# Jack Howe R4

### 1AC – Plan

#### Plan – The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent and exclusivity protection.

#### The Plan solves Evergreening.

Feldman 3 Robin Feldman 2-11-2019 "‘One-and-done’ for new drugs could cut patent thickets and boost generic competition" <https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/11/drug-patent-protection-one-done/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law, Albert Abramson ’54 Distinguished Professor of Law Chair, and Director of the Center for Innovation)//SidK + Elmer

I believe that one period of protection **should be enough**. We should make the legal changes necessary to prevent companies **from building patent walls** and piling up mountains of rights. This could be accomplished **by a “one-and-done” approach** for patent protection. Under it, a drug would receive just one period of exclusivity, and no more. The choice of which “one” could be left entirely in the hands of the pharmaceutical company, with the election made when the FDA approves the drug. Perhaps development of the drug went swiftly and smoothly, so the remaining life of one of the drug’s patents is of greatest value. Perhaps development languished, so designation as an orphan drug or some other benefit would bring greater reward. The choice would be up to the company itself, based on its own calculation of the maximum benefit. The result, however, is that a pharmaceutical company chooses whether its period of exclusivity would be a patent, an orphan drug designation, a period of data exclusivity (in which no generic is allowed to use the original drug’s safety and effectiveness data), or something else — but **not all of the above** and more. Consider Suboxone, a combination of buprenorphine and naloxone for treating opioid addiction. The drug’s maker has extended its protection cliff eight times, including obtaining an orphan drug designation, which is intended for drugs that serve only a small number of patients. The drug’s first period of exclusivity ended in 2005, but with the additions its protection now lasts until 2024. That makes almost two additional decades in which the public has borne the burden of monopoly pricing, and access to the medicine may have been constrained. Implementing a one-and-done approach in conjunction with FDA approval underscores the fact that these problems and solutions are designed for pharmaceuticals, not for all types of technologies. That way, one-and-done could be implemented through **legislative changes to the FDA’s drug approval system**, and would apply to patents granted going forward. One-and-done would apply to both patents and exclusivities. A more limited approach, a baby step if you will, would be to invigorate the existing patent obviousness doctrine as a way to cut back on patent tinkering. Obviousness, one of the five standards for patent eligibility, says that inventions that are obvious to an expert or the general public can’t be patented. Either by congressional clarification or judicial interpretation, many pile-on patents could be eliminated with a ruling that the core concept of the additional patent is nothing more than the original formulation. Anything else is merely an obvious adaptation of the core invention, modified with existing technology. As such, the patent would fail for being perfectly obvious. Even without congressional action, a more vigorous and robust application of the existing obviousness doctrine could significantly improve the problem of piled-up patents and patent walls. Pharmaceutical companies have become adept at maneuvering through the system of patent and non-patent rights to create mountains of rights that can be applied, one after another. This behavior lets drug companies keep competitors out of the market and beat them back when they get there. We shouldn’t be surprised at this. Pharmaceutical companies are profit-making entities, after all, that face pressure from their shareholders to produce ever-better results. If we want to change the system, we must change the incentives driving the system. And right now, the incentives for creating patent walls are just too great.

### 1AC – Advantage 1

#### The Advantage is Innovation -

#### We are in an innovation crisis – new drugs are not being developed in favor of re-purposing old drugs to infinitely extend patent expiration.

Feldman 1 Robin Feldman 2-11-2019 "‘One-and-done’ for new drugs could cut patent thickets and boost generic competition" <https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/11/drug-patent-protection-one-done/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law, Albert Abramson ’54 Distinguished Professor of Law Chair, and Director of the Center for Innovation)//SidK + Elmer

Drug companies **have brought great innovations** to market. Society rewards innovation with patents, or with non-patent exclusivities that can be obtained for activities such as testing drugs in children, undertaking new clinical studies, or developing orphan drugs. The rights provided by patents or non-patent exclusivities provide a defined time period of protection so companies can recoup their investments by charging monopoly prices. When patents end, lower-priced competitors should be able to jump into the market and drive down the price. **But that’s not happening**. Instead, drug companies build massive patent walls around their products, extending the protection **over and over again**. Some modern drugs have an avalanche of U.S. patents, with expiration dates **staggered across time**. For example, the rheumatoid arthritis drug Humira is **protected by more than 100 patents**. Walls like that **are insurmountable**. Rather than rewarding innovation, our patent system is now largely repurposing drugs.

#### The only major study confirms our Internal Link – Evergreening decimates competition by resulting in functional monopolies

Arnold Ventures 20 9-24-2020 "'Evergreening' Stunts Competition, Costs Consumers and Taxpayers" <https://www.arnoldventures.org/stories/evergreening-stunts-competition-costs-consumers-and-taxpayers/> (Arnold Ventures is focused on evidence-based giving in a wide range of categories including: criminal justice, education, health care, and public finance)//Elmer

In 2011, Elsa Dixler was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. That August, she was prescribed Revlimid, a drug that had come on the market six years earlier. By January 2012, she went into full remission, where she has remained since. So long as Revlimid retains its effectiveness, she will take it for the rest of her life. “I was able to go back to work, see my daughter receive her Ph.D, and have a pretty normal life,” said Dixler, a Brooklyn resident who is now 74. “So, on the one hand, I feel enormously grateful.” But Dixler’s normal life has come at a steep financial cost to her family and to taxpayers. Revlimid typically costs nearly $800 per capsule, and Dixler takes one capsule per day for 21 days, then seven days off, and then resumes her daily dose, requiring 273 capsules a year. Since retiring from The New York Times at the end of 2017, she has been on Medicare. Dixler entered the Part D coverage gap (known as the donut hole) “within minutes,” she said. She estimates that adding her deductible, her copayment of $12,000, and what her Part D insurance provider pays totals approximately $197,500 a year. Revlimid should have **been subject to competition** from generic drug makers starting in 2009, bringing down its cost by many orders of magnitude. But by obtaining **27 additional patents**, eight orphan drug exclusivities and 91 total additional protections from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) since Revlimid’s introduction in 2005, its manufacturer, Celgene, has extended the drug’s **monopoly** **period** **by 18 years** — through March 8, 2028. “I cannot fathom the immorality of a business that relies on **squeezing people with cancer**,” Dixler said, noting her astonishment that Revlimid has obtained orphan drug protections when it treats a disease that is not rare and does not serve a very limited population. She also observed that Revlimid’s underlying drug is thalidomide, which has been around for decades. “They didn’t invent a new drug, rather, they found a new use for it,” she said. “The cost of Revlimid has imposed constraints on our retirement,” Dixler said, “but when I hear other people’s stories, I feel very lucky. A lot of people have been devastated financially.” Revlimid is a case study in a process known as “evergreening” — artificially sustaining a monopoly for years and even decades by manipulating intellectual property laws and regulations. Evergreening is most commonly used with blockbuster drugs generating the highest prices and profits. **Of the roughly 100 best-selling drugs, more than 70 percent have extended their protection** from competition at least once. More than half have extended the protection cliff multiple times. The true scope and cost of evergreening has been brought into sharper focus by a groundbreaking, publicly available, comprehensive database

