Governance Programme Josep Borrell, President of the EUI, Prof. Miguel Maduro, Director of the Global Governance Programme, Prof. Petros C. Mavroidis, Columbia University, with the top-level policy makers and leading academic participants. Favoured Nation (MFN) principle allows even the smallest WTO members with tiny markets and nothing much to offer to benefit from the full extent of market opening that occurs under WTO rules and to operate on the basis of the same terms of trade. The WTO is the only venue in which developing countries can truly hope to get a “fair shake” over the longer term.

#### WTO obligations will undermine CCP legitimacy

Halverson, 4 (Boston College International and Comparative Law Review, Interrelationships: International Economic Law and Developing Countries China ’s WTO Accession: Economic, Legal, and Political Implications, Volume 27, Article 6, http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=iclr/)ms

**The concept of transparency is central to the WTO agreements.** Article X of the GATT 1994 requires that all trade-related laws, regulations, and rulings be promptly published and administered in an "impartial and uniform" manner.I05 The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of lntellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) devotes an entire chapter to enforcement obligations,106 and the GATS, in addition to publication and notification requirements, requires setting up "enquiry points" to provide information at the request of any member.107 Thus, the transparency-related obligations contained in the wro agreements encompass not only the publication of trade-related laws, but also their accessibility as well as fair and effective implementation. In addition to these obligations, China's protocol of accession includes a number of specific commitments that confirm as well as supplement the obligations contained in the WTO agreements. This section describes these rules, points out certain obstacles to their effective implementation, and notes the extent to which the Chinese government has achieved progress in implementation. There has been much written regarding the differences between China's legal culture and that of Western countries, including debate on the degree to which China is a country governed by the "rule of law. "1°8 This Article does not address all of these questions but instead describes the transparency-related rules that bind China as a WTO member and assesses the general progress China has made, and the challenges that remain, in implementing these obligations. When compared with the state of affairs in 1978, China has made impressive progress in creating the legal framework necessary to support a market economy. Certainly, GATT (and later WTO) accession has proceeded alongside this massive rebuilding of China's legal system-a system that was virtually wiped out during the Cultural Revolution. 109 Yet **it is increasingly apparent that WTO accession has also provided a catalyst for China's evolution away from a legal system driven by power relationships and towards a rule-based legal system.**

#### CCP collapse causes extinction

Yee and Storey, 13 [Professor of Politics and International Relations at Hong Kong Baptist University and Lecturer in Defence Studies at Deakin University, The China Threat: Perceptions, Myths and Reality, p. 5]

The fourth factor contributing to the perception of a China threat is the fear **of political and economic collapse in the PRC, resulting in territorial fragmentation, civil war and waves of refugees** pouring into neighbouring countries. Naturally, any or all of these scenarios **would have a profoundly negative impact on regional stability.** Today the Chinese leadership faces a raft of internal problems, including the increasing political demands of its citizens, a growing population, a shortage of natural resources and a deterioration in the natural environment caused by rapid industrialisation and pollution. These problems are putting a strain on the central government’s ability to govern effectively. **Political disintegration or a Chinese civil war might result in millions of Chinese refugees** seeking asylum in neighbouring countries. Such an unprecedented exodus of refugees from a collapsed PRC would no doubt put a severe strain on the limited resources of China’s neighbours. **A fragmented China could also result in an**other nightmare scenario — **nuclear weapons falling into the hands of irresponsible local provincial leaders or warlords**.12 From this perspective, **a disintegrating China would** also **pose a threat to its** neighbours and **the world.**

## Util

### 1NC – Short

#### 1] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence. Probability doesn’t solve because a) Probability is improvable, as it relies on inductive knowledge, but induction from past events cant lead to deduction of future events, and b) Probability assumes causation, but we can’t assume every act was the cause of tangible outcomes.

#### 2] An infinite world mathematically contains an infinite amount of pleasure and pain, so moral acts can’t change the amount of happiness.

Bostrom 08Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. *The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics*. 2008. <http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf> //ACCS JM

Is the world canonically infinite or not? **Recent** cosmological evidence suggests **that** the world is **probably** infinite. **Moreover, if the totality of physical existence is indeed infinite, in the kind of way that modern cosmology suggests it is, then it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets.** If there are an infinite number of planets then there is**, with probability one,** an infinite number of people. Infinitely many of these people are happy, infinitely many are unhappy. **Likewise for other local properties that are plausible candidates for having value**, pertaining to person-states, lives, or entire societies, ecosystems,or civilizations—there are infinitely many democratic states, and infinitely many that are ruled by despots, etc. It therefore appears likely that the actual world is canonically infinite.

#### 3] Util is racist – a policy that harms a minority but helps the majority has a net-surplus of utility – independent voter for safety – it’s a pre-req to debate.

#### 4] If you’re held responsible for things other than an intention ethics aren’t binding because there are infinite events occurring over which you have no control, so you can never be moral as you are permitting just action – if ethics arent binding then people can just say no.

5] Moral uncertainty means extinction first  
**Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

### 1NC – P&P

#### Presumption and permissibility negate –

#### 1] Probability – there are an infinite number of ways for something to be false and only one way for it to be true bc If one part of a statement is false the whole statement is

#### 2] intuition – That’s why we don’t immediately believe conspiracy theories or flat earth.

#### 3] logic –

#### A] You can’t assume that P and ~P are both true.

#### B] Ought means to prove a moral obligation – if there is no offense the aff hasn’t met their burden so you negate

#### Negating is harder