#### Only innovation now solves AMR super-bugs -- timeframe’s key.

Sobti 19 [Dr. Navjot Kaur Sobti is an internal medicine resident physician at Dartmouth-Hitchcock-Medical Center/Dartmouth School of Medicine and a member of the ABC News Medical Unit. May 1, 2019. “Amid superbug crisis, scientists urge innovation”. <https://abcnews.go.com/Health/amidst-superbug-crisis-scientists-urge-innovation/story?id=62763415>] Dhruv

[The United Nations](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/amal-clooney-angelina-jolie-speak-us-weighed-vetoing/story?id=62574726) has called antimicrobial resistance a “global crisis.” With the [rise in superbugs](https://abcnews.go.com/Health/superbug-fungus-global-health-threat-600-us-infected/story?id=62297532) across the globe, common infections are becoming harder to treat, and lifesaving procedures riskier to perform. Drug-resistant infections result in about 700,000 deaths per year, with at least 230,000 of those deaths due to multidrug resistant tuberculosis, [according to a groundbreaking report from the World Health Organization (WHO).](https://www.who.int/antimicrobial-resistance/interagency-coordination-group/IACG_final_report_EN.pdf?ua=1) Given that antibiotic resistance is present in every country, antimicrobial resistance (AMR) now represents a global health crisis, according to the UN, which has urged immediate, coordinated and global action to prevent a potentially devastating health and financial crisis. With the rising rates of AMR -- including antivirals, antibiotics, and antifungals -- estimates from the WHO show that AMR may cause 10 million deaths every year by 2050, send 24 million people into extreme poverty by 2030, and lead to a financial crisis as severe as the on the U.S. experienced in 2008. Antimicrobial resistance develops when germs like bacteria and fungi are able to “defeat the drugs designed to kill them,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Through a biologic “survival of the fittest,” germs that are not killed by antimicrobials and continue to grow. WHO explains that “poor infection control, inadequate sanitary conditions and inappropriate food handling encourage the spread” of AMR, which can lead to “superbugs.” Those superbugs require powerful and oftentimes more expensive antimicrobials to treat. Examples of superbugs are far and wide, and can range from drug-resistant bacteria like Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus aureus to fungi like Candida. These bugs can cause illnesses that range from pneumonia to urinary tract and sexually transmitted infections. According to the WHO, AMR has caused complications for nearly 500,000 people with tuberculosis, and a number of people with HIV and malaria. The people at the [highest risk for AMR](https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/27-02-2017-who-publishes-list-of-bacteria-for-which-new-antibiotics-are-urgently-needed) are those with chronic diseases, people living in nursing homes, hospitalized in the ICU or undergoing life-saving treatments such as organ transplantation and cancer therapy. These people often develop infections, which can become antimicrobial-resistant, rendering them difficult, if not impossible, to treat. [(MORE: Melissa Rivers talks about her father's suicide with Dr. Jennifer Ashton)](https://abcnews.go.com/Health/melissa-rivers-talks-fathers-suicide-dr-jennifer-ashton/story?id=62733179&cid=clicksource_26_null_headlines_hed) The CDC notes that “antibiotic resistance has the potential to affect people at any stage of life,” including the “healthcare, veterinary, and agriculture industries, making it one of the world’s most urgent public health problems." AMR can cause prolonged hospital stays, billions of dollars in healthcare costs, disability, and potentially, death. “The most important thing is to understand and embrace the interconnectedness of all of this,” said Dr. Robert Redfield, director of the CDC, in a recent interview with ABC News’ Dr. Jennifer Ashton. It’s not just our countries that are connected.” Research has shown that superbugs like Candida auris “came from multiple places, at the same time. It wasn’t just one organism that [evolved]” in a single location, Redfield added. Given longstanding concerns about antimicrobial misuse leading to AMR, physicians have embraced a medical approach called antibiotic stewardship. This encourages physicians to carefully evaluate which antibiotic is most appropriate for their patient, and discontinue it once it is no longer medically needed. WHO has also highlighted that the inappropriate use of antimicrobials in agriculture -- such as on farms and in animals -- may be an underappreciated cause of AMR. Noting these trends, the WHO has urged for “coordinated action...to minimize the emergence and spread of antimicrobial resistance.” It urges all countries to make national action plans, with a focus on the development of new antimicrobial medications, vaccines, and careful antimicrobial use. Redfield emphasized the importance of vaccination during the global superbug crisis, stating that “the only way we have to eliminate an infection is vaccination.” He added that investing in innovation is key to solving the crisis. While WHO continues to advocate for superbug awareness, they warn that AMR has reversed “a century of progress in health.” The WHO added that “the challenges of antimicrobial resistance” are “not insurmountable,” and that coordinated action will “help to save millions of lives, preserve antimicrobials for generations to come and secure the future from drug-resistant diseases.”

#### Extinction - generic defense doesn’t apply.

Srivatsa 17 Kadiyali Srivatsa 1-12-2017 “Superbug Pandemics and How to Prevent Them” <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/01/12/superbug-pandemics-and-how-to-prevent-them/> (doctor, inventor, and publisher. He worked in acute and intensive pediatric care in British hospitals)//Elmer

It is by now no secret that the human species is locked in a race of its own making with “superbugs.” Indeed, if popular science fiction is a measure of awareness, the theme has pervaded English-language literature from Michael Crichton’s 1969 Andromeda Strain all the way to Emily St. John Mandel’s 2014 Station Eleven and beyond. By a combination of massive inadvertence and what can only be called stupidity, we must now invent new and effective antibiotics faster than deadly bacteria evolve—and regrettably, they are rapidly doing so with our help. I do not exclude the possibility that bad actors might deliberately engineer deadly superbugs.1 But even if that does not happen, humanity faces an existential threat largely of its own making in the absence of malign intentions. As threats go, this one is entirely predictable. The concept of a “black swan,” Nassim Nicholas Taleb’s term for low-probability but high-impact events, has become widely known in recent years. Taleb did not invent the concept; he only gave it a catchy name to help mainly business executives who know little of statistics or probability. Many have embraced the “black swan” label the way children embrace holiday gifts, which are often bobbles of little value, except to them. But the threat of inadvertent pandemics is not a “black swan” because its probability is not low. If one likes catchy labels, it better fits the term “gray rhino,” which, explains Michele Wucker, is a high-probability, high-impact event that people manage to ignore anyway for a raft of social-psychological reasons.2 A pandemic is a quintessential gray rhino, for it is no longer a matter of if but of when it will challenge us—and of how prepared we are to deal with it when it happens. We have certainly been warned. The curse we have created was understood as a possibility from the very outset, when seventy years ago Sir Alexander Fleming, the discoverer of penicillin, predicted antibiotic resistance. When interviewed for a 2015 article, “The Most Predictable Disaster in the History of the Human Race, ” Bill Gates pointed out that one of the costliest disasters of the 20th century, worse even than World War I, was the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918-19. As the author of the article, Ezra Klein, put it: “No one can say we weren’t warned. And warned. And warned. A pandemic disease is the most predictable catastrophe in the history of the human race, if only because it has happened to the human race so many, many times before.”3 Even with effective new medicines, if we can devise them, we must contain outbreaks of bacterial disease fast, lest they get out of control. In other words, we have a social-organizational challenge before us as well as a strictly medical one. That means getting sufficient amounts of medicine into the right hands and in the right places, but it also means educating people and enabling them to communicate with each other to prevent any outbreak from spreading widely. Responsible governments and cooperative organizations have options in that regard, but even individuals can contribute something. To that end, as a medical doctor I have created a computer app that promises to be useful in that regard—of which more in a moment. But first let us review the situation, for while it has become well known to many people, there is a general resistance to acknowledging the severity and imminence of the danger. What Are the Problems? Bacteria are among the oldest living things on the planet. They are masters of survival and can be found everywhere. Billions of them live on and in every one of us, many of them helping our bodies to run smoothly and stay healthy. Most bacteria that are not helpful to us are at least harmless, but some are not. They invade our cells, spread quickly, and cause havoc that we refer to generically as disease. Millions of people used to die every year as a result of bacterial infections, until we developed antibiotics. These wonder drugs revolutionized medicine, but one can have too much of a good thing. Doctors have used antibiotics recklessly, prescribing them for just about everything, and in the process helped to create strains of bacteria that are resistant to the medicines we have. We even give antibiotics to cattle that are not sick and use them to fatten chickens. Companies large and small still mindlessly market antimicrobial products for hands and home, claiming that they kill bacteria and viruses. They do more harm than good because the low concentrations of antimicrobials that these products contain tend to kill friendly bacteria (not viruses at all), and so clear the way for the mass multiplication of surviving unfriendly bacteria. Perhaps even worse, hospitals have deployed antimicrobial products on an industrial scale for a long time now, the result being a sharp rise in iatrogenic bacterial illnesses. Overuse of antibiotics and commercial products containing them has helped superbugs to evolve. We now increasingly face microorganisms that cannot be killed by antibiotics, antifungals, antivirals, or any other chemical weapon we throw at them. Pandemics are the major risk we run as a result, but it is not the only one. Overuse of antibiotics by doctors, homemakers, and hospital managers could mean that, in the not-too-distant future, something as simple as a minor cut could again become life-threatening if it becomes infected.

#### Pharma spills-over – has cascading global impacts that are necessary for human survival.

NAS 8 National Academy of Sciences 12-3-2008 “The Role of the Life Sciences in Transforming America's Future Summary of a Workshop” //Re-cut by Elmer

Fostering Industries to Counter Global Problems The life sciences have applications in areas that range far beyond human health. Life-science based approaches could **contribute to advances in** many industries, from energy production and pollution remediation, to clean manufacturing and the production of new biologically inspired materials. In fact, biological systems could provide the basis for new products, services and industries that we cannot yet imagine. Microbes are already producing biofuels and could, through further research, provide a major component of future energy supplies. Marine and terrestrial organisms extract carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, which suggests that biological systems could be used to help manage climate change. Study of the complex systems encountered in biology is decade, it is really just the beginning.” Advances in the underlying science of plant and animal breeding have been just as dramatic as the advances in genetic can put down a band of fertilizer, come back six months later, and plant seeds exactly on that row, reducing the need for fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural inputs. Fraley said that the global agricultural system needs to adopt the goal of doubling the current yield of **crops while reducing key inputs like pesticides, fertilizers, and water** by one third. “It is more important than putting a man on the moon,” he said. Doubling agricultural yields would “change the world.” Another billion people will join the middle class over the next decade just in India and China as economies continue to grow. And all people need and deserve secure access to food supplies. Continued progress will require both basic and applied research, The evolution of life “put earth under new management,” Collins said. Understanding the future state of the planet will require understanding the biological systems that have shaped the planet. Many of these biological systems are found in the oceans, which cover 70 percent of the earth’s surface and have a crucial impact on weather, climate, and the composition of the atmosphere. In the past decade, new tools have become available to explore the microbial processes that drive the **chemistry of the oceans**, observed David Kingsbury, Chief Program Officer for Science at the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. These technologies have revealed that a large proportion of the planet’s genetic diversity resides in the oceans. In addition, many organisms in the oceans readily exchange genes, creating evolutionary forces that can have global effects. The oceans are currently under great stress, Kingsbury pointed out. Nutrient runoff from agriculture is helping to create huge and expanding “dead zones” where oxygen levels are too low to sustain life. Toxic algal blooms are occurring with higher frequency in areas where they have not been seen in the past. Exploitation of ocean resources is disrupting ecological balances that have formed over many millions of years. Human-induced changes in the chemistry of the atmosphere are changing the chemistry of the oceans, with potentially catastrophic consequences. “If we are not careful, we are not going to have a sustainable planet to live on,” said Kingsbury. Only by understanding the basic biological processes at work in the oceans can humans live sustainably on earth.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (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)//Re-cut by Elmer

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 c**hallenges 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.

#### Evergreening restricts access to necessary life-saving HIV/Aids Medication.

Mellouk and Cassolato 19 Othoman Mellouk and Matteo Cassolato 10-2-2019 "HOW PATENTS AFFECT ACCESS TO HIV TREATMENT" <https://frontlineaids.org/how-patents-affect-access-to-hiv-treatment/> (International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC))//Elmer

Since the world acknowledged the global AIDS epidemic in the 1980s much has changed. **With** **better treatment** and prevention options, **AIDS is no longer** seen as **a death sentence**. Better treatment for co-infections, particularly multi-drug resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) and for viral hepatitis have also emerged in the past decade. However, **despite** the **huge progress** made, **1.7 million** people **acquired HIV** **last year** and 770,000 died of AIDS-related illness. For those people – the parents, children, siblings, and friends who unnecessarily lost their lives – the declarations of success are hollow. UNAIDS, which NGOs have been criticising for years for its unduly optimistic reporting, has now acknowledged in its 2019 Epidemic Update that “the annual number of HIV infections has increased in three regions: Eastern Europe and Central Asia (29% increase), Middle East and North Africa (10% increase) and Latin America (7% increase)”. **HIV advances** that had been made, are now **reversing**. The over-positive reporting resulted in a serious side-effect. Donors, with competing priorities, bought into the success narrative, and overall global funding for AIDS was reduced. Investment in the HIV responses of low- and middle-income countries decreased by $900 million in just one year. We must act now to ensure the response is fully funded and barriers to accessing medicines, including to second and third line HIV treatment and co-infection treatments, are effectively tackled. Frontline AIDS and the International Treatment Preparedness Coalition (ITPC) have released a joint report looking at one of these crucial barriers – the problem with patents in middle-income countries (MICS). In 2019, people aren’t dying because the drugs for treating HIV, MDR-TB, hepatitis C and many other diseases don’t exist. People are dying because they can’t access them. With an increasing focus on voluntary mechanisms to provide access to medicines, the problem with patents in MICs is being seriously over-looked; as are the legitimate tools that governments can use to increase access and availability and decrease prices. The use of legal mechanisms like TRIPS flexibilities by governments has proven highly effective; in the use of these legal tools, governments, global health agencies and civil society all have an essential role to play. **It will not be possible to achieve** a sustainable **response to HIV without** **tackling i**ntellectual **p**roperty (IP) **barriers**, particularly in MICs. THE PROBLEM WITH PATENTS One of the **most critical barriers** that has existed since treatment for HIV was first approved relates to **patents**. Patenting of medicines has increased considerably since 2005. More worrying is the trend of ‘**evergreening’** patents. Evergreening is a tactic **used** by pharmaceutical companies **to extend** their **exclusivity** over a medicine by applying for, and usually getting, multiple, overlapping patents on a single medicine. Most medicines are covered by several patents, known as patent ‘thickets’ and are used to delay or complicate generic production. **Over-pricing** as a result of unmerited and extended monopolies **puts a huge strain on health budgets**. While in theory a government may commit to universal access, in reality the budget may not stretch. **Prices for HIV treatment** can **vary** from under $100 **to tens of thousands** of dollars per person per year (pppy) – for the same drug. Take **dolutegravir** (DTG) for example. In July 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommended all countries immediately adopt DTG-based regimens as the preferred first-line treatment for HIV. Prices pppy range from $75 for countries that are in a ‘voluntary license’, up to $9656 for those that are not. MIDDLE-INCOME, HIGH BURDEN Typically, MICs are worst affected by the patent problem. Nearly 38 million people live with HIV and a majority of them live in MICs. The countries’ income classification means they are frequently left out of pricing deals or voluntary agreements and have funding reduced by health and development agencies, and so face the dual burden of high prevalence and high costs. Evergreening is just one of the tactics employed by pharmaceutical companies to maintain monopolies and pave the way for this arbitrary pricing. Our report details other tactics as well as how they can be legitimately challenged. Within the Sustainable Development Goals themselves our recommendations are backed. SDG3b reaffirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all. Unless TRIPS flexibilities are more routinely put into practice we risk undermining the commitments made to the HIV response.

#### AIDS spread leads to great power nuclear war

Koblentz 10, Deputy Director of the Biodefense Program @ GMU, Assistant Professor in Public and International Affairs, March, "Biosecurity Reconsidered: Calibrating Biological Threats and Responses." International Security Vol. 34, No. 4, p. 96-132 //Re-cut by Elmer

Pandemics are disease outbreaks that occur over a wide geographic area, such as a region, continent, or the entire world, and infect an unusually high proportion of the population. Two pandemic diseases are widely cited as having the potential to pose direct threats to the stability and security of states: HIV/AIDS and influenza. HIV/AIDS. Since it was first identified in 1981, HIV is estimated to have killed more than 25 million people worldwide. According to the Joint UN Program on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the percentage of the global population with HIV has stabilized since 2000, but the overall number of people living with HIV (33 million in 2007) has steadily increased. Sub-Saharan Africa continues to bear a disproportionate share of the global burden of HIV with 35 percent of new HIV infections, 75 percent of AIDS deaths, and 67 percent of all people living with HIV. 116 Scholars have identified four ways that HIV/AIDS can affect security. 117 First, the disproportionately high prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the armed forces of some nations, particularly in Southern Africa, may compromise the ability of those states to defend themselves from internal or external threats. Militaries with high rates of HIV infection may suffer losses in combat readiness and effectiveness as infected troops are transferred out of combat roles, units lose cohesion because of high turnover rates, middle management is "hollowed out" by the early death or disability of officers, and defense budgets are strained because of rising medical costs and the need to recruit and train replacements for sick soldiers. The second threat is that HIV/AIDS will undermine the international peace-keeping system. Nations with militaries with high rates of HIV/AIDS will be unable to provide troops for international peacekeeping missions; nations with healthy militaries may be unwilling to commit troops to peacekeeping operations in nations with a high prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS; and war-torn nations may be unwilling to accept peacekeepers for fear they will spread the disease in their country. The third threat is that a "second wave" of HIV/AIDS could strike large, strategically important countries such as China, India, and Russia. These states, which possess nuclear weapons and are important players in critical regions, also suffer from internal security challenges that could be aggravated by a severe AIDS epidemic and its attendant socioeconomic disruptions.The fourth threat is that the high prevalence of HIV in less developed countries will cause political instability that could degenerate into internal conflict or spread into neighboring countries. Unlike most diseases, which affect primarily the poor, young, and old, HIV/AIDS strikes young adults and members of the middle and upper classes. By sickening and killing members of society when they should be their most productive, HIV/AIDS has inflicted the "single greatest reversal in human development" in modern history. 118

#### Evergreening restricts Generic Patents by artificially extending Patent Cliffs.

Moir and Gleeson 14 Hazel Moir and Deborah Gleeson 11-5-2014 "Explainer: evergreening and how big pharma keeps drug prices high" <https://theconversation.com/explainer-evergreening-and-how-big-pharma-keeps-drug-prices-high-33623> (Adjunct Associate Professor; economics of patents, copyright and other "IP", Australian National University AND Lecturer in Public Health, La Trobe University)//Elmer

Efforts by pharmaceutical companies to extend their patents cost taxpayers millions of dollars each year. In some cases they also mean people are subjected to unnecessary clinical trials. **Big pharma** makes big profits. Their useful new **drugs are patented**, **protecting them from competition** and allowing them to charge high prices. When the patent ends, other companies are allowed to supply the previously patented drug. These are **known as generics**. The prices of generic drugs are much lower than the prices of in-patent drugs – it has been suggested that for widely used drugs price falls can be as much as 95%. Pharmaceutical companies want to get their new products listed on the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS), because they will sell in much higher volumes. Taxpayers have an interest in ensuring that these drugs move from the high in-patent price to the much lower off-patent price as early as possible. On average, a patent provides effective protection from competition for about 14 years. But, of course, **companies** like monopolies and would like to **extend the patent period**. Over the past few decades they have **used** a process known as evergreening to keep generic companies out of the market for longer. How evergreening works **Evergreening** is achieved by seeking extra patents on variations of the original drug – new forms of release, new dosages, new combinations or variations, or new forms. Big pharma refers to this as “lifecycle management”. Even if the patent is dubious, the company can earn more from the higher prices than it pays in legal fees to keep the dubious patent alive. Evergreening is possible because in Australia the standard required to get a patent is very low. Different methods of delivering drugs (such as extended release, for example) have been known for decades. But when one of these known delivery methods is combined with a known drug, the patent office considers this sufficiently inventive to grant a new 20-year patent. Another favourite evergreening strategy is to patent a slight variation of the drug. Brand pharmaceutical companies argue that these “lifecycle management” patents provide improved health outcomes to the community. They meet the (very low) patentability thresholds of novelty and inventiveness. Critics argue that the claimed improved health outcomes are small or non-existent. An evergreening story: from Efexor to Efexor-XR to Pristiq An example is useful. In the case of the depression drug **venlafaxine** (marketed as Efexor), the original version had major side-effects. However, when provided in extended release form these side-effects were substantially reduced. Naturally the extended release form (Efexor-XR) became preferred. Although it might seem obvious to combine venlafaxine with an extended release form to overcome the side-effect problem, the patent office **granted two new patents** for extended release versions of venlafaxine. One of these was written in such a broad form that it **delayed generic entry by two and a half years**, while legal wrangling took place. Eventually the evergreening patent was declared invalid. But the cost to taxpayers of this delay is estimated at $209 million. Pfizer has a second evergreening strategy for venlafaxine. When venlafaxine is taken, the human body converts it to desvenlafaxine. In other words desvenlafaxine is a variant of the original active pharmaceutical ingredient venlafaxine. Clearly the two compounds are closely related. So it is astonishing that desvenlafaxine passed the tests for getting a patent. Desvenlafaxine is marketed as Pristiq. Pristiq entered the market early in the two-and-a-half-year period of legal wrangling over the extended release venlafaxine (Efexor-XR) patent. Pfizer’s marketing of Pristiq in February 2009 was so lavish that it attracted the attention of investigative journalists. Pristiq has no additional benefits for patients. Despite this, during the first six months of 2014 half of prescriptions were written for Pristiq rather than for the clinically identical Efexor-XR. But Pristiq costs between $A22.32 and $A26.50 more than Efexor-XR, depending on the dose. Based on reported prescription volumes in 2013-14, the cost to the taxpayer of doctors prescribing Pristiq rather than Efexor-XR exceeds $21 million a year. Unless generic companies challenge the desvenlafaxine patent, there will be **no generic versions of Pristiq until after August 2023**, when the patent expires.

#### That inhibits India’s Pharma Industry – exports of Generics is key to revitalize India Pharma Leadership.

Neelakantan 14 Murali Neelakantan 11-11-2014 “Indian Pharmaceutical Industry: Affordable Access to Healthcare for all” https://web.archive.org/web/20150315092713/https://abcmundial.com/en/news/brics/technology/3838-indian-pharmaceutical-industry-affordable-access-healthcare-all/ (consejero general global de Cipla Limited)//Elmer

The story of the Indian pharma sector could well have been like the IT sector if only enough attention was paid to its achievements and the huge impact it has had on healthcare around the world. Unlike other manufacturing or heavy industries in **India**, the **pharma** sector is innovative, widely **acknowledged as making a global impact in** the **treatment** of diseases like HIV AIDS[1] and also able to support the healthcare needs of the world[2]. The fact that Indian factories are licensed to produce 3,685 drugs compared with 3,815 made within the UK suggests that Indian factories meet global quality standards and are able to produce complex drugs.[3] While news of regulators visiting Indian manufacturing facilities and finding fault with processes is widely reported, very little is said about how routine this is. Gerald Heddell, director of inspections, enforcement and standards at the MHRA, stressed that the number of problems identified by regulators in India was in proportion to the volume of medicines they produced. “When we look back over 110 inspections we conducted over the last two years in India, we had significant concerns with 9 or 10 companies,” he said. “That does not represent a statistically higher proportion than in other parts of the world. India stands out because it is just such a big supplier.”[4] The **Indian pharma Industry** **produces** about **20%** [5] **of** the **global generic drugs** **with the US accounting for** nearly **28 per cent of Indian pharmaceutical exports**[6], followed by the European Union at 18 per cent and Africa at over 17 per cent.[7] This should be a clear acknowledgement of the **global leadership that Indian pharma industry has** achieved which would have been impossible without following global quality standards. Another popular criticism of Indian pharma has been that there is insufficient investment in innovation and R&D. Despite over 500 new drugs being discovered by Indian pharma companies during 1985 – 2005, there seems a perception that India thrives on copying foreign products[8]. A recent study by Evaluate[9], a leading independent specialist pharma consultancy, reports that there is little difference in the investment by “innovators” and “generics” and it is just a myth that “innovators” invest heavily in research while “generics” don’t. Despite well publicised claims of the Western world, there seems to be a marked decrease in R&D investments[10] and this trend is expected to continue.[11] When one realises that almost 50% of the European pharma patents are either lying dormant or filed in order to block competitors[12] one wonders how innovation is being defined and encouraged. Is it innovation if the effect is stifling further innovation and competition and creating barriers for improvements? **Indian pharma** industry has clearly demonstrated that it **has** the **potential to be** a part of **the solution** for universal access to healthcare. India’s strength is **innovating** **to improve global access to medicines** as opposed to developing more and more “me too” drugs which have been traditionally defined by the West as innovation. There is now a growing acknowledgment that the existing IPR regime that is being touted by the West doesn’t foster innovation. As such, the current patent system is itself reeling from the ill effects of patent assertion entities (trolls) that do not produce anything of value but merely hold patents with a view to threatening businesses with infringement actions to obtain licensing revenue. Patents have other flaws that relate to monopoly power, both because it harms consumers who have to pay high prices and because it can hinder improvements and subsequent innovations.[13] Static distortions, too little incentive for original research, and wasteful duplication of research are some of the most serious problems of the patent system.[14]In addition to TRIPs - compliant patent regimes which ostensibly promote innovation and discourage copying, the next generation of barriers to competition seems to be set up as global standards. Just as IPR was addressed by the WTO in TRIPs, the more recent barriers are likely to be in the form of harmonised regulations. Patent linkage[15] (in Canada and the US for example) denies access to markets on a mere allegation of patent infringement. Despite the US Supreme Court[16] indicating that patent linkage needs to be reconsidered and access to medicines should not be denied on allegation of patent infringement and recent attempts by Italy to introduce a system of patent linkage resulted in a notice from the European Commission asking for the removal of these provisions from Italian law,[17] patent linkage is a real barrier to competition in healthcare which is beset with unaffordable drugs. Data exclusivity extends the term of monopoly enjoyed by patent holders and keeps out competition and innovation without any benefits to society. This concept does not exist in sectors other than pharma and there seems to be no real rationale for pharma to get special treatment. In fact, data exclusivity raises several ethical and moral issues. Countries have always been allowed to customise their IP policy and regulation based on their unique local conditions. Some countries are more technologically proficient than others, and this distinction may warrant separate norms in areas of technology that they are strong in.[18] Even where harmonisation has been accepted as a concept, like the EU for example, it has been implemented in a manner that is sympathetic to the local conditions of individual countries. India’s strength and expertise lies in developing drugs which are accessible for patients across the globe. India’s stand on IPR regime acknowledges that diverse countries cannot be forced to one uniform regulatory system. This principled stand was recently demonstrated during the Bali round of talks on the Trade Facilitation Agreement.[19] In the background of the Trans Pacific and Trans Atlantic Partnerships being negotiated, India has the opportunity to demonstrate leadership in the global market place by pioneering the opposition to using harmonisation as a proxy for barriers to competition. While the US and its allies may officially oppose India’s view of the IPR regime they have realised that the key to their sustainable development is the ability of government to ensure that healthcare is accessible to everyone, not just the rich. Cost of healthcare has increased significantly causing an alarming number of patients to go off treatment, risk importing counterfeits[20] or in many cases, declare bankruptcy[21]. The issue of access to healthcare in the developing world has, despite some efforts by the UN, The Global Fund, PEPFAR and other aid institutions, not had the impact that it should have. There is a realisation, albeit unarticulated, that Indian Pharma companies have the potential to be, like Indian technology companies averted the y2K crisis, a key element of the solution to world's healthcare crisis. **Now is** a great **opportunity for India to demonstrate leadership** in IPR regimes as more and more countries like South Africa and Brazil are following India’s example.

#### Indian pharma strength is key to their soft power

Jha 16 Prem Shankar Jha 11-5-2016 “Let India unleash its soft power” <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/Let-India-unleash-its-soft-power/article13292272.ece> (Writer at the Hindu)//Elmer

And why stop at food grains? In drought-struck regions, contaminated water kills much faster than hunger and takes the very young and the very old first. The **Indian pharmaceuticals** industry **is the envy of the world**, **because it produces and sells** **medicines at a tenth to a thirtieth** of the **retail prices abroad**. **Can Delhi not buttress its** **food aid with medicines** and vitamins? This will give **an entirely new meaning to** the concept of **Soft Power for**, **unlike the West** in its present incarnation, **it would be seeking to build influence by protecting** and preserving, **not destroying**; by expanding peoples' futures instead of ending them in darkness. We have been relatively **slow to realise** our **full potential** for the exercise of soft power. This could be because of our too-ready acceptance of a concept that was created by an American to address American foreign policy concerns. In Joseph Nye's original definition, soft power originated in the capacity to attract others to your country's culture, values and institutions. Indian policymakers have taken this to heart and relied mainly upon India's open society, democratic institutions, lack of aggressive intent and willingness to share the burden of U.N. peacekeeping and policing the global commons, to garner respect and support in the international community. It is only in the last half-decade, as the Westphalian international order crumbled and India's neighbourhood became increasingly unstable, that New Delhi has begun to explore the economic dimensions of ‘soft power' seriously. Afghanistan has been the focus of its initial efforts, and its success is attested to by the threat (irrational though it is) that Pakistan feels from it.

#### Successful India Soft Power solves Extinction

Kamdar 7, Mira. Planet India: How the fastest growing democracy is transforming America and the world. Simon and Schuster, 2007. (Bernard Schwartz Fellow at the Asia Society in 2008)//Elmer

**No other country matters more to the future of our planet than India**. There is no challenge we face, no opportunity we covet where India does not have critical relevance. **From combating global terror to finding cures for dangerous pandemics, from dealing with the energy crisis to averting the worst scenarios of global warming**, from rebalancing stark global inequalities to spurring the vital innovation needed to create jobs and improve lives—**India is now a pivotal player**. The world is undergoing a process of profound recalibration in which the rise of Asia is the most important factor. India holds the key to this new world. India is at once an ancient Asian civilization, a modern nation grounded in Enlightenment values and democratic institutions, and a rising twenty-first-century power. With a population of 1.2 billion, India is the world’s largest democracy. It is an open, vibrant society. India’s diverse population includes Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists, Jains, Zoroastrians, Jews, and animists. There are twenty-two official languages in India. Three hundred fifty million Indians speak English. India is the world in microcosm. Its geography encompasses every climate, from snowcapped Himalayas to palm-fringed beaches to deserts where nomads and camels roam. A developing country, India is divided among a tiny affluent minority, a rising middle class, and 800 million people who live on less than $2 per day. India faces all the critical problems of our time—extreme social inequality, employment insecurity, a growing energy crisis, severe water shortages, a degraded environment, global warming, a galloping HIV/AIDS epidemic, terrorist attacks—on a scale that defies the imagination. India’s goal is breathtaking in scope: transform a developing country of more than 1 billion people into a developed nation and global leader by 2020, and do this as a democracy in an era of resource scarcity and environmental degradation. The world has to cheer India on. If India fails, there is a real risk that **our world will become hostage to political chaos, war over dwindling resources, a poisoned environment, and galloping disease**. Wealthy enclaves will employ private companies to supply their needs and private militias to protect them from the poor massing at their gates. But, if India succeeds, it will demonstrate that it is possible to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. It will prove that multiethnic, multireligious democracy is not a luxury for rich societies. It will **show us how to save our environment, and how to manage in a fractious, multipolar world**. India’s gambit is truly the venture of the century.

#### Drug Innovation efforts are key to solve Influenza – more effective vaccines are key to prevent another Flu Pandemic.

Lagnado 18 Lucette Lagnado 11-2-2018 "New Ideas to Fight the Flu" <https://archive.is/VcNyK#selection-4589.0-4619.188> (Reporter for the Wall Street Journal)//Elmer

**Researchers spooked by** the recent **brutal flu season** and fearful of a pandemic are **looking for** **something more effective than a seasonal shot** to prevent the virus. Ideas include germ-killing lamps and **a turbo-charged “universal vaccine**” that would be effective for years and would fight all strains of flu, not just a few. NYC Health + Hospitals, the nation’s largest public health system, recently convened experts to brainstorm how to handle a flu pandemic, in which millions would be stricken**. “It is not a matter of if it will happen, it is a matter of when it will happen**,” Syra Madad, senior director of the system’s Special Pathogens Program, told the gathering of more than 100 hospital and government officials and researchers. “We have **all the ingredients for a pandemic**,” she said, recalling the 1918 flu that killed 50 million people across the world. Since then, there have been major advances in science and infection control. But there are also **more lethal bugs** floating around **in** an incredibly **mobile society,** Dr. Madad said. In the 2017-2018 flu season, nearly 80,000 Americans died and more than 900,000 were hospitalized. Experts advise getting the seasonal shot; this week, they couldn’t predict this flu season’s severity or how effective the flu shot will be. One weapon unavailable in 1918 is the flu shot, which Dr. Madad and other experts say is still a must, no matter its shortcomings. A new drug to relieve flu symptoms was recently approved by the Food and Drug Administration, the first in nearly 20 years, the agency said. Xofluza is supposed to shorten the flu’s duration by a day or more and requires only one dose. But preventing flu is the goal, and most experts agree that more effective vaccines are urgently needed. Typically, the seasonal shot has an effectiveness rate between 40% and 60%, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In the most recent season, it reduced a person’s likelihood of getting sick with the flu by 40%. Getting the vaccine significantly reduces hospitalization among adults and children, says Dan Jernigan, director of CDC’s influenza division. Every year, flu vaccines are planned months in advance. Predicting which strains the vaccine should cover “is a guessing game,” said Jeffrey Shaman, an associate professor at Columbia’s Mailman School of Public Health. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, is spearheading the federal effort for a universal vaccine. A leader during the AIDS epidemic, he sees that fight as a template for taking on the flu. He hopes to replicate the “passion” that went into AIDS research, with “young as well as experienced investigators from different fields” mobilized to seek a cure. Dr. Fauci aims to assemble a dream team of scientists with different areas of expertise—such as virology, immunology and drug development—to work together on a universal vaccine. For seven years, his project, the Collaborative Influenza Vaccine Innovation Centers, will dole out $30 million a year in grants. The deadline for proposals is Nov. 29. Dr. Fauci said he welcomes researchers who aren’t flu experts to join the effort. Among those researching a different tack is David Brenner, a professor of radiation biophysics at Columbia’s Vagelos College of Physicians & Surgeons. Dr. Brenner wants to fight the spread of flu with a form of ultraviolet light that can destroy germs but is safe for humans. “Our approach is let us try and kill the virus before they get to you,” Dr. Brenner said. He sees his lamps as a supplement to a vaccine, not a substitute for one. Hospitals already zap equipment with ultraviolet light to sanitize it, but the lamps are off-limits to people, because of health hazards. Dr. Brenner’s lamps emit “far UVC” light—a wavelength he said is safe for humans. These would be beamed “anywhere people congregate,” he said, such as doctors’ offices or airplanes. Most experts said **a long-term** and **more effective** **universal vaccine should be the priority**. “I am a firm believer that the **best solution is an appropriate vaccine**,” said Adolfo Garcia-Sastre, a professor of medicine and infectious diseases at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, noting that **smallpox was eradicated by vaccine**. “The ultimate dream is the universal [vaccine], but even one that works better” than the seasonal flu shot would be welcome, Dr. Garcia-Sastre said. He and his colleagues **teamed up with** other scientists, including some from **the pharmaceuticals industry**, and are seeking funding from Dr. Fauci’s effort to research a vaccine they say works differently from the seasonal shot. The flu virus is covered in proteins shaped like mushrooms, said Florian Krammer, one of the Sinai researchers and a professor of microbiology. The seasonal vaccine targets the mushroom’s “cap” to produce antibodies that fight back, Dr. Krammer said, but this cap changes, prompting the need to change the vaccine constantly. The Sinai team’s vaccine focuses on the “stalk” of the virus, which doesn’t change, so a person would need, ideally, no more than two or three shots during his lifetime. A trial of the shot’s safety and immune response is under way on about 65 patients. Dr. Fauci’s agency already is funding research into other universal vaccines, such as one by BiondVax Pharmaceuticals, an Israeli company. The vaccine, known as M-001, was designed to keep the “vast majority of flu strains” at bay, BiondVax said, and is being tested in the U.S. A universal vaccine is probably years off, experts warned, and likely to be reached through incremental stages. Robert Atmar at Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, the principal investigator of the M-001 trial, said more studies are needed. A universal vaccine, he said, “is a high bar to attain.”

#### Influenza will cause Extinction

Gueterl 12 Fred Guterl 11-28-2012 “Armageddon 2.0” <https://thebulletin.org/2012/11/armageddon-2-0/> (executive editor – Scientific American)//Elmer

The world lived for half a century with the constant specter of nuclear war and its potentially devastating consequences. The end of the Cold War took the potency out of this Armageddon scenario, yet the existential dangers have **only** multiplied.Today the technologies that pose some of the biggest problems are not so much military as commercial. They come from biology, energy production, and the information sciences -- and are the very technologies that have fueled our prodigious growth as a species. They are far more seductive than nuclear weapons, and more difficult to extricate ourselves from. The technologies we worry about today form the basis of our global civilization and are essential to our survival. The mistake many of us make about the darker aspects of our high-tech civilization is in thinking that we have plenty of time to address them. We may, if we're lucky. But it's more likely that we have less time than we think. There may be a limited window of opportunity for preventing catastrophes such as pandemics, runaway climate change, and cyber attacks on national power grids. Emerging diseases. The influenza pandemic of 2009 is a case in point. Because of rising prosperity and travel, the world has grown more conducive to a destructive **flu** virus **i**n recent years, many public health officials believe. Most people probably remember 2009 as a time when health officials overreacted. But in truth, the 2009 virus came from nowhere, and by the time it reached the radar screens of health officials, it was already well on its way to spreading far and wide. "H1N1 caught us all with our pants down," says flu expert Robert G. Webster of St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, Tennessee. Before it became apparent that the virus was a mild one, health officials must have felt as if they were staring into the abyss. If the virus had been as deadly as, say, the 1918 flu virus or some more recent strains of bird flu, the result would have rivaled what the planners of the 1950s expected from a nuclear war. It would have been a "total disaster," Webster says. "You wouldn't get the gasoline for your car, you wouldn't get the electricity for your power, you wouldn't get the medicines you need. Society as we know it would fall apart."

### 1AC – Advantage 2

#### Advantage 2 is Drug Prices

#### Evergreening keeps Drug Prices high.

Amin 18 Tahir Amin 6-27-2018 "The problem with high drug prices isn't 'foreign freeloading,' it's the patent system" [High drug prices caused by US patent system, not 'foreign freeloaders' (cnbc.com)](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/06/25/high-drug-prices-caused-by-us-patent-system.html) <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/06/25/high-drug-prices-caused-by-us-patent-system.html> (co-founder of nonprofit I-MAK.org)//Elmer

**'Evergreening'** Instead of going to new medicines, the study finds that 74 percent of new patents during the decade went to drugs that already existed. It found that 80 percent of the nearly 100 best-selling drugs extended their exclusivity protections at least once, and 50 percent extended their patents more than once—with the effect of **prolonging** the **time before generics** could reach the market **as drug prices continued to rise**. The strategy is called “evergreening”: drug makers add on new patents to prolong a drug’s exclusivity, even when the additions aren’t fundamentally new, non-obvious, and useful as the law requires. One of the most expensive cancer drugs on the market, **Revlimid**®, is a case in point: **priced at** over $**125,000** per year of treatment, Celgene has sought **105 patents** on Revlimid®, many of which have been granted, extending its monopoly until the end of 2036. That gives the Revlimid® patent portfolio a lifespan of 40 years, which is being used to block or deter generic competitors from entering the market. But a recent I-MAK analysis finds that several of Celgene’s patents are mere add-ons—not fundamentally new to deserve a patent. And because of the thicket of patents around Revlimid®, **payers** are **projected to spend $45 billion** **in excess costs** on that drug alone as compared to what they could be paying if generic competitors were to enter when the first patent expires in 2019. Meanwhile, Celgene is also among the pharmaceuticals that have been recently scolded by the FDA for refusing to share samples with generic makers so they can test their own products against the brands in order to attain FDA approval. **In the absence of** genuine **competition** in the U.S. prescription drug market, **monopolies are yielding reckless pricing schemes and prohibitively expensive drugs** for Americans (and people around the world) who need them. In 2015, for example, U.S. Senators Wyden and Grassley found after an 18-month bipartisan investigation that the notorious $84,000 price tag for the hepatitis C drug made by Gilead was based on “a pricing and marketing strategy designed to maximize revenue with little concern for access or affordability.” Gilead’s subsequent hepatitis C drug Harvoni® was introduced to the market at a still higher cost of $94,500. Who benefits when drugs are priced so high? Not the 85 percent of Americans with hepatitis C who are still not able to afford treatment.

#### That pushes people into poverty – our internal is causal.

Hoban 10 Rose Hoban 9-13-2010 "High Cost of Medicine Pushes More People into Poverty" <https://www.voanews.com/science-health/high-cost-medicine-pushes-more-people-poverty> (spent more than six years as the health reporter for North Carolina Public Radio – WUNC, where she covered health care, state health policy, science and research with a focus on public health issues. She left to start North Carolina Health News after watching many of her professional peers leave or be laid off of their jobs, leaving NC with few people to cover this complicated and important topic. ALSO cites Laurens Niens who is a Health Researcher at Erasmus University Rotterdam)//Elmer

Health economist Laurens Niëns found that drugs needed to treat chronic diseases could be considered unaffordable **for many people in poor countries**. Medicines can be expensive and often make up a large portion of any family's health care budget. And the burden can be even greater for people in poor countries, where the **cost of vital medicines can push them into poverty**. The problem is growing as more people around the world are diagnosed with chronic diseases such as high blood pressure and diabetes. Being diagnosed with a chronic disease usually compells patients to seek treatment for a prolonged period of time. That increases the eventual price tag for health, says health economist Laurens Niëns at Erasmus University in the Netherlands. Niëns examined medication pricing data from the World Health Organization and also looked at data from the World Bank on household income in many countries. Using the data, he calculated how much people need to spend on necessities such as food, housing, education and medicines. "The medicines we looked at are medicines for patients who suffer from asthma, diabetes, hypertension and we looked at an adult respiratory infection," Niëns says. "Three conditions are for chronic diseases, which basically means that people need to procure those medicines each and every day." Niëns focused on the cost of medicine for those conditions. He found the essential drugs could be considered unaffordable for many people in poor countries - so much so that their cost often pushes people into abject poverty. "The proportion of the population that is living below the poverty line, plus the people that are being pushed below the poverty line, can **reach up to 80 percent** in some countries for some medicines," Niëns says. He points out that generic medicines - which are more affordable than brand-name medications - are often **not available in the marketplace**. And, according to Niëns, poor government policies can drive up the cost of medications. "For instance, a lot of governments actually tax medicines when they come into the country," he says. "[They] have no standard for the markups on medicines through the distribution chain. So often, governments think they pay a good price for the medicines when they procure them from the producer. However, before such a medicine reaches a patient, markups are sometimes up to 1,000 percent."

#### Inequality drives diversionary nationalism which sparks international conflict.

Solt 11, Frederick. "Diversionary nationalism: Economic inequality and the formation of national pride." The Journal of Politics 73.3 (2011): 821-830. (Ph.D. in Political Science from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, currently Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa, Assistant Professor, Departments of Political Science and Sociology, Southern Illinois at the time of publication)//Elmer

One of the oldest theories of nationalism is that states instill the nationalist myth in their citizens to divert their attention from great economic inequality and so forestall pervasive unrest. Because the very concept of nationalism obscures the extent of inequality and is a potent tool for delegitimizing calls for redistribution, it is a perfect diversion, and states should be expected to engage in more nationalist mythmaking when inequality increases. The evidence presented by this study supports this theory: across the countries and over time, where economic inequality is greater, nationalist sentiments are substantially more widespread. This result adds considerably to our understanding of nationalism. To date, many scholars have focused on the international environment as the principal source of threats that prompt states to generate nationalism; the importance of the domestic threat posed by economic inequality has been largely overlooked. However, at least in recent years, domestic inequality is a far more important stimulus for the generation of nationalist sentiments than the international context. Given that nuclear weapons—either their own or their allies’—rather than the mass army now serve as the primary defense of many countries against being overrun by their enemies, perhaps this is not surprising: nationalism-inspired mass mobilization is simply no longer as necessary for protection as it once was (see Mearsheimer 1990, 21; Posen 1993, 122–24). Another important implication of the analyses presented above is that growing economic inequality may increase ethnic conflict. States may foment national pride to stem discontent with increasing inequality, but this pride can also lead to more hostility towards immigrants and minorities. Though pride in the nation is distinct from chauvinism and outgroup hostility, it is nevertheless closely related to these phenomena, and recent experimental research has shown that members of majority groups who express high levels of national pride can be nudged into intolerant and xenophobic responses quite easily (Li and Brewer 2004). This finding suggests that, by leading to the creation of more national pride, higher levels of inequality produce environments favorable to those who would inflame ethnic animosities. Another and perhaps even more worrisome implication regards the likelihood of war. Nationalism is frequently suggested as a cause of war, and more national pride has been found to result in a much greater demand for national security even at the expense of civil liberties (Davis and Silver 2004, 36–37) as well as preferences for “a more militaristic foreign affairs posture and a more interventionist role in world politics” (Conover and Feldman 1987, 3). To the extent that these preferences influence policymaking, the growth in economic inequality over the last quarter century should be expected to lead to more aggressive foreign policies and more international conflict. If economic inequality prompts states to generate diversionary nationalism as the results presented above suggest, then rising inequality could make for a more dangerous world. The results of this work also contribute to our still limited knowledge of the relationship between economic inequality and democratic politics. In particular, it helps explain the fact that, contrary to median-voter models of redistribution (e.g., Meltzer and Richard 1981), democracies with higher levels of inequality do not consistently respond with more redistribution (e.g., Bénabou 1996). Rather than allowing redistribution to be decided through the democratic process suggested by such models, this work suggests that states often respond to higher levels of inequality with more nationalism. Nationalism then works to divert attention from inequality, so many citizens neither realize the extent of inequality nor demand redistributive policies. By prompting states to promote nationalism, greater economic inequality removes the issue of redistribution from debate and therefore narrows the scope of democratic politics.

### 1AC – Framing

#### The standard is act hedonistic util. Prefer –

#### [1] – No intent-foresight distinction – if I foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of my deliberation since its intrinsic to my action

#### [2] – Actor spec – governments lack wills or intentions and inevitably deals with tradeoffs – outweighs because agents have differing obligations.

#### [3] Extinction first – [A] Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible [B] Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities [C] Moral obligation – allowing people to die is unethical and should be prevented because it creates ethics towards other people

### 1AC – Underview

#### [1] Aff gets 1AR theory since the neg can be infinitely abusive and I can’t check back. It’s drop the debater since the 1ar is too short to win both theory and substance. No 2NR RVI, paradigm issues, or theory since they’d dump on it for 6 minutes and my 3-minute 2AR is spread too thin. Competing interps since reasonability is arbitrary and bites judge intervention.